FATİH UNIVERSITY
Institute of Social Sciences

LITERATURE AND EXILE: IMPERIAL IDENTITIES OF ASIA MINOR

A dissertation submitted
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Comparative Literature

by

Emine Yeşim BEDLEK

Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. Agnes BRANDABUR

For the victims of the Lausanne Convention

APPROVAL

Student	**:** Emine Yeşim BEDLEK
Institute	**:** Institute of Social Sciences
Department	**:** Comparative Literature
Thesis Subject	**:** Literature and Exile: Imperial Identities of Asia Minor
Thesis Date	**:** 11.03.2013

I certify that this dissertation satisfies all the requirements as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Mohamed BAKARİ
Head of Program

This is to certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philisophy.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Agnes Clare BRANDABUR
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mohamed BAKARİ ……

Prof. Dr. Barry Charles THARAUD ..…….

Prof. Dr. Mehmet İPŞİRLİ …….

Prof. Dr. Ayhan AKTAR …….

Assist. Prof. Dr. Agnes Clare BRANDABUR ..…..……

It is approved that this dissertation has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet KARAKUYU
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATION

1. The material included in this dissertation has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The program of advanced study of which this dissertation is a part has been comprised of: courses in Comparative Literature, including literary theory, English, American, and World Literature in genres that include narrative literature, and thematic courses such as Identity Politics and Literature.

i) Research Methods. The dissertation incorporates research methods taught on both undergraduate and on graduate levels by the dissertation advisor during the course of study. See below.

ii) Sources examined in this dissertation include articles from scholarly journals, other articles such as essays and interviews with the authors in question; books on literature, history, anthropology, sociology in general and history of the Ottoman Empire, Greece and Turkey, social and cultural anthropology, sociology, international relations on Greece and Turkey, and oral history in particular; dissertation style guides of Turkish universities and international universities as well as many relevant books published by university presses on this subject.

Emine Yeşim BEDLEK

March 2013

ABSTRACT

Emine Yeşim BEDLEK **March 2013**

LITERATURE AND EXILE: IMPERIAL IDENTITIES OF ASIA MINOR

This dissertation analyzes the imperial identities of the Asia Minor Greeks in three selected literary texts: *Farewell Anatolia* by Dido Sotiriou, *Birds Without Wings* by Louis de Bernières, and *Emanet Çeyiz: Mübadele İnsanları* (The Entrusted Trousseau: Peoples of the Exchange) by Kemal Yalçın. The selected texts depict the lives of the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor before and after the Catastrophe, with special emphasis on common cultural heritage of the Greeks and Turks flourished in Anatolia. The Lausanne Convention signed in 1923 between Greece and Turkey displaced more than one million people from their homeland in order to homogenize the populations of Greece and Turkey. Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were deported to Greece, and Muslims of Greece were deported to Turkey to live with their co-religionists. Having a totally different background and culture from the local Greeks, the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor differentiated themselves from the local Greeks. Asia Minor refugees were the last Ottomans and they used to have "imperial identities" or "Ottoman identities," which were cosmopolitan and tolerant to different ethnic groups and religions. Their distinct imperial identity was against the discourse of the nationalist agenda and policy of the Greek state.

Key words:

The Treaty of Lausanne, population exchange, Asia Minor refugees, imperial identity, Ottoman identity, oral history, witness literature, cosmopolitanism, nationalism.

KISA ÖZET

Emine Yeşim BEDLEK **Mart 2013**

EDEBİYAT VE SÜRGÜN: KÜÇÜK ASYA'NIN İMPARATORLUK KİMLİĞİ

Bu çalışma Anadolu Rumlarının imparatorluk kimliklerini seçilmiş üç eserde incelemektedir: Dido Sotiriyu'nun *Benden Selam Söyle Anadolu'ya* adlı romanı, Louis de Bernières tarafından yazılmış olan *Kanatsız Kuşlar* ve Kemal Yalçın'ın *Emanet Çeyiz: Mübadele İnsanları*. Seçilmiş eserler Anadolu Rumlarının mübadele öncesinde Anadolu'da Türklerle birlikte barış içinde yaşayışlarını ve ortak bir kültürel mirasın varisi olduklarını vurgular. Lozan Protokolü ile bir buçuk milyon insan anavatanından ayrılmak zorunda kalmıştır. Yunanistan ve Türkiye milliyetçi akımlardan etkilenerek kurdukları milli devlet sınırları içinde azınlıklara yer vermek istememiş ve mübadele ile nüfuslarını homojen yapmaya çalışmışlardır. Anadolu Rumları Ortodoks oldukları için Yunanistan'a, Yunanistan'daki Müslümanlar ise Anadolu'ya göç ettirilmişlerdir. Yerel Yunan halkından oldukça farklı bir kültüre ve geçmişe sahip olan Anadolu Rumları Yunanistan'da "imparatorluk" veya "Osmanlı kimliği" diyeceğimiz bir kimlikle, yani çok kültürlü bir Osmanlı geçmişinden geldiklerini vurgulayarak yaşamlarını sürdürmüşlerdir. Aslında mübadiller son Osmanlılardır. Bu çalışma seçilmiş eserlerde Anadolu Rumlarının Yunanistan'da Osmanlı kimliklerine vurgu yaparak Yunanistan'ın yerel halkından kendilerini nasıl ayırdıklarını inceler. Bu tutum ise milli devlet söylemine aykırıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Lozan Anlaşması, mübadele, Küçük Asya Rumları, mübadil, imparatorluk kimliği, Osmanlı kimliği, sözlü tarih, tanıklık edebiyatı, çokkültürlülük, milliyetçilik.

LIST OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION…….……iii
APPROVAL……iv
AUTHOR DECLARATION... ……v
ABSTRACT…….....vi
KISA ÖZET……...…….vii
LIST OF CONTENTS…….....viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…….…….....xi
INTRODUCTION……1

CHAPTER 1

THE *MILLET* SYSTEM: AN OTTOMAN LEGACY IN LAUSANNE

1.1. The *Millet-i Rum*…….....15

1.2. The Asia Minor Catastrophe……23

1.3. The Treaty of Lausanne……...31

1.4. Karamanlis: Ethno-religious Conflict in Lausanne……..37

1.5. Deportation and Settlement of the Refugees……..…….47

1.6. Lausanne in Contemporary Debates……52

CHAPTER 2

MEMORIES OF EXILE: WITNESSING THE CATASTROPHE

2.1. Oral History Archives of the Catastrophe……64

2.2. Fictionalizing the Catastrophe…….....74

2.3. Sophia's Trousseau: Recollecting the Past……..93

CHAPTER 3

NATIONALISM IN ASIA MINOR: RESOLUTION OF A CONFLICT

3.1. Greeks and Turks: Imagined Communities……...118

3.2. Imperialism in Asia Minor.....143

3.3. Saying farewell to Philothei……..161

CHAPTER 4

IMPERIAL IDENTITIES OF *MIKRASIÁTES*

4.1. Refugees: The Last Ottomans…….….....175

4.2. Imperial Lives of the *Mikrasiátes*……..193

4.3. *Mikrasiátes:* The Legacy of the *Millet-i Rum* ……...204

CONCLUSION…….…..213

BIBLIOGRAPHY……..…….218

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

F. U.	Fatih University
I. S. S.	Institute of Social Sciences
M. A.	Master of Arts
M. Sc.	Master of Science
Ph. D.	Doctor of Philosophy
YÖK	Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu (Higher Education Council)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I will not be able to complete this dissertation in good time without the support of those special people in my life. First of all, I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Agnes Clare Brandabur and Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari for taking my attention to the population exchange. Dr. Brandabur encouraged me to pursue my research and helped me in every step of this long and tiring journey. Secondly, I want to thank my professor, Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari, who has taught me the pleasure of reading and learning since 1999, and whose comments contributed greatly to this work. I also want to thank Prof. Dr. Barry Charles Tharaud for his comments and contributions throughout my research.

I also thank Prof. Dr. Mehmet İpşirli and Prof. Dr. Ayhan Aktar for their contributions as my committee members. I owe a special thanks to Prof. Dr. Renèe Hirschon who kindly invited me to St. Peter's College, the University of Oxford, to pursue my research. She also shared her memoirs of the refugees in Greece back in 1970s. I also would like to thank Louis de Bernières who kindly agreed to meet in London for an insightful interview on *Birds Without Wings*. I am also grateful to Kemal Yalçın, Müfide Pekin, Tanaş Çimbis, Malkhaz Sungulashvili and Ala Kavtaradze for their support and kindness.

I also thank TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) for providing me research grant. Without the grant, I will not be able to enjoy the facilities of Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford to complete my work in good time.

Finally, I am grateful to my family, friends and colleagues who were very supportive. Yakup, my husband, deserves special thanks as well since he has been always encouraging and supportive throughout my journey both in İstanbul and Oxford.

INTRODUCTION

I. Objectives of the Research

This dissertation is an attempt to analyze the imperial identities of the Asia Minor Greeks, the *Millet-i Rum* of the Ottoman Empire, after the exchange of populations that took place in 1923 between Greece and Turkey in the light of three literary texts: *Farewell Anatolia* by Dido Sotiriou, *Birds Without Wings* by Louis de Bernières and *Emanet Çeyiz: Mübadele İnsanları* (The Entrusted Trousseau: Peoples of the Exchange)[1] by Kemal Yalçın. The Treaty of Lausanne approved a compulsory exchange of populations in the Aegean just after the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922). More than one million people were displaced according to their religious affiliations. Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were sent to Greece while the Muslims of Greece were sent to Turkey. This research will only analyze the imperial lives and identities of Asia Minor Greeks in the chosen literary texts. The lives of the Muslim Turks who were deported from Greece are not the subject of this research. We intend to focus on the imperial identities of the Asia Minor refugees and the process of their integration into Greek society together with their Ottoman past.

Asia Minor Greeks were the local peoples of Anatolia who were also defined as the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor before the rise of nationalism. During the Ottoman era, they were the *Millet-i Rum* and they were autonomous. However, nationalist ideology defined those peoples of Asia Minor as "Greeks" and deported them to their "ancestral" home. Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were mostly Turkish-speaking and their culture was totally different from local Greeks. In this research we intend to demonstrate that Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were not Greeks in terms of nationalist sentiments because their culture and traditions were almost identical with the Muslim Turks of Anatolia with whom they lived for centuries. Therefore Orthodox Christians preserved their imperial identity or Ottoman identity after their deportation from Anatolia. The fourth chapter of this dissertation will define the imperial identities of Asia Minor refugees.

[1] The name of the book was translated into English by Aslı Iğsız in her article "Documenting the Past and Publicizing Personal Stories: Sensescapes and the 1923 Greco-Turkish Population Exchange in Contemporary Turkey," *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 26, No.2. (October 2008): 451-487.

In order to explain our thesis, we will analyze the chosen literary texts which were written at different times and in different contexts. Dido Sotiriou, herself a refugee, published *Farewell Anatolia* in 1962 on the fortieth anniversary of the Lausanne Convention, and she particularly concentrated on the rise of nationalism in Asia Minor among the Orthodox Christians. Furthermore, she blamed the Great Powers for encouraging Greece to invade the western coast of Anatolia. Scholarly writings on *Farewell Anatolia* also project the same aspects of the novel along with Sotiriou's socialist point of view. We chose *Farewell Anatolia* for several reasons. First, Sotiriou was an insider, an Ottoman citizen and a refugee, who knew the culture of Anatolia. Therefore her insights are crucial in analyzing the imperial identities of Asia Minor Greeks. Her observations on the rise of nationalism in Anatolia are impressive and informative because her parents were nationalists, as she describes in her documentary *Anıların Tadı: Küçük Asyalı Dido Sotiriou* (Taste of the Memoirs: Dido Sotiriou of Asia Minor), which we analyze in Chapter 2. Second, as an insider Sotiriou knew the Turkish language, and her use of Turkish words throughout *Farewell Anatolia* emphasizes the common cultural heritage of Greeks and Turks. She frequently emphasizes the peaceful lives of the Christians and the Muslims in Anatolia. Sotiriou and her novel inspired our research to understand the lives of the Ottoman subjects and their reaction to nationalism during the first quarter of the twentieth century.

The second literary text that we chose to analyze is *Birds Without Wings* by Louis de Bernières, published in 2004. The author is British and well-informed about the history of Anatolia due to his family connections through his grandfather, who fought at the Battle of Gallipoli during World War I. He is generally objective in his projections of the lives of the Asia Minor Greeks in Anatolia. We discussed his special interests during our interview, which is included in Chapter 2. de Bernières also projects the peaceful atmosphere in Anatolia among different ethnic groups before the rise of nationalism. Thus his story enlightens us about the imperial lives and identities of Asia Minor Greeks. Through the characters he depicts in his novel, we learn how each character reacts for or against nationalism and how they were treated in Greece by their hosts. Interestingly, there is no critical scholarly article on

Birds Without Wings so far, although it has been in circulation for almost a decade. Thus our analysis of the novel may encourage other critics to discuss and analyze *Birds Without Wings* from various perspectives.

The third literary text is *Emanet Çeyiz* by Kemal Yalçın, who is a Turkish citizen, an insider from Honaz/Denizli. His grandfather was entrusted with a wedding trousseau by his Christian neighbors during the population exchange and the trousseau was kept for seventy years by Yalçın's family. Yalçın was moved by his grandfather's loyalty to his former neighbors and decided to return the trousseau through his father's encouragement. He went to Greece and interviewed Asia Minor refugees and recorded their past experiences of the population exchange. Yalçın's book is a documentary narrative based on oral history. We chose to work on *Emanet Çeyiz* because the oral testimonies of the refugees strengthen our thesis that the refugees preserved their imperial identities in Greece and identified themselves from the locals. Yalçın's *Emanet Çeyiz* was first given an award by the Turkish Republic, but then was found "offensive." This issue is explained in Chapter 2. That is why *Emanet Çeyiz* is not appreciated by all levels of Turkish society. For us, *Emanet Çeyiz* promotes humanism and reminds both Greeks and Turks how extreme nationalism destroyed their peaceful lives in Anatolia. Furthermore, oral testimonies of the refugees demonstrate the differences between oral history and the official histories of Greece and Turkey which are mostly based on nationalist ideology.

II. Theoretical Framework

The complex nature of this study requires an interdisciplinary and inter-textual approach for an adequate understanding of the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the imperial identities of the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor. In this study, we prefer to apply the theory of New Historicism to deepen our understanding of the historical, cultural, social and political aspects of the Lausanne Convention and the Asia Minor Catastrophe because New Historicism critiques literature through historical context and employs both literary and non-literary texts. In an interview with Tariq Ali Edward Said remarks that, "the study of literature was essentially a

historical task, not just an aesthetic one."[2] Literature is a product of human imagination and inspiration as well as a product of an era with its socio-political atmosphere. Literary critics need to consult history in order to understand the context in which a literary work of art is produced. That is why New Historicism is the best paradigm to analyze and discuss why Asia Minor Greeks were deported from their homeland and how that deportation affected the lives of those displaced people. Formalism, Post-Colonial Theory, and other literary theories are inadequate for the purpose of understanding the history of Greece and Turkey during the fall of the Ottoman Empire. Formalism only deals with the formal or structural aspects of a text and ignores the lives of the authors. Therefore, it is not suitable for this research because our study emphasizes the lives of the authors as well as their interests in the Asia Minor Catastrophe. Post-Colonial Theory analyzes the relations of the colonized with the colonizer and the writings of the post-colonial authors enlighten us about the colonial period of the Third World Countries. Since Greece and Turkey were not colonized by the Great Powers, Post-Colonial Theory is not appropriate for our study as well.

The literary texts we have selected to analyze, *Farewell Anatolia*, *Birds Without Wings* and *Emanet Çeyiz*, cannot be understood without reference to the historical context. For that reason, New Historicism will help us to analyze and understand the sociopolitical and cultural history of the Ottoman Empire, the *millet* system, the Greek Revolution, World War I, and the Greco-Turkish War which are the key historical facts that enlighten us as to why the Treaty of Lausanne was signed and why millions of people were displaced from their homeland. Peter Uwe Hohendahl claims that, "The New Historians claim to have returned to history without relying on the worn-out clichés of traditional historical scholarship. In other words, their claim is to offer critical history – a way of thinking about literature and history that rejects the narrative structure of conventional literary history."[3] We intend to analyze the imperial identities of Asia Minor Greeks through a critical analysis of the conventional historiography of Greece and Turkey as well as the

[2] Tariq Ali, "Remembering Edward Said," *New Left Review* 24, November-December 2003, accessed March 12, 2013, http://newleftreview.org/II/24/tariq-ali-remembering-edward-said

[3] Peter Uwe Hohendahl, "A Return to History? The New Historicism and Its Agenda," *New German Critique*, No. 55 (Winter, 1992): 88.

Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, we also make use of oral history and interviews that change the current conventional perspectives of modern Greeks and Turks toward their own national history.

The term "New Historicism" was coined by Stephen Greenblatt, a Harvard critic, who reformulated Historicism as he was editing a selection of essays on the Renaissance.[4] Greenblatt analyzed Renaissance literature to project the sociopolitical atmosphere of the era, and he compiled his essays in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. Greenblatt states that New Historicism was not a doctrine but a practice.[5] There are some influential figures who helped Greenblatt to think over the role of history in literary studies. Michel Foucault, a French philosopher and literary critic, shaped Greenblatt's literary critical practice during his stay in Berkeley.[6] Greenblatt was also influenced by Marxism, as he states: "It's true that I'm still more uneasy with a politics and a literary perspective that is untouched by Marxist thought."[7] Both Foucault and Marx were influential in Greenblatt's reshaping of Historicism for a new literary theory, New Historicism. John Brannigan explains that, "New Historicism is a mode of critical interpretation which privileges power relations as the most important context for texts of all kinds. As a critical practice it treats literary texts as a space where power relations are made visible."[8]

Obviously Greenblatt also analyzes literature, history, and society through Foucault's perspectives on the relationship between knowledge and power. Greenblatt thinks that, "the work of art is the product of a negotiation between a creator or class of creators, equipped with a complex, communally shared repertoire of conventions, and the institutions and practices of society."[9] Richard J. Lane notes that, "new historicists seek to read texts as part of a diverse, and at times contradictory, social and ideological network of power-knowledge relations."[10] Greenblatt analyzes literature through the categories developed by Foucault and Marx, both of whom paid special attention to history. Foucault's knowledge-power

[4] Stephen Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse* (U.K: Routledge, 2007), 196.
[5] Ibid., 197.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., 198.
[8] John Brannigan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism* (U.S.A: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 6.
[9] Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse*, 213.
[10] Richard J. Lane, Fifty Key Literary Theorists (U.K: Routledge, 2006), 143.

relations and Marx's conception of history as based on class struggle are means of analyzing literature because, Greenblatt believes, history deepens the meaning of the literary, and by touching the real it makes history even more complicated.[11] According to him literature and history are inseparable because historical facts can be better understood and explained through literature as well. Greenblatt regards "literature as part of the system of signs that constitutes a given culture; its proper goal, however difficult to realize, is a *poetics of culture*."[12]

According to Peter Barry, New Historicism "is a method based on the *parallel* reading of the literary and non-literary texts, usually of the same historical period."[13] Neither literary nor non-literary texts are 'privileged' for the New Historicists because they are equally important for the analysis of a literary work.[14] "Texts, literary and nonliterary, are always part of a network."[15] Moreover, New Historicists need to do intensive close reading in order to throw light on the literary work of art.[16] For that reason, New Historicists read the former in the light of the latter.[17] Brannigan states that, "Literature is not, however, simply a medium for the expression of historical knowledge. It is an active part of a particular historical moment."[18] That is why, as Aram Veeser explains, New Historicism "brackets together literature, ethnography, anthropology, art history, and other disciplines and sciences, hard and soft."[19] "The New Historians are rather eclectic, borrowing suitable tools wherever they can find them."[20]

One of those necessary tools that the New Historicists used to consult is cultural materialism. For the New Historicists, Clifford Geertz and the term he often uses for interpreting cultures, "thick description," is an indispensable approach to interpret the literary texts within its socio-cultural context. Geertz, a leading cultural anthropologist, resembles culture to a web and claims that "the analysis of it to be

[11] Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse*, 7.
[12] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (U.S.A: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 4-5.
[13] Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory* (U.K: Manchester University Press, 2009), 166.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Hohendahl, "A Return to History?," 93.
[16] Barry, *Beginning Theory*, 170.
[17] Ibid., 172.
[18] Brannigan, *New Historicism*, 3.
[19] Aram Veeser, ed., introduction to *The New Historicism* (U.S.A: Routledge, 1989), xi.
[20] Hohendahl, "A Return to History?" 91.

therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning."[21] Thus human behaviors can be interpreted through a close analysis of their culture and this is called "thick description."[22] Veeser claims that "New Historicists have evolved a method of describing culture in action."[23] Clearly, New Historicism is not different from cultural studies because "On a very basic level, cultural materialism has been equated with new historicism because both practices interpret literary texts as historical and cultural artefacts."[24] Hayden White asserts that, for the New Historicists, the historical text is the "cultural system."[25] "It is a relationship between two kinds of "texts": "literary" on the one side, "cultural" on the other."[26] Literature, as a whole, reflects cultural, social, political, and linguistic aspects of the society in which they are produced.

III. Nations and Nationalism

Contemporary Turkish and Greek understanding of the Lausanne Convention and the population exchange are based on nationalism. Modern Greeks and Turks believe that through the population exchange, they ethnically cleansed their territories of the "Other." Turks believe that Orthodox Christians were ethnically Greek, and the population exchange was necessary in order to create a homogeneous Turkey. Greeks, on the other side, think alike because for them a homogeneous Greece could only be achieved through displacing the Muslims of Greece who were the "Turks." As Elizabeth Tonkin notes, "We live in other people's pasts whether we know it or not and whether or not we want to do so."[27] Modern Greeks and Turks, two neighbor communities of the Aegean and once the subjects of the Ottoman Empire, live in their ancestors' past because they became enemies in the first quarter of the twentieth century due to the rise of nationalism. Renèe Hirschon states that

[21] Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 5.
[22] Ibid., 7.
[23] Veeser, introduction to *The New Historicism,* xi.
[24] Brannigan, *New Historicism*, 94.
[25] Hayden White, "New Historicism: A Comment," in *The New Historicism*, ed. Aram Veeser, 293-302 (U.S.A: Routledge, 1989), 294.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (U.K: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 9.

with the rise of nationalism and the population exchange, the peoples of the Aegean have lost "familiarity which carries with it the possibility for understanding and respect, and this is all too often replaced by suspicion, hostility and the inability to cooperate."[28]

The hostility between Greeks and Turks stemmed from the nineteenth century starting with the Greek Revolution of 1821 which liberated the Ottoman Greeks from Turkish rule. Another important event was the Greek invasion of Asia Minor in 1919 with the backing of the Great Powers and the Greek national fantasy of the *Megali Idea* which destroyed whatever good will was left in Asia Minor between the Christians and the Muslims. The Asia Minor Catastrophe of 1922 was a turning point in the lives of the Orthodox Christians and Muslim Turks as they were forced to migrate across the Aegean to be integrated into the nation-states of Greece and Turkey. The main motivation that led the Greeks and the Turks to clash in the twentieth century with thousands of people killed, and the rest facing famine, hardship, and the compulsory exchange of populations, was nationalism.

Nationalism is an ideology that eliminates different ethnic groups for a homogenized population that shares the same language, culture, religions and history with a mythical past. Michalis N. Michael states that nationalism and a myth-constructed past are inseparable. Nationalism reconstructs and appropriates the past in its own way, and it partly survives thanks to the spreading of myth.[29] According to Umut Özkırımlı, "Nationalists tend to present the nation as the natural or logical outcome of a series of readily identifiable features, such as common territory, language, religion, or a sense of belonging together."[30] For that reason, nationalism is an ideology of a particular nation that dominates the state and promotes and exaggerates its culture, language, and history.[31] In a way, "nationalism brings the cultural and the political together: it involves the 'culturalization' of politics and the

[28]Renèe Hirschon, "'Unmixing Peoples' in the Aegean Region," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 3-12 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 10.
[29] Michalis N. Michael, "History, Myth and Nationalism: The Retrospective Force of National Roles within a Myth-Constructed Past," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, ed. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızıkyürek &Umut Özkırımlı, 149- 159 (U.K: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 149.
[30] Umut Özkırımlı, *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement* (U.S.A: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 166.
[31] Kemal Karpat, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler* (İstanbul: Timaş, 2010), 37.

'politicization'of culture."[32] Nationalism is a political ideology and the nation is a form of political organization shaped by the French Revolution of 1789.[33] It is not a universal phenomenon, but a product of European thought in the last 150 years.[34] Since then our modern world has been shaped by the nationalist ideology which destroyed multi-ethnic empires by the end of World War I and created many nation-states.[35] The fall of the Soviet Union in the 1990s changed the map of the Balkans, the Transcaucasus, and Central Asia.[36] Several nation states emerged because those oppressed nations got their independence and established their own nation-states to be identified as a separate nation.

The modern world is the age of nation-states, and national identity is the most valid reference of identification. Ernest Gellner argues in *Nations and Nationalism* that nationalism is the product of the modern world because industrial society is different from agrarian society in terms of cultural, political, and social organizations. He notes that nationalism "is in reality the consequence of a new form of social organization, based on deeply internalized, education-dependent high cultures, each protected by its own state."[37] Furthermore, "The nationalist discourse does not arise in a social vacuum, but makes ample use of state and civil society institutions to sustain and reproduce itself."[38] Therefore, nationalism is a kind of project initiated by the state and its instituitions. Without a central authority or a government, nationalism cannot be imposed to the masses.

Like Ernest Gellner, Otto Bauer believes that modern nations are the outcome of the rise of industrial society. He discusses nations and nationalism through a socialist perspective, claiming that industrialism and capitalism transformed traditional society with all its cultural and historical values into a modern one which was very different. According to Bauer, each nation has a character and national character is changeable because "the members of a nation are linked by a community

[32] Özkırımlı, *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism*, 163.
[33] Karpat, *Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler*, 35.
[34] Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism* (U.K: Blackwell, 1998), 68.
[35] Aviel Roshwald, *Ethnic Nationalism and the Fall of Empires: Central Europe, Russia and the Middle East, 1914–1923* (London: Routledge, 2001), 7.
[36] Craig Calhoun, *Nationalism* (U.S.A: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 1- 2.
[37] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (U.S.A: Cornell University Press, 2008), 46.
[38] Özkırımlı, *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism*, 164.

of character in a certain definite era; in no way is the nation of our time linked with its ancestors of two or three millennia ago."[39] With the industrial revolution, the rural population was uprooted by capitalism and the life of the peasant changed tremendously.[40] Those uprooted people become industrial workers and have no time to think over the nation formation. Moreover, the national education they receive does not provide them full possession of intellectual culture.[41] Educated individuals become more powerful over the masses because through the private property law "the nation has given its fate out of its own hands entrusting it to the will of individuals."[42] Those individuals, who are the ruling classes, make their decisions without considering the effects of their decisions on the masses. For that reason, the educated classes of modern times form the nation, and the masses are left behind.[43] According to Bauer, the nation is formed and ruled by the educated elite and nationalism is an ideology promoted by the elite.

Recent studies and debates on nationalism focus on how nationalism was invented through creating mythical pasts and how people imagine their communities within that invented mythical past. E.J. Hobsbawm and Benedict Anderson looked at nations and nationalism from a wider perspective through social, political, religious, and cultural aspects that shape nations and nationalism as an ideology. Hobsbawm claims that "the term 'nationalism' was actually invented in the last decade(s) of the nineteenth century."[44] Invented nations also invented national languages to form nation-states such as the modern Hebrew that was invented by the nationalist Jews, despite the fact that nobody spoke the language.[45] Hobsbawm remarks that "It is hardly surprising that nationalism gained ground so rapidly from the 1870s to 1914. It was a function of both social and political changes, not to mention an international situation that provided plenty of pegs on which to hang manifestos of hostility to

[39] Otto Bauer, "The Nation," in *Mapping the Nation*, ed. Gopal Balakrishnan, 39-77 (U.S.A: Verso, 2012), 40-41.
[40] Ibid., 44.
[41] Ibid., 47.
[42] Ibid., 48.
[43] Ibid., 56.
[44] E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (U.K: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 102.
[45] Ibid., 110.

foreigners."[46] Nation-states produce closed societies and indoctrinate their citizens to hate the "Other" who is perceived as an enemy of the state and the nation. For the perpetuation of the nation-state, the invention of 'enemy' is necessary to hold the nation together against the "Other."

Benedict Anderson came up with a remarkable definition of nations which he clearly defined as "imagined communities." His book *Imagined Communities* explains the role of imagination that affected the lives of the peoples from Europe to Spanish America, Colonial Africa and South East Asia. Social, political, and cultural inequalities—the colonized nations all over the world- as well as improvements and rebellions—the Reformation and the French Revolution—paved the way to nationalism. Anderson also discusses other unifying elements such as religion and the dynastic realm. Religion is one of those unifying elements among the believers of different ethnic groups because people of the same faith realize during their pilgrimage that through the common sacred texts, they are able to communicate and understand each other even though they do not know their vernacular languages.[47] Another unifying element is the dynastic realm because royal families are the only imaginable 'political' systems for masses.[48] Both of them help people to realize what they share with other people.

Anderson argues that the novel and the newspaper changed the concept of time and space. Readers of novels and newspapers became aware of other people around the globe although they do not know them personally. They both "provided the technical means for 're-presenting' the *kind* of imagined community that is the nation."[49] They also helped the Europeans to revive their vernacular languages against Latin, the lingua-franca of the Middle Ages. International publishing houses, the humanists and their interest in antiquity, and the Reformation paved the way to national consciousness in Europe.[50] While printing was the most important driving force of nationalism in Europe, it did not have much effect in Spanish America. Non-

[46] Ibid., 109.
[47] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*: *Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006), 12-13.
[48] Ibid., 19.
[49] Ibid., 25.
[50] Ibid., 38-39.

Spanish speaking populations of Spanish America created creoles and defined themselves as fellow-nationals.[51] The oppression of the Spanish Empire and the geographic and economic conditions of Spanish America motivated the colonized people to form their nations and fight for their independence.[52] Geographical discoveries, Renaissance and Reformation, the Enlightenment as well as the French Revolution, are the key forces that awakened ethnic groups to identify themselves as nations.

That is why a nation "is an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion."[53] Nation-states are formed through imaginations because people first imagine that a group, who speak the same language and share the same religion, and culture, had shared a long existence together continued from a mythical past. This long existence together with a common language, religion and culture form the fundamental arguments of the nation which has to "be imagined, and, once imagined, modeled, adapted and transformed."[54] The transformation process can be defined as assimilation which is one of the policies of the nation-states to homogenize its population. Each individual has to fit into the definition of the nation-state. Differences have to be eliminated because according to the nationalists even minor differences among different ethnic groups within a nation are threats to the future of nation-states. As Reşat Kasaba explains, "In a world of nation-states, census taking, conscription, taxation, defense, and the maintenance of security could be carried out only by working with an easily identifiable and classifiable population within well-defined borders."[55]

This study intends to deconstruct the conventional understanding of the modern Turks and Greeks, that those displaced peoples of the Aegean were the local

[51] Ibid., 50.
[52] Ibid., 51-52.
[53] Ibid., 6.
[54] Ibid., 141.
[55] Reşat Kasaba, *A Moveable Empire: Ottoman Nomads, Migrants & Refugees* (U.S.A: University of Washington Press, 2009), 123.

peoples of their homeland, and to argue that the population exchange was not repatriation, but a form of exile.[56] In order to strengthen our argument we brought to bear on our study, literature, history, ethnography, anthropology, cultural studies, sociology, and political science. We also interviewed Renèe Hirschon, a social anthropologist specializing in the social lives of the Asia Minor refugees, Louis de Bernières, the author of *Birds Without Wings*, Kemal Yalçın, an oral historian and the author of *Emanet Çeyiz* as well as Müfide Pekin, whose family migrated from Crete to İzmir due to the Lausanne Convention and Tanaş Çimbis, a *Rum* of İstanbul. Those interviews were very enlightening for my analysis of the imperial lives and identities of the Orthodox Christians.

As Renèe Hirschon discovered during her research in 1970s in Kokkinia/Greece, Asia Minor refugees were the last Ottomans on Greek soil.[57] They were totally different from the local Greeks who had been the citizens of a nation state for almost a century. Asia Minor refugees, who referred to themselves as *Mikrasiátes* (Asia Minor people), had a different social, cultural, and linguistic background from the local Greeks, which was the major problem for a smooth integration into Greek society. As an insider, I intend to focus on the imperial identities of Asia Minor Greeks to reexamine the nationalist perspective on the issues of ethnicity, religion, and language. Hirschon observes that "The inhabitants of Kokkinia had a clearly developed sense of identity, separate from that of metropolitan Greek society."[58] Depending on Hirschon's observation, I want to clarify the identities of Asia Minor refugees. Imperial identity is a term that I use in this research for Asia Minor Greeks who were the subjects of an imperial tradition first under the reign of the Eastern Roman Empire, then under the Ottomans.

Before discussing the imperial identities of Asia Minor refugees, we need to know how the peoples of Asia Minor and Greece were divided through the articles of the Lausanne Convention. Thus the first chapter of this dissertation will deal with the

[56] Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. 1961. Third Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 349.
[57] Renèe Hirschon, "'We got on well with the Turks': Christian-Muslim Relations in the late Ottoman Period," in *Archaeology, Anthropology and Heritage: the Work of F.W. Hasluck (1878-1920)*, ed. David Shankland, 325- 343, V. II. (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2004), 326.
[58] Renèe Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1998), 4.

Lausanne Convention and its criteria of dividing the peoples of the Aegean. Greece and Turkey could not divide their minorities in terms of their ethnicity, race, or language. The only solution for the negotiators of Lausanne was to depend on the religious affiliations of the Christians and the Muslims. The *millet* system of the Ottoman legacy was applied by the Lausanne Convention regardless of ethnicity. Although the compulsory exchange of population was perceived as 'ethnic cleansing', ethnicity of the Christians and Muslims were not consulted by the policy makers, because religion and ethnicity were overlapping concepts.

The second chapter of this dissertation discusses oral history and its contribution to history writing as well as fiction writing. The authors whose literary works we have selected to analyze, Dido Sotiriou, Louis de Bernières and Kemal Yalçın, consulted oral history for a better understanding of the Catastrophe from the perspectives of its victims. Furthermore, those authors are also connected to the Asia Minor Catastrophe through their family histories. The third chapter of this work analyzes the rise of nationalism in Asia Minor through the selected novels. Some Orthodox Christians and Muslims of Anatolia were influenced by the nationalist ideologies of the twentieth century and started to identify themselves as "Greeks" and "Turks", not as Ottomans. That nationalist uprising among the Ottoman subjects divided the folk of Anatolia and ended centuries of co-existence under the reign of the Ottomans. The population exchange changed the social fabric of Greece and Turkey as well as the social and cultural lives of the people who were the victims of the Treaty of Lausanne. The fourth and the last chapter of this work will analyze the imperial identities of the Asia Minor refugees and their first encounter with the local Greeks.

CHAPTER 1

THE *MILLET* SYSTEM: AN OTTOMAN LEGACY IN LAUSANNE

1.1. The *Millet-i Rum*

This chapter will discuss the role and the impact of the *millet* system, the Ottoman legacy, in resolving the Aegean Conflict at the Lausanne Convention. The *millet* system was established by Sultan Mehmet II as he conquered Constantinople in 1453, and gathered different ethnic and religious groups under his reign. The *millet* system, which established religion as an ethnic identification, lasted until it was eliminated in 1839 with the Tanzimat Charter. The Westernization of the empire continued with the Islahat Charter of 1856. With the pressure and influence of the West, the Tanzimat and Islahat Charters reorganized Ottoman society, abandoning the traditional society to move in a modern and Western direction.[59] Hereafter non-Muslims were practically regarded as citizens of the empire. However, Alexis Alexandris states that the Ecumenical Patriarch Iōakeim III resigned his post as a reaction to the new system that affected the privileges of *Millet-i Rum* in the early 1880s. His protest and resignation "forced Sultan Abdülhamid II to issue a proclamation restoring the traditional rights and privileges of the Greek millet."[60] Thus, the *millet* system continued to function until the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. This is obviously a contradiction for the negotiators of the Lausanne Convention because both Greece and Turkey, two modern nation states, were trying to bury all legacies of the Ottoman Empire during their foundation. However, they could not manage to divide the peoples of the Aegean without consulting the *millet* system because that was how they had been ruled for centuries. The ethnic and religious ambiguity of Ottoman society was so complex that it was not easy for the new nation-states to eliminate this Ottoman institution at once. In

[59] See Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*.
[60] Alexis Alexandris, "The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910-1912): A Contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography," in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, ed. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 45-76 (U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999), 47.

order to understand how this Ottoman legacy operated or functioned at Lausanne, one should know the *millet* system and the role of religious affiliation in Ottoman society as well as in the lives of the Orthodox Christians within the empire who were subject to the population exchange.

Before discussing the *millet* system, it is crucial to clarify the terminology for Asia Minor and Anatolia, Greek and *Rum*, refugee and exchangee. Both of these terms, Anatolia and Asia Minor, were coined by Greeks. "The word 'anatoli' means 'east' in Greek, more literally 'the land of sunrise'."[61] Asia Minor, the heartland of the Ottoman Empire, is the standard terminology in Greece today. However Turkish people are not familiar with the word; they prefer to use "Anatolia", the term adopted by the Ottomans after their conquest. The names of the cities and villages will be referred to both by their Greek and Turkish names throughout this research. Ottomans classified Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor as *Millet-i Rum*. As Bernard Lewis explains,

> The word used by the Turks, and more generally by Muslims in the Middle East, to designate the Greeks is *Rum*. But *Rum* doesn't mean Greeks; *Rum* means Romans, and the use of the name, first by the Greeks themselves and then by their new Muslim masters, echoes their last memory of political sovereignty and greatness.[62]

The Holy Quran has a chapter titled "Rum" in which the peoples of the Roman Empire were called *Rum* (30:1-2).[63] Ottoman Sultans regarded themselves as the heirs of the Eastern Roman Empire and called their realm "Rumeli" stemming from the land of the Romans. *Rum*, then means the inhabitants of Rumeli. Therefore, Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were called *Rum*. *Millet-i Rum* referred to Orthodox Christian subjects of the empire. The Greeks of modern Greece are called *Yunan* or *Yunanlı* in Turkey. The Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor must be distinguished from the citizens of modern Greece because they are different socially, politically, culturally, and linguistically.

[61] John Freely, *Children of Achilles: The Greeks in Asia Minor since the Days of Troy* (U.K: I.B.Tauris, 2010), 2.
[62] Bernard Lewis, *The Multiple Identities of the Middle East* (New York: Schocken Books, 1998), 12.
[63] Abdullah Yusuf Ali, trans., *The Meaning of the Holy Quran* (U.S.A: Amana, 2004).

This work will analyze the imperial identities of the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor in the age of nationalism in three literary texts: *Farewell Anatolia*, *Birds Without Wings*, and *Emanet Çeyiz*, therefore, it is necessary to select somewhat arbitrarily a set of designations for the sake of clarity. In this study, I prefer to use "Asia Minor" rather than Anatolia since it is more common in Greek and Western historiography. For the words to define the *Millet-i Rum* of the Ottoman Empire, Asia Minor Greeks, *Rums*, and the Ottoman Greeks are the common words used in both Turkish and Western historiography. With the rise of nationalism, the Greek Kingdom claimed that all Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were ethnically Greek. Turkey also claimed that all Muslims of the Balkans and Greece were ethnically Turk. However the correct words should be Orthodox Christians of Anatolia/Asia Minor, the *Millet-i Rum* or just the *Rum* because these are what really define the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor who were different from the Greeks of modern Greece. Furthermore, the ethnic diversity of the Ottoman Empire makes it impossible to define people without referring to their religious affiliations. For the Turkish exchangees who migrated from Greece to Turkey, the correct word should be the "Muslims of Greece" for the same reasons. In this study, we will mostly use "Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor." However, "Asia Minor Greeks," "Ottoman Greeks," "*Rum"* and the "*Millet-i Rum*" will also be used to show how Orthodox Christians were identified and named in history.

The terminology for the exchanged peoples of Turkey and Greece used after the Lausanne Convention is also important to identify and address the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor and the Muslims of Greece. Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor are called "refugees" in Greece although they were given citizenship by the Lausanne Convention. Normally, the term "refugee" is not appropriate to refer to the Christians of Asia Minor because a refugee does not have a citizenship in the host country. However, the Christians of Asia Minor call themselves "refugee" to be distinguished from the local Greeks.[64] In Turkey, *mübadil*, meaning exchangee, is a common word that refers to the exchanged peoples of Lausanne; whereas "refugee" is not used at all. While Muslims of Crete refer to themselves as "exchangees," the

[64] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 4.

Muslims of Greece prefer *muhacir,* meaning immigrant.[65] Tolga Köker informs us that, "*muhacirs* being the immigrants of Atatürk's presidency (1923-1938) and *göçmens* those of İnönü's (1938-1950)."[66] This implies that immigrants from the Balkans and Crete are classified according to the time of their arrived in Turkey. Each immigrant group tried to identify themselves in the host country.

The *millet* system has always been a subject of debate among historians and scholars since, unlike the Western colonial tradition; the Ottoman Empire did not for the most part colonize and assimilate its subjects by force. Kemal Karpat says that "Linguistic, ethnic and religious assimilation occurred on a local basis, rather than on a global one, and was largely voluntary, based on the relative influence of a majority group."[67] It was not by force as in the case of Western imperialism because the Ottoman Sultans created a harmonious multicultural society within which subjects of the empire were autonomous. Ethnicity and religion were closely connected and the subjects of the empire were identified through their faith, rather than by race or ethnicity. Karpat also claims that the *millet* system, which was a religion-based identification of the Ottoman subjects, gave birth to nationalities within the Ottoman Empire.[68] National identification stemmed from the *millet* system, which "enabled them to retain their separate identities and religious organizations."[69]

The *millet* system was based on Islamic (Sharia) law. According to the Sharia, as Seyyed Hossein Nasr states, human rights are consequences of human obligations and "Islam holds this conception not only for its own followers but also for the followers of all other religions who, therefore, as religious minorities, are given rights under their own religious codes."[70] This was how the Ottoman subjects

[65] Sophia Koufopoulou, "Muslim Cretans in Turkey: The Reformulation of Ethnic Identity in an Aegean Community," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 209-211 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 209-210.
[66] Tolga Köker, "Lessons in Refugeehood: The Experience of Forced Migrants in Turkey," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 193-208 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 194.
[67] Kemal Karpat, "*Millets* and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era," in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, ed. Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, 141-171, V.1 (U.K: Holmes & Meier, 1982), 143.
[68] Kemal Karpat, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Kimlik ve İdeoloji* (İstanbul: Timaş, 2009), 36.
[69] Umut Özkırımlı and Spyros A. Sofos, *Tormented by History: Nationalism in Greece and Turkey* (U.K: Hurst & Company, 2008), 45.
[70] Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Islamic Life and Thought* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 18.

were ruled. Furthermore, the Holy Quran has several verses that forbid racism and compulsory conversion of people to Islam: "O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (Not that ye may despise each other)" (49:13), "Let there be no compulsion in religion" (2:256), "If it had been the Lord's Will, they would all have believed—All who are on earth! Wilt thou then compel mankind, against their will, to believe!" (10:99).[71] The Holy Quran teaches Muslims to be ideal believers who should be tolerant and respectful towards the followers of other religions. Islam opposes racism, aspiring instead to universal egalitarianism rather than privileging one particular group.

The word "millet," derived from "mille" in Arabic, did not have the meaning of "nation" as it has now.[72] The *millet* system was based on Islamic law and it was a division of monotheistic religions into various sects. Thus each religious group was recognized through its faith, not ethnicity, because ethnicity was determined by religion. Alexis Alexandris says:

> This was mainly the outcome of a remarkable system of government, the *millet* system, adopted by the Ottoman state machinery. Faced with the administration of a large cosmopolitan empire, the Islamic Ottoman ruling class granted a substantial degree of self-government to the non-Muslim religious minorities. Perhaps the most striking feature of the *millet* structure was its formation on strictly religious, rather than racial or linguistic affiliations.[73]

The Ottoman Empire was a pluralistic society within which various ethnic and religious groups lived, worked, and worshipped together. The largest group was the Muslim Turks, and the second largest group was the Orthodox Christians, the remnant population of the defeated Byzantine Empire who were more privileged compared to other *millets*. The Orthodox Christians remained as the privileged *millet* of the empire with the support of the privileged Orthodox Church, and the Greek language continued flourishing without any obstacle. Greek was partly the official

[71] Ali, *Holy Quran*.
[72] Bilal Eryılmaz, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Gayrimüslim Tebaanın Yönetimi* (İstanbul: Risale Yayın, 1996), 17.
[73] Alexis Alexandris, *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974* (Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 1992), 21. See also Haris Eksertzoglou, *Osmanlı'da Cemiyetler ve Rum Cemaati.*

language of the empire in which some declarations were written. Moreover, educated Orthodox Christians had administrative positions.[74] The Ottomans successfully synthesized "the legal traditions of Islam, their own knowledge of the Byzantines, and the distinctive customs of the Turkish peoples"[75] as they ruled the multi-ethnic empire. Non-Muslims were the *dhimmi* (protected) subjects of the empire, and they were literarily protected by the Ottoman state against any kind of violence or oppression.[76]

Halil İnalcık evaluates the *millet* system from an economic point of view as he thinks that the Ottoman Empire was not interested in creating a common culture, religion, or language: for them, sovereignty over the people was more important.[77] With the conquest of Istanbul in 1453, Sultan Mehmet II revived the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Phanar (*Fener* in Turkish), and it became the church of all the Orthodox Christians in the empire. Each religious group had their churches, and they were free to participate in the rituals required by their faith. İnalcık says that, "It is an undeniable fact that in these vast empires the central government had to operate, for practical reasons, through such already established organizations, religious or professional, in which communal identity was essential."[78] Therefore the relations between the Ottoman administration and the *millets* were mutual. As Bruce Clark states in *Twice A Stranger*, "as long as they remained loyal to their sovereign and his local representatives, and respected the privileges of the Muslims, the minorities were more or less free to go about their business as merchants, craftsmen or peasants."[79] Non-Muslim subjects were free in their commercial affairs unless they threatened the peaceful atmosphere of the society guaranteed by the Sultan. Mutual respect was meant to put everything in order in the Ottoman Empire. "For while the Ottoman sultans assumed the responsibility of protecting the life and property of their subject races, the heads of the *millets*, in return ensured the fidelity and

[74] İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı* (İstanbul: Timaş, 2011), 73.
[75] Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, eds., introduction to *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, V.1. (U.K: Holmes & Meier, 1982), 10.
[76] M. Macit Kenanoğlu, *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek* (İstanbul: Klasik, 2007), 282.
[77] Halil İnalcık, *Essays in Ottoman History* (İstanbul: Eren, 1998), 70.
[78] Ibid., 207.
[79] Bruce Clark, *Twice A Stranger: How Mass Expulsion Forged Modern Greece and Turkey* (London: Granta, 2007), 5.

obedience of their «flocks» to the Sublime Porte"[80] notes Clark.

According to Kemal Karpat, the *millet* system not only arranged the religious lives of Ottoman subjects, but also their social, political, cultural, and economic lives. He explains lucidly the *millet* system:

> The *millet* system emerged gradually as an answer to the efforts of the Ottoman administration to take into account the organization and culture of the various religious-ethnic groups it ruled. The system provided, on the one hand, a degree of religious, cultural, and ethnic continuity within these communities, while on the other it permitted their incorporation into the Ottoman administrative, economic and political system. An ethnic-religious group preserved its culture and religion while being subject to continuous "Ottomanization" in other spheres of life.[81]

Orthodox Christians not only preserved their religion and culture, but also established international trade between the West and the East with the rich resources of the Ottoman land and through the help of the Greek Diaspora. The Greeks were highly urbanized and populated the biggest cities of the empire such as Constantinople, Smyrna, and Thessaloniki.[82] Ottoman Greeks were also well-educated because "The large Greek diaspora, first in Italy and the Balkans, then in Russia, Egypt, central and western Europe, and, finally, in the Americas, also provided this community a flow of ideas, funds, and various other kinds of support that helped their kin in the empire."[83] The schools of the minorities in the empire were better than the schools of the Muslims. Furthermore, the Ottoman Greeks were also interested in studying abroad, a practice that also improved their language skills.[84]

Elena Frangakis-Syrett asserts that "The Greeks, whether as Ottoman citizens, European-protected subjects, or Hellenes, predominated in all sectors of trade—from large-scale international trade to medium-scale intraregional trade and from small-scale local trade in the interior to wholesale and retail trade in the stalls of the

[80] Ibid., 24.
[81] Karpat, "Millets and Nationality," 141-142.
[82] Charles Issawi, introduction to *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, ed. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 1-16 (U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999), 2. See also Dimitris Tziovas, *Greek Diaspora and Migration since 1700.*
[83] Ibid., 2.
[84] Ibid., 8.

city's bazaars."[85] Although the Ottoman Greeks were well-educated and they had opportunities to establish international trade, there was another reason behind their wealth. Since the Christian subjects of the empire were exempted from military service, the burden of military service and long years of fighting in the battlefields were on the shoulders of the Muslims. During their absence, the Christian subjects of the empire purchased the farmlands of the Muslims because the women and children, whose husbands and fathers were in the army, were incapable of farming those lands alone. In the east, Armenians, in the west, the Asia Minor Greeks, owned the lands of the Muslim Turks in the nineteenth century.[86] Charles Eliot, a British diplomat, stated that,

> when force does not rule, when progress, commerce, finance and law give the mixed population of the Empire a chance of redistributing themselves according to the wits, the Turk and the Christian are not equal; the Christian is superior. He acquires the money and land of the Turk, and proves in a lawcourt that he is right in so doing.[87]

Reşat Kasaba notes that the wealth of the Ottoman Greeks led them to have their independent state, the Kingdom of Greece, through a civil society within the empire. Newspapers, schools, social clubs, and political organizations established in western Anatolia were the outcome of this wealth.[88] Despite many conflicting events between the Orthodox Christians and the Muslim Turks, such as the Greek Revolution and Independence between 1821 and 1829, Christians and Muslims had good relations in Asia Minor until the Asia Minor Catastrophe, which marked the end of pluralistic Ottoman society in the 1920s.

---

[85] Elena Frangakis-Syrett, "The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir in the Second Half of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, ed. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 17-44 (U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999), 18.
[86] Issawi, introduction to *Ottoman Greeks*, 9.
[87] Charles Eliot, *Turkey in Europe* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965), 153.
[88] Reşat Kasaba, "Economic Foundations of a Civil Society: Greeks in the Trade of Western Anatolia, 1840-1876," in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, ed. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 77-88 (U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999), 84.

1.2. Asia Minor Catastrophe

At the end of the nineteenth century, with the rise of nationalism flourishing in Europe and other parts of the world, non-Muslim subjects of the empire wanted to have their independent states. Many nation-states emerged such as Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and many others in the Middle East due to the rise of nationalism and imperialism, starting from the nineteenth century. In order to save the Ottoman Empire from disintegration, three main projects were promoted: Ottomanism, Islamism, and Turkism.[89] Ottomanism, which aimed to create an Ottoman nation, and Islamism, which promoted a state based on Islam, could not save the empire from disintegration. There was only one option left—Turkism, which created the modern Turkish Republic and the Turkish nation. Turkey emerged from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire and was founded by Mustafa Kemal (later Atatürk) against imperialist ideologies. Mustafa Kemal, who was born in Salonika in 1881, was willing to establish a country just for Turks confined to Asia Minor. As Louis de Bernières describes the era in *Birds Without Wings*, "Mustafa is born into a world where law and order are fast collapsing, where looting has become more profitable than working, where the arts of peace are becoming more and more impracticable, and personal tolerance makes less and less difference."[90]

Mustafa Kemal, who was born into wars and conflicts, witnessed the rise of nationalism in the Balkans. He was a successful and respected soldier of the Ottoman Army who had fought in World War I and gained great fame in the Battle of Gallipoli before the War of Independence (the Greco-Turkish War). Mustafa Kemal, with nationalist sentiments, wanted to establish a nation-state for Turks limited to Asia Minor. The territory of the new country was announced and confirmed in *Misak-ı Milli* (National Pact or Oath) that only covers Asia Minor. Lewis states that "The name Turkey has been given to Turkish-speaking Anatolia almost since its first conquest by the Turks in the eleventh century—given, that is, by Europeans. But the Turks themselves did not adopt it as the official name of their country until 1923."[91]

[89] Ahmet İçduygu et al., "The Politics of Population in a Nation-Building Process: Emigration of Non-Muslims from Turkey," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31:2 (2008):362.
[90] Louis de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings* (London: Vintage, 2005), 16-17.
[91] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 1.

The establishment of the Turkish Republic was achieved through the War of Independence that infused nationalist sentiments into the Turks as well as the Greeks who fought against them. The Greek invasion of Asia Minor in 1919 not only affected the lives and the future of the Turks, but also the Greeks themselves.

Greece, another nationalist country ruled by Elefterios Venizelos, who was also born into the same world in Crete in 1864, wanted to revive the Byzantine Empire stretching from mainland Greece to the west coast of Asia Minor including the former Byzantine regions. Michael Llewellyn Smith, in *Ionian Vision: Greece in Asia Minor 1919-1922*, summarizes the mission and vision of Venizelos: "Venizelos's policy was twofold: the territorial expansion of the Greek state so as to include as many as possible of the Greek people, and the making to Greece into an important Mediterranean power."[92] The western coast of Asia Minor, the former Ionia, was populated by Orthodox Christians (the *Millet-i Rum*) as well as Muslims. However, Greece was weak financially and incapable of uniting the western coast of Anatolia to the Greek Kingdom without the support of the Great Powers. Italy and France did not support the *Megali Idea* (The Great Idea) since their interests were shifting—story too long to discuss here. Britain was not sure whether to help Greece and secure the path to its colony, India, or not. Some British leaders preferred to have Greece, a poor country, remain in the Mediterranean rather than any powerful European countries. As Hirschon notes, the interests of the Great Powers were shifting very rapidly.[93] Whatever the conditions, Greece was determined to invade the western coast of Asia Minor to liberate the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor from the Turkish rule.

But it was not Greece alone that ordered the Greek army to occupy Smyrna in 1919. As Justin McCarthy in *Death and Exile,* states, "The decision to allow Greece to occupy the sancak of İzmir was made at the Paris Peace Conference (1919) by the Great Powers."[94] The *Megali Idea*, a dream or fantasy of Greek nationalist

[92] Michael Llewellyn-Smith, *Ionian Vision: Greece in Asia Minor 1919-1922* (India: Hurst & Company, 2009), 37. See also Alexander Pallis, *Greece's Anatolian Venture, and After: A Survey of the Diplomatic and Political Aspects of the Greek Expedition to Asia Minor (1915-1922).*
[93] Hirschon, "'Unmixing Peoples' in the Aegean Region," 5.
[94] Justin McCarthy, *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922* (New Jersey: The Darwin Press, 2004), 259.

intellectuals, was the leading force that encouraged the Greeks toward the invasion of Asia Minor. According to the *Historical Dictionary of Greece,* the *Megali Idea* was

> A term used in a Greek Parliament debate of 1844 to describe Greece's post-independence irredentist aspirations. Since over three fourths of Greeks at the time resided outside the realm of the Hellenic Kingdom, it became the policy of most governments to unite and incorporate all territories on which the unredeemed lived.[95]

Hirschon states that "This expansionist dream of nineteenth-century Hellenism was to gain access to the Anatolian heartland of the Byzantine Empire and to recapture its capital city, Constantinople/Istanbul."[96] The followers of the *Megali Idea* believed and advocated that Asia Minor Hellenism on the west coast of Anatolia (Ionia) existed for 3.000 years without interruption. The claim of the Greek Kingdom was that all Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were ethnically Greek. Georgios Nakracas, who criticizes the irredentist ideology of the Greek Kingdom, claims that 3.000 years of existence was a myth because the Orthodox Christians did not constitute the majority of Anatolia.[97]

On 15 September 1919, the Greek army landed in Smyrna to invade the western coast of Asia Minor to revive the Byzantine Empire. The invasion was well prepared, as McCarthy explains:

> The pattern of Greek actions against the Turkish population was fairly consistent. First, all Ottoman police and soldiers and Muslim civilians were disarmed. Then, guns were distributed to the local Greeks. Next, officials of the Ottoman government and Muslim religious leaders were imprisoned or deported. Following this, plunder, murder, and rape began, sometimes immediately, sometimes after a short time had elapsed. Turkish houses and government buildings were destroyed.[98]

While the Greek army was heading from İzmir into the Anatolian interior, Mustafa Kemal was heading to Eastern Anatolia to encourage the people to defend and liberate their country from the invasion of the Greek army. As Mustafa Kemal was

[95] Thanos M. Veremis and Mark Dragoumis, *Historical Dictionary of Greece* (London: Scarecrow Press, 1995), 122.
[96] Hirschon, "'Unmixing Peoples' in the Aegean Region," 4.
[97] Georgios Nakracas, *Anadolu ve Rum Göçmenlerin Kökeni* (İstanbul: Belge, 2003), 19.
[98] McCarthy, *Death and Exile*, 269.

leaving İstanbul for Samsun to initiate the national struggle against the imperialists, his ship was inspected for smuggled goods by British soldiers since İstanbul was then under the occupation of the British. As a response to the inspection, he only said: "We are not taking contraband or weapons, but faith and determination."[99] Turks and Greeks fought for three years (1919-1922) to dominate the western part of Anatolia. As Giles Milton remarks in *Paradise Lost: Smyrna 1922*, it was "a war fought on Turkish territory in which Britain, and other Western powers, had aided and armed the Greeks."[100] Erik Goldstein claims that "Greece was seen by many observers as Britain's Trojan horse."[101]

While Greeks and Turks were fighting for their "imagined communities," Arnold Toynbee, who held the Koraís Chair of Byzantine and Modern Greek Language, Literature, and History in the University of London during the 1920s, travelled from England to Turkey and Greece in 1921 to observe the atrocities between the Greeks and the Turks. He compiled his observations in *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey.* Toynbee analyzed the role of the Great Powers in the Aegean Conflict as well as the impact of Western ideas on Near Eastern civilization. Toynbee's observations and ideas on the Asia Minor Catastrophe are crucial since he contextualized the whole picture from the Balkans to the Middle East with historical facts. According to Toynbee, Great Britain was backing the Greeks against the Turks.[102] Greece justified her willingness to occupy the west coast of Anatolia since "In invading Ottoman territory she was simply recovering what she regarded as her own."[103] "If the Greek troops had never landed, assuredly the breach could have been healed and the status quo restored. But the policy actually chosen by the Supreme Council not only kept the wound open; it inflamed it almost beyond hope of cure"[104] says Toynbee.

During his investigation of the Greco-Turkish War, Toynbee learned that it was not just the Greeks and the Turks who were fighting in Asia Minor for Asia

[99] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 453.
[100] Giles Milton, *Paradise Lost: Smyrna 1922* (U.K: Hodder & Stoughton, 2009), 4.
[101] Erik Goldstein, "The British Official Mind and the Lausanne Conference 1922-1923," *Diplomacy Statecraft*, 14:2 (2003):187.
[102] Arnold Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey* (U.S.A: Martino, 2009), 42.
[103] Ibid., 137.
[104] Ibid., 148.

Minor, but the British and the French as well:

> During the battle of the In Önü (sic) in March 1921, a Greek private soldier said to me: 'This is really a battle between England and France for the possession of Anatolia.' He meant it, I think, in the literal sense, for a majority of the Greek and Turkish combatants in this battle believed that French and British officers were directing operations on opposite sides.[105]

Another tragedy behind the war was the soldiers of the Turkish army who migrated from the Balkans to Asia Minor due to the rise of nationalism. While Toynbee was "helping to evacuate Turkish survivors of Greek atrocities and making lists of names of the men of military age whom the Greek authorities were detaining"[106], he realized that Rumelian Muslim refugees, who had already experienced the Balkan Wars and migrated to Anatolia due to the harassment of the Christians, comprised one third of the Turkish army. The atrocities and hatred between the Greeks and the Turks during the Greco-Turkish War stemmed from the Balkans Wars. Toynbee observes that the Balkan Wars had two victims: the Muslims of Rumelia and the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor.[107] This remarkable observation of Toynbee indicates that the Muslims of the Balkans took out their revenge for the Balkan Wars against the Greek army as well as against the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor in the Greco-Turkish War. It is clear that the Muslims of the Balkans, the Greeks of Greece, the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor, and the Turks of Anatolia fought in Asia Minor for their own liberation.

The Turks succeeded in overcoming the Greek forces and ending the Greco-Turkish War in 1922. It is called the War of Independence in Turkish historiography because the war was against the expansion of Greece. The Greek army was defeated in 1922 in Smyrna/İzmir, which had been one of the most cosmopolitan cities of the empire. According to Milton's description, Smyrna "had a Greek population that was at least twice that of Athens and the reminders of her great Byzantine heritage were to be found scattered throughout the city."[108] Richard Chandler, who traveled in Asia

[105] Ibid., 39.
[106] Ibid., 139.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 4.

Minor in the eighteenth century, asserts that the Turks had outnumbered the Greeks in Smyrna before the formation of the independent Greek state in 1829. Chandler observed that, "The conflux at Smyrna of people of various nations, differing in dress, in manners, in language and in religion is very considerable. The Turks occupy by far the greater part of the town."[109] Obviously the Greek population of Smyrna increased in two centuries because Smyrna had been the center of commerce during the times of the Ottoman Empire.[110] Smith notes that,

> The establishment of the independent Greek state boosted the renaissance of Asia Minor. Greece served as an example and a lure to the still unredeemed communities. At the same time, the economic growth of the Greek communities on the west coast was partly dependent on, and helped to attract, Greek immigration from the mainland.[111]

Moreover in 1773 Aivali (*Ayvalık* in Turkish) was colonized by the citizens of Greece with a special *firman* (a legal document) by the Sultan that no Muslim will reside in Aivali during the residence of the Greeks as they cultivate olives for oil and soap.[112]

Reşat Kasaba, who analyzes the mobility of the Ottoman subjects in his book *A Moveable Empire*, informs us that, "Workers, especially Greeks, moved back and forth between parts of Anatolia and between western Anatolia, the Aegean islands, the Greek mainland, and places beyond."[113] Karpat remarks that those immigrant Greeks, who were Greek citizens, were influential over the rise of nationalism among the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia.[114] Another motivation for the migration of Greeks to Asia Minor was the reforms approved by the Sultan in the nineteenth century.[115] This explains how the population of the Greeks increased in Asia Minor after the establishment of the Greek Kingdom and how they infused nationalism to the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor.

---

[109] Richard Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor* (London: 1776), 64.
[110] See Bülent Varlık, *19. Yüzyılda Emperyalizmin Batı Anadolu'da Yayılması* (Imperialism on the Western Coast of Anatolia in the 19th Century).
[111] Smith, *Ionian Vision*, 25.
[112] Toynbee, *The Western Question*, 122.
[113] Kasaba, *A Moveable Empire*, 125.
[114] Karpat, *Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler*, 80.
[115] Salahi R. Sonyel, *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society Printing, 1993), 190.

Smyrna was an admirable city during the Ottomans. For Richard Chandler, "The two cities Ephesus and Smyrna have been termed the eyes of Asia Minor."[116] For Colonel A. Kemal Sırrı, "Smyrna is the brightest Asiatic jewel of the Ottoman Crown."[117] However, the brightest jewel of the Ottoman Crown was no longer what it used to be between 1919 and 1922. A British officer reports about the Greek atrocities in Smyrna and the population of the city:

> What the Allied Fleet was doing to allow this sort of thing to go on I don't understand; for the Greeks, both military and civil, took a hand to it—and—it was not until they were attacked that the Turks showed fight. The Greeks claim that Smyrna is Greek—as a matter of fact, Christians are in a majority here, but not Greek Christians. Of Ottoman Greeks and Ottoman Turks there are more Ottoman Turks.[118]

Greeks, Turks, Jews, Armenians, French, Italian, British, and Americans lived and worked together in Smyrna. However, Greek atrocities in Anatolia destroyed the prevailing atmosphere in 1922. Crowning the defeat, a huge fire burnt the city to ashes. Since then, the identity of the perpetrators of the fire has been a controversial issue among historians because nobody knows who started the fire.[119] The Greeks blame the Turks and the Turks blame the Greeks. Some people blamed Armenians since the first flame was seen in the Armenian quarter of the city.[120] The Greco-Turkish War started in Smyrna in 1919 and ended in Smyrna in 1922. The defeat was named the Asia Minor Catastrophe by the Greeks because it was the end of the *Megali Idea*. As de Bernières states, "It is one of history's little ironies that in one century the Greeks should have fought a war of independence against the Turks, and in the following century the Turks should have fought a war of independence against the Greeks."[121]

Justin McCarthy has illuminating observations on the formation of modern Turkey as well as its social fabric: "The new Turkish Republic was a nation of

---

[116] Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor*, 108.
[117] Permanent Bureau of the Turkish Congress at Lausanne. *Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna (May to July 1919)* (BiblioBazaar, 2009), 3.
[118] Ibid., 38.
[119] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 23.
[120] Alexis Heraclides, *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the Aegean: Imagined Enemies* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 61.
[121] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 503.

immigrants whose citizens came from Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Armenia, Georgia, Russia, Ukraine, and elsewhere."[122] McCarthy stresses that the Ottoman Muslims who were the victims of ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, the Crimea, Russia, and the Caucasus migrated to the Ottoman Empire to find shelter. McCarthy criticizes the conventional and orientalist Western historiography that labels the battles as "massacres" and wars as "genocide" with no reference to the sufferings of the Muslims in the Balkans, the Crimea, Russia and the Caucasus.[123] The Muslim immigrants who migrated to Anatolia had no choice other than to embrace nationalism, to liberate Anatolia, and to make it their new home. Like the Ottoman Empire, Turkey has become a multi-ethnic state; however the diverse citizens of Turkey have united in Islam. Speros Vryonis states that "Since antiquity the inhabitants of the Mediterranean world had been subject to a remarkable variety of transforming cultural forces: Hellenization, Romanization, Arabization, Christianization, and Islamization. To these were now added Turkification."[124] The War of Independence strengthened Turkification in Anatolia, and the immigrants successfully integrated in the process of driving foreign forces from a constructed modern Turkey.

It can be argued that the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 by Sultan Mehmet II, who "knew Greek and appreciated Hellenic learning"[125], was not the end of Byzantine heritage and culture. The Asia Minor Catastrophe was the real end of the Byzantine Empire. The conquest of Constantinople was a turning point for the Orthodox Christians who gained a new status in the new Islamic Empire of the Turks. Sultan Mehmet II transformed the Ottoman State into an empire with newly established social, cultural, and religious institutions and foundations. İnalcık asserts that, "He (Mehmet) was a warrior who strove for world dominion but who was at the same time a man of tolerance and culture."[126] Orthodox Christians continued to live in an imperial atmosphere with more privileges granted by the Ottoman Sultan. As

[122] McCarthy, *Death and Exile*, 2.
[123] Ibid., 23.
[124] Speros Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (U.S.A: University of California Press, 1971), 1.
[125] Heraclides, *Greek-Turkish Conflict*, 19.
[126] Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600*, trans. Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973), 29.

Karpat stresses, "The patriarch was no longer the humble servant of the emperor, but a recognized and respected member of the sultan's bureaucracy enjoying full jurisdiction over his followers."[127] He was not just the religious leader of his community, but also an administrator. In contrast in 1923 all the privileges of the *Millet-i Rum* were buried by the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the Lausanne Convention sealed the end of the *Megali Idea.*

1.3. The Treaty of Lausanne

The Lausanne Convention was signed between Greece and Turkey on 30 January 1923, part of the Treaty of Lausanne signed on 24 July 1923. The convention was between Greece and Turkey to solve the minority problems of both. Fridtjof Nansen was regarded as the initiator of the population exchange. However, Nansen declared that he was following the orders of the Great Powers and he was appointed "by the world community to deal with the vast refugee flows created by the First World War and its aftermath."[128] The Muslims of Greece and the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were regarded as minorities in Greece and Turkey respectively. The exchange of populations seemed to be the only solution in order to prevent atrocities. Hirschon says that "Separation of people who are caught up in deadly conflict is probably the only way of preventing further massacres and the only effective measure in the short-term."[129] Thus it was hoped that atrocities among the two communities of the Aegean would be abolished through the exchange of populations which approved what Hirschon calls the first compulsory exchange of populations in world history.[130]

The Lausanne Convention has many implications for Greece and Turkey because the convention gave birth to two nation-states in the Aegean. As Hirschon states, "this event constituted a major defeat, known as the Asia Minor Catastrophe, a greater disaster even than the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453, for it

[127] Karpat, "Millets and Nationality," 145.
[128] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 44.
[129] Hirschon, "'Unmixing Peoples' in the Aegean Region," 10.
[130] Ibid., 7.

ended with finality the millennia-long Hellenic presence in Anatolia."[131] Therefore, it was not a success but a failure and tragedy for the Greeks since the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor in effect left their motherland and went into exile. For Turkey, the convention was the end of the Ottoman Empire, but it was also the birth of the Turkish Republic.[132] For Turks it was a victory and a great success that paved the road to establish a country of their own. The convention forced both Christians and Muslims to migrate from their motherland to an unfamiliar country. The Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were claimed to be Greek; whereas the Muslims of Greece were claimed to be Turks. These people were indoctrinated to perceive the unknown country as their motherland, and were told that it was time to go back to their roots after a long period of exile. However, it is still a controversial issue whether these people were sent to their motherland or into exile. There is no single answer to this question because of the nature of the diverse Ottoman society. The Lausanne Convention could not solve the ethnic and religious ambiguity of Greeks and Turks. The only possible solution seemed to fall back on the *millet* system; thus Greeks and Turks were separated through their faith, which became an over-simplified marker for their ethnicity.[133]

The Lausanne Convention had two purposes: to legitimize the migrations from and to Asia Minor, and to homogenize the populations of Greece and Turkey. During the decline of the Ottoman Empire, several wars and rebellions had broken out. Muslims of the Balkans had migrated to Turkey during the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) since they were harassed by the Orthodox Christians with the rise of nationalism. Muslims in the Crimea, Georgia, and the Caucasus had been forced to convert to Christianity by the Russians. Like their co-religionists in the Balkans, those Muslims also migrated to Anatolia, the only choice for those persecuted Muslims.[134] On the other hand, Orthodox Christians of Anatolia had been migrating

[131] Renèe Hirschon, "The Consequences of the Lausanne Convention: An Overview," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 13-20 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 14.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Çağlar Keyder, "The Consequences of the Exchange of Populations for Turkey," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 39-53 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 42.
[134] McCarthy, *Death and Exile*, 23.

to Greece and to other parts of the world before the Lausanne Convention. According to Ahmet Efiloğlu's findings, during the Balkan Wars some Ottoman Greeks helped the Bulgarians in Thrace against the Ottoman army. Moreover they burnt many villages, killed Muslims and after that escaped to Greece.

Efiloğlu states that Greece was manipulating the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor to fight against the Ottomans in order to make Asia Minor part of Greece (*Megali Idea*). Those Ottoman Greeks did not return from Greece and sent letters and money to their families who were still in Anatolia to encourage them to migrate to Greece. In those letters, Asia Minor Greeks depicted Greece as a rich and prosperous country. They claimed that the living conditions were better compared to Anatolia, and that the government was providing food for them. This was not true, but it was the only way to attract the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia.[135] Efiloğlu asserts that Greece and the Patriarchate made propaganda for the migration of Orthodox Christians from Turkey. Finally, most of them migrated to Greece to unite with their family and friends. Muslims were migrating into Anatolia, and Christians were migrating out of Anatolia to live with their co-religionists.

The second reason for the Convention dates back to the Ottoman era. The Ottoman Empire had many troubles and conflicts when the Russians and the Europeans interfered with the Ottoman policy, ostensibly to protect the Christian minorities of the empire. Ayhan Aktar emphasizes that "This was a critical issue since the Great Powers often used the position of non-Muslim minorities as a pretext to intervene in the domestic affairs of the Ottoman Empire."[136] Vretu Meneksepulu, an Asia Minor refugee interviewed by the Center for Asia Minor Studies (hereafter CAMS), stated that Orthodox Christians of Anatolia had photos of the Russian Tsar in their homes and had no idea of Greece. They knew about Russia because the Russian Tsar used to send them bells and icons to decorate their houses and

[135] Ahmet Efiloğlu, *Osmanlı Rumları: Göç ve Tehcir 1912-1918* (İstanbul: Bayrak, 2011), 145.
[136] Ayhan Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation, Turkifying the Economy: The Turkish Experience of Population Exchange Reconsidered," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 79-97 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 87.

churches.[137] This oral testimony indicates that the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were not aware of the Greek Kingdom, but they knew the Russian Tsar who acted as a protector. Actually, these interventions were just an excuse to disintegrate the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, Turkey did not want to experience the minority problems that would possibly be created by the Europeans to disintegrate the country in the future. Moreover because Orthodox Christians helped the Bulgarians during the Balkan Wars, and had helped the Allied Forces during World War I as well, the Turkish state did not have confidence in their loyalty. For Turkey and its future policy, compulsory population exchange was necessary to avoid European interference. Turkey both homogenized its population and Turkified its economy through the exchange of populations.[138] No room was left in Anatolia for the minorities of the Ottoman Empire that posed a potential threat to Turkey.

For the Greeks, the convention was also necessary for the homogenization of the country. Greece and Bulgaria had clashed in the Balkan Wars in competition to dominate Macedonia. By the end of the Balkan Wars, Greece managed to gain a large part of Macedonia.[139] Macedonia, the newly gained lands, needed to be populated. Thus the Greek state wanted to "use the exodus of Orthodox Christians from Anatolia to repopulate its newly won northern lands, and hence consolidate Greek control of the southern Balkans."[140] Thus the population exchange was a means of populating those areas and some refugees were settled in the northern part of Greece for that purpose.[141] Both countries had excuses to displace thousands of people from their motherland. Çağlar Keyder explains that

> The exchange between Greece and Turkey, then, was seen as an inevitable consequence of the demise of the old order of empires. Although involving a huge and brutal displacement, it was thought of as a necessary measure correcting the incongruity of territory and nation, and it was accepted because it provided an

[137] Küçük Asya Araştırmaları Merkezi, *Göç: Rumların Anadolu'dan Mecburi Ayrılışı (1919-1923)* [Migration: Compulsory Displacement of *Rum* from Anatolia (1919-1923)], comp. Herkül Millas, trans. Damla Demirözü (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001), 167.
[138] Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation," 92. See also Ayhan Aktar, *Türk Milliyetçiliği, Gayrimüslimler ve Ekonomik Dönüşüm*.
[139] Anastasia Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990* (U.S.A: Chicago University Press, 1997), 141.
[140] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 43.
[141] Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat*, 145.

accelerated route to nation-state formation.[142]

Ethnic cleansing of the minorities appeared to be the first step for nation formation. During his investigation in Asia Minor, Toynbee foresaw the population exchange. He knew that the Orthodox Christians "can only get political union with Greece in one of two ways: either emigration, which means exile if not ruin or the annexation by Greece of the vast territories over which they are spread, and of the Moslem majorities among whom they live."[143]

According to Bernard Lewis, the deportation of both Christians and Muslims from their homeland was not repatriation, but an exile.[144] Furthermore, in the crisis of 1923, people were not asked whether or not they wanted to leave their motherland. Politicians did not hesitate to initiate this most tragic human migration in 1923. Migrations have always been miserable even if voluntary, and the tragedy of the population exchange stems from its having been compulsory and allowing no return. It was Lord Curzon of Britain who wanted the exchange to be compulsory, "guaranteeing the stability of the new international order."[145] The Muslims of Thrace and the *Rum* of Istanbul were exempted from the compulsory exchange of populations due to the Phanar *Rum* Patriarchate in İstanbul. For the *Rum* of İstanbul, the city has been the "Second Rome" therefore; it was impossible for Venizelos to have the public accept the exchange of Istanbul *Rum* because it would be the real end of the *Megali Idea*. Furthermore, "the Patriarchate would most probably have had to move to Mount Athos in Greece, and this would inevitably have caused great friction between it and its rival institution, the autocephalous Church of Greece."[146] Due to all these factors that Venizelos faced, "The exclusion from the exchange of a substantial number of Muslim-Turks just within the Greek border was a price

[142] Keyder, "The Consequences," 40.
[143] Toynbee, *The Western Question*, 126-127.
[144] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 349.
[145] Baskın Oran, "The Story of Those Who Stayed," in *Crossing the Aegean*: *An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 97-115 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 98. For the social and political lives of the minorities in Greece and Turkey after the Lausanne Convention see also Kevin Featherstone, *The Last Ottomans: The Muslim Minority of Greece 1940-1949*; Samim Akgönül, *Türkiye Rumları: Ulus-Devlet Çağından Küreselleşme Çağına Bir Azınlığın Yok Oluş Süreci*; Speros Vryonis, *The Mechanism of Catastrophe: The Turkish Pogrom of September 6-7, 1955, and the Destruction of the Greek Community of Istanbul*.
[146] Ibid., 99.

Venizelos had to pay to ensure that the Istanbul *Rum* and the Patriarchate crucially stayed where they were in Istanbul."[147]

The criteria for the division of Orthodox Christians and Muslims according to the Lausanne Convention created a long debate between Greece and Turkey. The question was on what criteria Ottoman Greeks and Turks, subjects of a multi-ethnic, multilingual, and multi-religious empire should be divided? Onur Yıldırım summarizes the diplomacy of the Lausanne Convention:

> In referring to the minorities under question, the discourse of both sides reflected more the ideal notions of national identity than actual realities. The Greeks spoke of a combined identity of ethnicity and religion for the Greek minority in Turkey, while the Turks, who came to Lausanne with a notion of "minority" based essentially on faith, persisted in using religion as the primary denominator. Therefore, the Turkish diplomats, İsmet Pasha and Rıza Nur, used the broad term "non-Muslims" *(gayri-Müslim*) to refer to the Greeks. As for the Muslim population in Greece, they used the term "people of Islam" (*ahali-i islamiye*) and "Turkish" (*Türk*) interchangeably from the beginning of the negotiations.[148]

Religion, not language, functioned as a primary denominator of ethnicity, as we have seen, because language had not been a denominator of ethnic origin in the Ottoman Empire. Language was neither a marker of identity nor ethnicity in the Ottoman context.[149] In Ottoman society different ethnic groups spoke different languages regardless of their ethnic origin and religion. "An Ottoman Muslim might speak Serbian, Arabic, Albanian or Turkish; it made no difference to that person's status in the eyes of his rulers"[150] says Clark.

---

[147] Ibid.
[148] Onur Yıldırım, *Diplomacy and Displacement: Reconsidering the Turco-Greek Exchange of Populations, 1922–1934*, ed. Shahrough Akhavi (U.S.A: Routledge, 2006), 110.
[149] Özkırımlı and Sofos, *Tormented by History*, 16.
[150] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 14-15.

1.4. Karamanlis: Ethno-religious Conflict in Lausanne

Perhaps the most interesting and controversial community of the Ottoman Empire was the Karamanlis who were Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, concentrated mostly in Cappadocia/Central Anatolia. They wrote the Turkish language in Greek script and published many books, journals, and newspapers in this form. They also worshipped in Turkish rather than Greek, since they regarded Turkish as their mother tongue. Cappadocia was a large region then as Evangelia Balta, a Pontic Greek, clarifies the boundaries of Cappadocia:

> Its boundaries for present purposes are: to the north as far as Ankara, Yozgat and Hudavendigar; to the south as far as Antalya and Adana; to the east as far as Kayseri and Sivas, and to the west as far as the borders of Aydın province. Within this geographical area with its solid Muslim population, Turkish-speaking Orthodox communities coexisted with Turkish-speaking Armenians and Turkish-speaking Protestants, as well as dispersed enclaves of Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians, until the Exchange of Populations in 1924.[151]

A close analysis of Balta's description of Cappadocia shows that most of the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were Turcophone. Bela Horvath, a Hungarian scholar and researcher, visited Anatolia in 1913 on the eve of World War I. She visited several cities of Cappadocia such as Konya, Aksaray, Niğde, Nevşehir, Kırşehir and Ankara, and observed the culture, life-style, and political atmosphere of the Ottoman Empire. Horvath observed Karamanlis while she was in Niğde: "*Rum* do not speak their national language any more however they are faithful to Christianity and worship in Turkish in the churches."[152] For Horvath, Turkish was not the national language of the *Rum*. Horvath, who was a Hungarian nationalist, was thinking in nationalist terms because, as Erol Köroğlu states, "The Hungarians, who at the time were searching for a point of support against Russia, started claiming descent from Turan, supposedly to constitute a bond among Hungarian, Finnish,

[151] Evangelia Balta, *Beyond The Language Frontier: Studies on the Karamanlis and the Karamanlidika Printing* (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2010), 49. For more information about the geography of Asia Minor, see Ionannis Kalfoğlu, *Küçük Asya Kıtasının Tarihi Coğrafyası*. Kalfoğlu was one of those Karamanlis who worked in "Anatoli" newspaper as a journalist.
[152] Bela Horvath, *Anadolu 1913* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996), 73.

Turkish and Mongolian nations."[153]

The most interesting figure of the Karamanlis was Evangelinos Misailidis. He was a leading writer and journalist who published his novel *Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-ü Cefakeş* (The Theater of the World and Tyrants and Tyrannized) in 1872 in İstanbul. Robert Anhegger and Vedat Günyol transliterated the novel into modern Turkish since the language of the novel was Turkish but in Greek script.[154] Actually *Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-ü Cefakeş* was a translation and adaptation of Grigorios Palaiologos's picaresque novel *O Polypathis* (The Man of Many Sufferings) that was published thirty years before in Athens.[155] Misailidis translated the novel into Turkish in order to educate the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia. Misailidis was born in Kula/Manisa in 1820 and died in 1890 in İstanbul. After receiving his degree in Literature in Greece, he returned to İzmir and started teaching Turkish. Between 1845 and 1847, he published the first journal of Karamanlis called "Beşaret-il Maşrık." He continued publishing in İstanbul with a new journal called "Anatolia".[156] "Anatolia" was also the name of the publishing house founded by Misailidis and it became the publishing center for Karamanlı intellectuals.[157]

Misailidis devoted his life to illuminating the *Millet-i Rum* until his death. He was so hardworking and productive that he was given the rank "National Educator" by the Patriarchate, a medallion by the Greek state, and the title of "Pasha" of the Ottomans.[158] In his work titled *Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-ü Cefakeş*, Misailidis criticized the *Rum* in Beyoğlu who had been greatly influenced by the European way of life that did not match with the traditions of Orthodox Christians in Anatolia. Misailidis generally preferred to use "Anatolians" for "*Rum.*" He did not use the word Karamanlis. He criticized the Anatolians for not educating themselves by

[153] Erol Köroğlu, *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity: Literature in Turkey during World War I* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007), 52.
[154] Evangelinos Misailidis, *Seyreyle Dünyayı (Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakâr-u Cefakeş)*, translit. Robert Anhegger and Vedat Günyol (İstanbul: Cem, 1986).
[155] Anthi Karra, "From *Polypathis* to *Temaşa-i Dünya*, from the Safe Port of Translation to the Open Sea of Creation," in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies*, ed. Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler, 201-218 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 201.
[156] Robert Anhegger, introduction to *Seyreyle Dünyayı*.
[157] Ibid.
[158] Ibid.

reading books and newspapers as the Europeans did.[159] *Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-ü Cefakeş* was the masterpiece of Misailidis as well as Karamanlidika Printing, but it was not the first work. "The first work to be published in Turkish with Greek characters was printed in Martin Crusiu's *Turcograecia* in Baseli in 1584"[160] notes Richard Clogg.

Before Misailidis published his novel, Vartan Paşa had published *Aḳabi Hikyayesi* (sic) in 1851 in Turkish, but in Armenian letters.[161] Vartan Paşa was a Catholic Armenian educated in Vienna.[162] Both authors were well-educated Ottoman subjects and published their works in İstanbul. While Misailidis criticized the European way of life, Vartan Paşa drew the attention of his readers to the conflict between Orthodox and Catholic Armenians with a love story. According to Laurent Mignon, *Akabi Hikâyesi* is a political novel because it has a message to the Armenians.[163] Both novels projected the socio-political atmosphere of the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire and clearly demonstrate the ethnic and linguistic diversity of Ottoman society and why language was not an ethnic marker for Ottoman subjects. Turkish-speaking Armenians and Orthodox Christians wrote the Turkish language in Armenian and Greek letters in order to reach their communities.

The ethnic origin of the Karamanlis has always been controversial. Greek scholars declared them Turkicized Greeks, while Turks insisted that they were Hellenized Turks.[164] The terminology of the word Karamanlis or Karamanlides is also controversial. According to Misailidis, the Christians of Anatolia did not have any connection with Karaman province in Anatolia. For him, Karaman was not in Konya, it was in İstanbul. Since the reign of Sultan Murat Han, he argued, the word had been used wrongly. Construction workers in İstanbul were mostly from Anatolia and they used to live in the Karaman quarter of İstanbul. Therefore, the workers were

[159] Misailidis, *Seyreyle Dünyayı*, 338.
[160] Richard Clogg, "A Millet Within a Millet: The Karamanlides," in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, ed. Dimitri Goncidas and Charles Issawi, 115-143 (USA: Darwin Press, 1999), 123.
[161] Vartan Paşa, *Aḳabi Hikyayesi: İlk Türkçe Roman, 1851*, prep. Andreas Tietze (İstanbul: Eren, 1991).
[162] Johann Strauss, "Is Karamanli Literature Part of a 'Christian-Turkish (Turco-Christian) Literature'?" in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies*, ed. Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler, 153-200 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 167.
[163] Laurent Mignon, *Elifbâlar Sevdası* (Ankara: Hece Yayınları, 2003), 69.
[164] Clogg, "A Millet Within a Millet," 116.

called Karamanlis and the residents of İstanbul perceived everybody from Anatolia as Karamanlis.[165] Toynbee, who observed the Karamanlis in İstanbul, notes that

> The Turkish-speaking Karamanly (sic) Christians who settled in Constantinople as small shopkeepers (often in Moslem quarters) feel themselves different from the Greek-speaking Christian natives of Rumelia and the Kingdom of Greece. They are pleased if you talk to them in Turkish, and proud of their home and name.[166]

According to Toynbee, "The medieval Greek population was not exterminated by the Saljuqs but converted. As they had once turned from Hittites and Phrygians into Greeks, so they turned again from Greeks into Turks, under the influence of a few nomadic intruders."[167] Toynbee thought that Greeks turned into Turks, and then "Turkish language did in time become the vernacular of most of the unconverted Christian minorities that remained in Anatolia."[168] Karpat emphasizes the same issue that Saljuqs did not exterminate the locals of Anatolia and Rumelia; instead they integrated smoothly and managed to live together.[169]

Yonca Anzerlioğlu, who did extensive research on the ethnicity of the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, claims that the Karamanlis were Turks depending on one of two theories: Karamanlis were either Turkicized *Rum or* they were Turks who served in the army of the Eastern Roman Empire and converted to Christianity during their service.[170] Not only linguistically were they Turks, but also their culture, tradition, and customs were almost the same as those of Muslim Turks.[171] Anzerlioğlu mentions that the Karamanlis even had Turkish names or surnames such as Yovan Kozmaoğlu, Bodos Bektaşidi, Hristo Topaloğlu, and Yovan Hacıoğlu, and they regarded themselves as Christian Turks, not as *Rum*.[172]

---

[165] Misailidis, *Seyreyle Dünyayı*, 134- 135. Karaman was one of the districts of Konya before, and now it is a city in modern Turkey.
[166] Toynbee, *The Western Question,* 120.
[167] Ibid., 113.
[168] Ibid., 117.
[169] Karpat, *Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler*, 12.
[170] Yonca Anzerlioğlu, *Karamanlı Ortodoks Türkler* (Ankara: Phoenix, 2003), 22.
[171] Another informative book on Karamanlis is written by Oğuz Özdem, *Biz Vatanımıza Hasret Öldük Yavrularım*. It is the life story of a Karamanlis family who migrated to Greece in 1923.
[172] Anzerlioğlu, *Karamanlı Ortodoks Türkler*, 169.

Nurten Ertul, a Turkish journalist from Niğde, learned that she was a descendant of Karamanlis.[173] Her great grandfather Yordan and his whole village converted to Islam just after the independence of Greece from the Ottoman Empire. Yordan did not want to ally with Greece because he regarded himself as an Ottoman subject, not a Greek. He forsaw the population exchange and did not want to migrate to Greece. Furthermore, he criticized the loyalty of the Greeks.[174] Ertul inherited a box full of personal documents archived by her grandmother, Elvan Karaman. Ertul wrote her biographical novel *Kimlik* (Identity) to search for her family background and project the sorrows of the Karamanlis during the population exchange. She indicates that Karamanlis were the inhabitants of the Karamanid Emirate founded in Central Anatolia just after the fall of the Saljuq Empire in the thirteenth century. Finally the Karamanid Emirate was conquered by the Ottomans in the sixteenth century.[175]

Clogg also listed several travel accounts of many travelers from the fifteenth century onwards stating that the Gospel was read in Turkish and church services were held in Turkish in Central Anatolia as well as in İstanbul by the Karamanlis. Some priests were capable of reading the Greek Gospel but did not understand much. Some priests did not know the Greek language as they used to hold church services in Turkish.[176] One of those priests of the Karamanlis was Papa Eftim, who preferred to align with the Turkish state during the Greco-Turkish War. Papa Eftim, the spiritual leader of the Karamanlis, rebelled against the Phanar *Rum* Patriarchate during the Greco-Turkish War, declaring that his community was not Greek, but Turk. He and his community opposed the *Megali Idea*. Papa Eftim stated that Orthodox Turks and Muslim Turks were different only in faith and they were therefore part of the mainstream, not minorities, in Anatolia.[177] Muslim Turks had never forced them to convert, and they had been living together for many centuries. Papa Eftim believed that a true believer had to obey the state that provided a peaceful

[173] For an interview with Nurten Ertul, http://www.haber7.com/haber/20060502/Hilal-Hac-ve-Kimlik.php.
[174] Nurten Ertul, *Kimlik: Osmanlı Topraklarında 700 Yıllık Yaşam ve Köklerimiz* (İstanbul: Nesa, 2006), 67.
[175] Ibid., 65.
[176] Clogg, "A Millet Within a Millet," 120.
[177] Anzerlioğlu, *Karamanlı Ortodoks Türkler*, 222-223.

atmosphere and freedom of faith to its subjects. However the Phanar *Rum* Patriarchate was cooperating with the Allied forces against the Turkish state, something unacceptable to the Karamanlis, who believed that a church should be free from politics. After all, states are founded by the will of God, and religions cannot survive without the protection of the states.[178] Thus the community of Papa Eftim remained faithful to the Turkish state, declaring that it had always protected them. Clark notes that since the Orthodox Christians of Cappadocia "had lived more or less peacefully with their Muslim neighbors, it could hardly be argued that co-existence between them and Islam was impossible."[179]

When Mustafa Kemal travelled to Eastern Anatolia to start the War of Independence against the Greeks and the Allied Forces, Papa Eftim declared that he was ready to receive orders from Mustafa Kemal, who met Papa Eftim in Sivas in 1919 for the first time and kept in touch with him till his death in 1938.[180] During the Independence War of Turkey on 22 July 1922, Karamanlis published a weekly newspaper titled *Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası* (The Voice of the Orthodoxy in Anatolia) in which they openly supported the Turkish state claiming that they were not Greeks but Turks.[181] Papa Eftim and his community were willing to establish their own patriarchate separate from Phanar for the same reason. Finally, they achieved their goal on 21 September 1922, before the Lausanne Convention was signed. An independent Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate[182] was established in Kayseri. Papa Eftim tried to keep Orthodox Turks exempt from the population exchange. Sadly, the policy of the Turkish state to ethnically cleanse non-Turks applied to the Karamanlis despite the efforts of Papa Eftim.[183]

Greeks and Turks defined the concept of ethnicity on religious grounds and cleansed their territories of people who had a different faith. Thus the Lausanne

[178] Ibid.
[179] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 101.
[180] Anzerlioğlu, *Karamanlı Ortodoks Türkler*, 226.
[181] Ramazan Tosun, *Türk-Rum Nüfus Mübadelesi ve Kayseri'deki Rumlar* (Niğde: Tolunay, 1998), 104- 105.
[182] The Patriarchate moved to Karaköy, İstanbul in 1924. Papa Eftim and his family also moved to İstanbul after the population exchange. He changed the language of worship from *Rum* (Greek) to Turkish. He also changed the names of his son, cousin and nephew to Turkish names. He remained as the leader of Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate, and fought against the Phanar *Rum* Patriarchate till his death in 1968.
[183] Keyder, "Consequences," 42.

Convention sent the Karamanlis to Greece to live with their co-religionists because the population exchange was based on religion, not language or culture. However, the Turkish Parliament passed a special law creating an exception for Papa Eftim and his family (50-60 people) to stay in Turkey as a reward for their contributions to the War of Independence. Eleni Pavlidu, an Asia Minor refugee interviewed in 1963 by the CAMS in Nea Elvetia/Greece, said that the women and children of Simav were sent into exile to Keskinmaden/Ankara when the Greek army got closer to Simav in 1920. During their exile, which lasted for two and a half years, the *Rum* of Ankara helped them to get clean and provided them with food and clothes. During their long trekking from Simav to Ankara, they became dirty and hungry. Papa Eftim was among the helpers, and he was asked by a woman whether they were invited to Greece by their ancestors as the Turks had said. Papa Eftim answered: "I will stay here with my community. However, you go."[184]

Obviously it seems impossible to distinguish the ethnic roots of any *millet* in the Ottoman Empire because people were divided through their faith. Language was a means of communication; it was not a denominator for ethnicity. The Karamanlis are a good example of the ethnic and religious ambiguity of the Ottoman Empire and the problem they posed for negotiators during the Lausanne Conference. Although the Karamanlis declared that ethnically they were Turks not *Rum*, the majority were sent to Greece because "The criterion for such an Exchange was religion. Turkish-speaking Christian Orthodox people and Greek-speaking Muslims found themselves, against their will, in countries that were alien to their customs and language."[185] "Anybody who lived in the 'wrong' place, from the viewpoint of religion, would be deported across the Aegean to start a new life in the 'right' country."[186] Being ethnically "Turk" did not save the Karamanlis or any other Christians from the exchange of populations unless they converted to Islam. As Clark mentions, "half a dozen Greek Orthodox women managed to stay behind in Sinasos

[184] KAAM, *Göç*, 252.
[185] John S. Koliopoulos, and Thanos M. Veremis, *Modern Greece: A History since 1821* (U.K: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2010), 93.
[186] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 11.

(Mustafapaşa/Cappadocia), by marrying Muslim men and adopting Islam."[187] During the deportation, some Christian girls in Muğla begged the officer to register them as Muslims in order to stay in Muğla and marry their Turkish boyfriends. However, the officer refused and these girls went to Greece in tears.[188]

The ethnic and religious ambiguity of the Ottoman Empire derived from the nature of Asia Minor, which has always been multi-ethnic since ancient times. William Mitchell Ramsay, a fellow of the British Academy, presented a report on 25 October 1916 titled *The Intermixture of Races in Asia Minor; Some of Its Causes and Effects*. Ramsay, who travelled in the area for nearly thirty-five years and studied Asia Minor for forty years, stated that

> The intermixture of races in Asia Minor during ancient times commonly meant real mixing of blood and stock through intermarriages. That is certain for the Greek and Roman period, and may be assumed with confidence at a still earlier time when direct evidence is not available. There was no feeling of caste and practically no pride in the natural superiority of one race to another, one in such strength as to forbid intermarriage. The conquerors who time after time took possession of the country appear to have taken wives from the native population.[189]

Intermarriages contributed greatly to the mixed races of Anatolia. Lewis mentions that "Not a few of the Turkish frontiersmen were suckled and weaned by Greek mothers—not a few of the noble families of the early Empire were descended from converted Greeks."[190] Ottoman sultans and princes married Christian nobility. For example Sultan Orhan married the daughter of Kantakouzenos, who was an important member of the Byzantine royal family, in 1343.[191] Thus Greeks and Turks are mixed races of Anatolia and it is not possible to trace their ethnicity.

---

[187] Ibid., 90. For the conversions of Christians to Islam and the Crypto-Christians of Anatolia see also Yorgo Andreadis, *Gizli Din Taşıyanlar*, and *Temel Garip*; Ertuğrul Aladağ, *Sekene: Türkleşmiş Rumlar/Dönmeler;* Fahriye Emgili, *"İhtidâ (Conversion to Islam) as an Effort to be Exempt from the Exchange of Populations."*

[188] Ertuğrul Aladağ, *Andonia: Küçük Asya'dan Göç* (İstanbul: Belge, 1995), 17-18.

[189] William Mitchell Ramsay, *The Intermixture of Races in Asia Minor; Some of Its Causes and Effects* (U.S.A: General Books, 2010), 3-4. For ethnic diversity of Anatolia see also Peter Andrews, *Ethnic Groups in the Republic of Turkey*; Atilla Durak, *Ebru: Reflections of Cultural Diversity in Turkey*.

[190] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 42.

[191] Kasaba, *A Moveable Empire*, 44.

There are other factors that enabled Ottoman society to become more diverse and cosmopolitan, such as conversions, the child levy (*devshirme*), deportations (*sürgün*), and migrations.[192] One has to know these policies of the empire in order to understand Ottoman society thoroughly. Karen Barkey states that "The *devshirme*, a levy of Balkan Christian young boys, had emerged as an institution during the reign of Murad as part of the natural transition from a small emergent state based mostly on horizontal kinship and friendship relations, to a hierarchical and vertically integrated structure."[193] Young Christian boys, who were taken from their families, were given to Turkish families to learn Turkish language and customs, and they were converted to Islam. The vast majority of those boys were trained and served in the Janissary corps. Highly talented ones became Grand Viziers.[194] As İnalcık writes, "No matter whether the boys were in origin Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, Albanian, Hungarian or Russian, they severed all ties with their past. In the Palace they received a thorough Muslim and Turkish education, their teachers all being Muslim Turks."[195]

The boys were selected according to their intelligence and physical strength. As the historians explain, an intelligent and hardworking person can easily ascend to a high position in the Ottoman hierarchy since the Ottomans had no racial arrogance or insistence on 'pure' Turkish descent.[196] Most of the Grand Viziers, pashas, soldiers, and administrators were *devshirme.* An impressive example is Sinan, the Chief Architect of the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century, who declared in his biography that he was a *devshirme* from Ağırnas village of Kayseri.[197] There are several other examples in Ottoman history, and one of the most interesting families of *devshirme* origin was the Köprülü dynasty and Grand Vizier Köprülü Mehmet Pasha and his successors. The Köprülü family, originally Albanian, ruled the empire

[192] Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective* (U.S.A: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
[193] Barkey, *Empire of Difference,* 76.
[194] Ibid.
[195] İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire,* 80.
[196] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. 42.
[197] Sai Mustafa Çelebi, *Yapılar Kitabı Tezkiretü'l-Bünyan ve Tezkiretü'l-Ebniye (Mimar Sinan'ın Anıları)* (İstanbul: Koç Kültür Sanat, 2002), 39.

for three generations.[198]

The *sürgün* or deportation policy also diversified the ethnic and religious ambivalence of the empire. As Kasaba notes, "Mobility thoroughly permeated Ottoman society and the nascent institutions of the empire. Consequently, the social makeup and even the geography of the region changed continuously, making it impossible to describe the late medieval history of these lands in terms of firm boundaries or fixed categories."[199] The Ottomans forced the peoples of Anatolia to settle in newly conquered lands. When Sultan Mehmet II conquered Constantinople, he populated the city with Greeks, Armenians, and Turks since he wanted to make the city more cosmopolitan, the center of Ottoman civilization with diverse cultures and religions. The city also became the center of commerce, so it attracted many people from various parts of the empire. Rumelia and the Balkan provinces were also populated by Turks from Anatolia, especially Bektashi and Mevlevi dervishes who spread Islam among non-Muslim subjects in Balkan cities and villages.[200] Turks and the residents of the Balkans integrated well socially, linguistically, and culturally. Ethnic origins were replaced by religious affiliations, and conversion changed the ethnic identity of individuals. Therefore when Christians converted to Islam, they became Turks since according to general understanding of the people of that time, all Muslims were Turks.[201] As we have seen, the reason behind this was the *millet* system that classified the communities through their faith. Clark makes a clear explanation: "It made a huge difference to your life whether you were an Ottoman Muslim, an Ottoman Orthodox Christian or an Ottoman Jew. This determined how much tax you would pay, what role you would play in public life and by what law you would be judged."[202]

[198] See Ismail Kadare, *The Palace of Dreams* that narrates Köprülü (Quprilis) family and their power within the Ottoman Empire.
[199] Kasaba, *A Moveable Empire*, 15.
[200] Barkey, *Empire of Difference*, 127.
[201] See Michael A. Sell's book *The Bridge Betrayed: Religion and Genocide in Bosnia* that discusses the clash of religion and ethnicity in the Balkans in 1990s. See also Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans.*
[202] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 14.

1.5. Deportation and Settlement of the Refugees

Kemal Arı's book called *Büyük Mübadele*: *Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç, 1923-1925* [The Great Exchange: Forced Migration to Turkey, 1923-1925] provides very detailed information on the population exchange as well as the preparations of the Turkish state to host the exchangees from Greece. Turkey needed to have a separate ministry to deal with the settlement of the immigrants. Despite the financial problems of the Turkish state, a new ministry called *Mübadele, İmar ve İskan Vekaleti* (Ministry of Reconstruction, Exchange and Settlement) was founded.[203] The ministry was responsible for constructing and repairing the buildings for the immigrants that had been damaged during the wars in Asia Minor. The plan was to settle them into the abandoned houses of deported Christians. The transportation of the refugees from Greece was also arranged by the ministry. People from the interior parts of Greece arrived at the port of Salonika and waited for Turkish ships to transport them. Salonika and Kavala in Greece, Kandiye, Hanya, and Resmo in Crete, were the selected ports for the transportation.[204] The exchangees were mostly settled in Edirne, Balıkesir, İstanbul, Bursa, Kırklareli, Samsun, Kocaeli, İzmir, Niğde, and Manisa.[205] Some migrated to other cities to find a place that looked like their hometown in Greece. The number of people who migrated from Greece to Turkey was estimated at half a million.[206]

As we have already seen, the migration of Orthodox Christians started even before the Lausanne Convention and continued after the defeat of Greece in 1922. Christians started to migrate to Greece and other parts of the world starting from the Central Anatolian cities of Niğde and Kayseri as well as from the western Anatolia, Marmara, eastern Thrace and the Black Sea (Pontus) Regions.[207] The transportation was conducted by rail, water, and highway.[208] Christians gathered in big cities such as İstanbul, İzmir, Samsun, and Trabzon before they left Anatolia. This mass

[203] Kemal Arı, *Büyük Mübadele: Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç 1923-1925* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2010), 28. For the preparation of Turkey see also Kemal Arı, *Mübadele Gemileri*; Cahide Zengin Aghatabay, *Mübadelenin Mazlum Misafirleri: Mübadele ve Kamuoyu 1923-1930*.
[204] Ibid., 78.
[205] Ibid., 113.
[206] Ibid.
[207] Ibid., 87.
[208] Ibid., 7.

movement was described by Melville Chater as "History's Greatest Trek" in *National Geographic*.[209] An estimate put the number of people migrating to Greece in one month at 650.000. At the end of 1922, the number had increased to 1.000.000 though these numbers are just estimates.[210] As mentioned above, the *Rum* of Istanbul and the Muslims of western Thrace were exempt from the population exchange.[211] They became the present-day minorities of Turkey and Greece. We are not sure about the total number of people who were affected by the population exchange. We know that the population of the displaced Christians was greater than that of the displaced Muslims of Greece, and roughly 1.5 million people, both Christians and Muslims, experienced the trauma of leaving their motherland. The population exchange was compulsory, and no return was allowed. Furthermore, the refugees lost their citizenship and were given the citizenship of their host countries.[212]

About the deportation of Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, the memoirs of Yianis Selinidis from Ordu/Pontus are worth mentioning.[213] Yianis Selinidis was a teenager during the Greco-Turkish War, and the Christians of Pontus (Pontic Greeks) prepared to leave the country just after the defeat of the Greek army in Smyrna to avoid the atrocities that might possibly occur between the Christians and Muslims in Pontus. His father applied to get permission to leave Pontus; however, he learned that he was on the list of artisans who would stay in Turkey for a while.[214] Yianis's father was a builder, so he stayed in Turkey to reconstruct the damaged buildings for the Muslim exchangees while Yianis and his brother migrated to Greece with their neighbors. Yianis met other members of his family in Greece after a couple of months. Along with thousands of the refugees, Yianis stayed in İstanbul for five days and then was taken to Piraeus. The voyage was terrible because the refugees "were compressed like mashed potatoes."[215] Many refugees could not survive due to the

[209] Melville Chater, "History's Greatest Trek," *National Geographic*, (Nov, 1925): 533.
[210] Arı, *Büyük Mübadele*, 8.
[211] Ibid., 19.
[212] Ibid.
[213] Yianis Selinidis wrote his life-story due to his sister-in-law's request. His sister-in-law was an American and was not able to converse him in Greek. He wrote his memoirs between 1967-1981 for his grandchildren as well and asked his son Kosta Selinidis to translate it into English. His memoirs are collected in *Son of Refugees*: *Immigrant to the United States.*
[214] Captain K.I. Selinidis, *Son of Refugees: Immigrant to the United States* (U.S.A: Xlibris, 2008), 95.
[215] Ibid., 97.

bad conditions, and passed away during the voyage. Selinidis wrote that "Having no other options the crew of the ship was performing burials at sea. In other words, they were throwing dead bodies overboard while many others were watching and wishing they were in their place."[216]

When Orthodox Christians were being deported from Turkey, Greece was also getting prepared to settle the refugees who were homeless, exhausted, sick, hungry, and miserable. Like Turkey, Greece was weak financially due to the long years of war, especially the Asia Minor campaign. Homeless Asia Minor refugees were arriving in Greece in large numbers, especially after the Lausanne Convention, and the victims of the disaster needed to be taken care off. *The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact on Greece* by Dimitri Pentzopoulos explains how Greece managed to host Asia Minor refugees who were regarded as the Hellenes of Ionia. The Greek government initially was in need of external funding to assist in supplying at least the basic needs of the refugees. Pentzopoulos claims that "Any nation would face great obstacles in absorbing a large number of immigrants, but for an underdeveloped one the task is even more formidable."[217] Venizelos wrote a letter to the editor of *The International Interpreter*, Mr. Nixon, and asked assistance to cope with the refugee problem.[218] However, Europe was not capable of assisting Greece due to its own financial problems stemming from World War I. Therefore, the United States was the only hope for Greece to get assistance.

The American Red Cross and the Near East Relief Organization (NERO) fed the refugees for eight months, suppressed epidemics, and saved the orphans.[219] Yiannis Karatzoglou was one of those orphans from the Balıklar village of Bafra/Samsun who was saved by the NERO just after the Greco-Turkish War.[220] His daughter, Sophia Kappatos, wrote his life-story, *The Promised Journey: Pontus-Kefalonia.* Yiannis was financially supported by an American woman Theodosia

[216] Ibid., 98.
[217] Dimitri Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact on Greece* (London: Hurston & Company, 2002), 143. See also Stephen P. Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey.*
[218] Ibid., 77.
[219] Ibid.
[220] For more information about the Near East Relief Organization, see Elçin Macar, "Mübadele Araştırmalarında Yeni Bir Kaynak: Dorothy Harrox Sutton Arşivi" (A New Source in Population Exchange Research: Archives of Dorothy Sutton).

Kane Eshbaugh through the efforts of the NERO.[221] Aktar states that without the support of the American Red Cross and the NERO, those refugees would have died of hunger.[222] In order to save those refugees from extreme poverty and to take the burden of settling the refugees from Greece, Jefferson Caffery, the U.S. Ambassador in Athens, even suggested returning the refugees to Anatolia.[223]

The Refugee Settlement Commission of Greece (RSC) was founded with four members: two appointed by the Greek Government, one selected by the League of Nations, and one by the United States to settle the refugees with a planned organization in Greece.[224] More than half of the urban refugees were settled in the three largest cities of Greece—Athens, Salonika and Piraeus—because the cities had convenient places to shelter refugees such as theatres, schools, churches, and warehouses.[225] Constructing houses for the refugees was not an easy task, and it took some time for the Greek government and the RSC, as Pentzopoulos writes:

> The Government in cooperation with the PSC proceeded to construct buildings, which could be let or sold around the main urban centers. This project provided at the same time work for many refugee workers such as masons and plumbers and shelter for those who wanted to settle in large towns. At the end of 1929, the Commission had built over 27,000 houses in about 125 urban refugee quarters. Some of them developed into fair-size towns and kept their old name, such as Nea Smyrne, Nea Philadelphia, Nea Kios, Nea Ionia.[226]

The cities were named after the lost homelands in Asia Minor. For refugees, this was a way of connecting themselves to Anatolia and orienting themselves in Greece because they always longed for the one across the Aegean that they had been forced to leave. In contrast, Turkey did not construct refugee settlements because the exchangees were given the houses of the Orthodox Christians. As we have already mentioned above, the number of Muslim exchangees were less than the Orthodox

[221] Sophia Kappatos, *The Promised Journey: Pontus-Kefalonia* (Greece: The Foundation of Hellenic World, 2011), 201.
[222] Ayhan Aktar, "Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi'nin İlk Yılı: Eylül 1922-Eylül 1923," in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 41-74 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 63.
[223] Ibid.
[224] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange,* 83.
[225] Ibid., 112.
[226] Ibid., 113-114.

Christians of Anatolia.

One of the most interesting and striking points of the population exchange is reflected in Kemal Yalçın's *Emanet Çeyiz*. Vasili Karabaş, an Asia Minor refugee from Kayseri, said that when his family migrated from Turkey to Greece, his family lived with Muslims in the same house for almost a year. Although they could not communicate properly, since Asia Minor refugees were speaking Turkish and local Muslims were speaking Greek, they had good relations. Furthermore, they cultivated the land together and made their living.[227] It is clear that the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia started to migrate before the Muslims of Greece.[228] Both Christians and Muslims tried to help each other in order to survive because after all they were both victims of the population exchange. Aktar emphasizes that "It is very significant that there are no records of serious inter-communal strife during this period, even though the Greek state confiscated some of the Rumelian Muslims' property and livestock and distributed it among the newcomers."[229] This example clearly shows that communities of the Aegean were not in conflict, socially or politically.

When the Lausanne Convention was signed on 30 January 1923, the Turkish state was not yet a republic. The Turkish Republic was founded on 29 October 1923. While Turkey was still ruled by the Ankara government during the Lausanne Conference, Greece had already been a kingdom for almost a century in 1923. When we compare the conditions of the two countries of the Aegean, we realize asymmetries as well as similarities between them. Although Greece was a kingdom, it was weak financially due to long years of war and, finally, the population exchange. More than one million people migrated into Greece. Nor was it easy for Turkey since Anatolia had been a battle field for ten years between 1912 and 1922. The Greco-Turkish War took place in Asia Minor and literarily destroyed the country. However, as McCarthy notes, "Greece was at least a settled state that had not suffered such destruction".[230] Greece took financial aid from the Great Powers,

[227] Kemal Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz* (İstanbul: Bir Zamanlar Yayıncılık, 2008), 82.
[228] For the experiences of the Turkish exchangees see İskender Özsoy, *Mübadelenin Öksüz Çocukları*.
[229] Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation," 85.
[230] McCarthy, *Death and Exile*, 302.

but Turkey did not take any financial assistance to settle the Rumelian refugees.[231]

1.6. Lausanne in Contemporary Debates

It has been ninety years since the Lausanne Convention changed the lives of Orthodox Christians of Anatolia and Muslims of Greece forever. Although both societies suffered severely due to the compulsory exchange of populations, the sorrows are reflected differently in Greek and Turkish literature. While Greek intellectuals were quite active in publishing biographies, novels, short stories, and articles on the experiences of the Asia Minor refugees, Turkish scholars and writers were silent. According to Hercules (or Iraklis) Millas,[232] the reason for the silence from 1923 to the 1980s was political, due to the central authority in Turkey.[233] The perception of the population exchange in Greece and Turkey was totally different as Millas notes: "While the Greeks would be justified in perceiving the event as the result of a military defeat and hence as a blow to their pride, the Turks see the exchange as the outcome of a military victory; for them it is less traumatic."[234] According to Athanasia Anagnostopoulou, whose family originated from Asia Minor, Greek society never perceived the population exchange as a migration that modernized the country and changed the demography of the Aegean.[235] In contrast, the population exchange was perceived as a national catastrophe in Greek historiography and literature.[236]

Turks perceived the population exchange as a victory because it occurred just after the Greco-Turkish War which is the War of Independence for Turks that also ended the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire and gave birth to the new Turkish

[231] Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation," 80.
[232] Millas was a Turkish citizen of *Rum* community, born in Ankara in 1940. He has published several articles on the Greek and Turkish relations in Turkish, English and Greek. He teaches Turkish Language and Literature at the University of the Aegean, Greece.
[233] Hercules Millas, "The Exchange of Populations in Turkish Literature: The Undertone of Texts," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey,* ed. Renèe Hirschon, 221-235 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 221.
[234] Ibid., 227.
[235] Athanasia Anagnostopoulou, "Mültecilerin Sosyal ve Kültürel Asimilasyonu," (Social and Cultural Assimilation of Refugees), in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 75 -81 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 76.
[236] Ibid.

Republic. We may discuss several reasons for the silence of the Muslim exchangees during the nation building process initiated by Atatürk and his circle. The first step was the change of the alphabet in 1928 as Kerem Öktem clarifies in *Angry Nation*: "The republic's children were raised to become illiterate with regard to their Ottoman past."[237] Those who were literate in Arabic script had to learn a new system of writing, the Latin alphabet, as the citizens of the new Turkish Republic.[238] To form a national history and a national literature for the Turks of Anatolia has always been a major purpose of the Turkish Republic since its establishment. The Turkish Historical Society and The Turkish Language Association were established by Atatürk to create a national history and standardize the Turkish language in 1931 and 1932 respectively.[239] Republican Turkey tried to construct a national literature and history that are totally different from the history and language of the Ottoman Empire. During this social re-engineering period, it is obvious that Turks did not produce much writing on the population exchange because they were constructing a homogeneous nation out of a multi-ethnic empire. "The *'Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş'* (Citizen, speak Turkish) campaign, was mostly directed at minorities. The purpose was to make Turkish the only language spoken in public spaces."[240] Most of the Muslim exchangees from Greece were illiterate in Turkish language because Greek was their mother tongue. That could be another reason why a smaller amount of literature on the population exchange was produced in Turkey between 1923 and 1980.

For the Turks, the population exchange was not seen as a tragedy or trauma, but put to use for purposes of the unification of Muslim Turks in Asia Minor, and the foundation of a new republic out of the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. As Öktem notes,

> The nation builders' foremost goal was to concentrate on the consolidation of the territory under their control into modern 'Turkey' and its diverse communities into 'Turks'. They could build on the extraordinary military success with which they had

[237] Kerem Öktem, *Angry Nation: Turkey since 1989* (London: Zed Books, 2011), 28.
[238] For the change of the alphabet see Geoffrey Lewis, *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*.
[239] Öktem, *Angry Nation*, 30-31.
[240] Özkırımlı and Sofos, *Tormented by History*, 67.

> thwarted European domination and which was the primary source of their popular legitimacy.[241]

On the other hand, it was considered as a catastrophe for the Greeks who were defeated by the Turks in Asia Minor and who were forced to bury the *Megali Idea*. The impact of the Lausanne Convention and the population exchange has always been a major subject of debate among Greek scholars, writers, and critics because it marked the end of Hellenism in Asia Minor, which they claimed to had existed for 3000 years.

Literature is one of the sources that can enlighten us about the perception of the "Other" in a particular society, especially neighbor countries like Greece and Turkey, which have been in conflict for a century. The research conducted by Hercules Millas for his PhD. dissertation contributes to an understanding of the changing attitudes of the "Other" in Turkish literature. Millas analyzed almost four hundred literary works in Turkish literature and classified them according to their approach to the "Other", the *Millet-i Rum*. In his work *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki": Ulusal Kimlikte Yunan İmajı* (Turkish Novel and the "Other": The Image of the Greek in National Identity), he classifies Turkish novels starting from the end of the nineteenth century, from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic, as follows: Ottomanist, From Ottomanist to Nationalist (transition period), Nationalist, Islamist, Anatolian, Socialist, Humanist Approach, and Unclassified Texts.[242] Millas aimed to project the most influential ideologies, social, political, and historical perceptions of Turkish society reflected in literature toward the *Millet-i Rum*.[243]

According to Millas, late nineteenth century authors of the Ottoman society were Ottomanist because they depicted the *Millet-i Rum* in a positive way since they were part of the pluralist Ottoman society, and did not perceive it as the "Other." Millas lists Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, Şemsettin Sami, Ahmet Mithat, Sami Paşazade Sezai, Recaizade Mahmut, Savfet Nezihi, Mehmet Rauf, Ahmet Rasim, and Ebubekir Hazım Tepeyran as multiculturalists who perceived non-Muslims as an

[241] Öktem, *Angry Nation*, 27.
[242] Hercules Millas, *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki": Ulusal Kimlikte Yunan İmajı* (İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2000).
[243] Ibid., 1.

organic part of the society, not as the "Other." Non-Muslim subjects were not discriminated against, because they were part of Western culture, and Westerners were seen as positive.[244] Religion was not an issue of debate among the authors of the Ottomanist approach.[245] Millas, whose work mirrors the status of the *Millet-i Rum*, explains that literary texts that were Ottomanist projected how the Ottoman Empire managed to keep different ethnic and religious groups living together peacefully for several centuries. Ottomanist authors, Millas points out, had an Ottoman, multicultural perspective toward other groups, and the Orthodox Christians were not the "Other" since they were an integral part of the larger society.

After 1908, the nation-building process in Turkey changed the attitudes of the authors from Ottomanist to Nationalists who depicted the "Other" negatively because the "Other" had already become the national enemy. Halide Edip Adıvar, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, and Atilla İlhan were the nationalist writers who distanced the "Other."[246] Sabahattin Ali, Nazım Hikmet, Orhan Kemal, Suat Derviş, Vedat Türkali, Mehmet Kemal, and Fakir Bayburt were among Marxist authors who believed that societies were formed by the classes so they were not the enemies of the "Other" but of their own states.[247] Millas notes that, "The "humanists" resemble the Ottomanists, and one may even claim that they represent a kind of non-declared Ottomanism."[248] For humanists the "Other" was culturally and historically very close to the Turks and they were reflected positively.[249] The Humanist approach did not have any restrictive boundaries other than humanism. *Rum* and Turks were depicted through humanist feelings that derived from inside rather than from any outside influence. Millas provides a long list of authors who have internalized a Humanist approach in their novels from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic: Reşat Nuri Gültekin, Sait Faik Abasıyanık, Refik Halit Karay, Haldun Taner, Necati Cumalı, Salim Şendil, Oktay Akbal, Tarık Dursun K, Nezihe Meriç, Bilge Karasu,

[244] Hercules Millas, "Constructing Memories of 'Multiculturalism' and Identities in Turkish Novels," in *Turkish Literature and Cultural Memory,* ed. Catharina Dufft, 79-105 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 80.
[245] Millas, *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki"*, 265.
[246] Millas, "*Constructing Memories*," 81.
[247] Ibid., 82.
[248] Ibid.
[249] Millas, *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki"*, 267.

Adalet Ağaoğlu, Çetin Altan, Aziz Nesin, Ahmet Altan, Oğuz Atay, Oya Baydar, Ayla Kutlu, Nazlı Eray, Duygu Asena, Nedim Gürsel, Nejat Gülen, Turgut Özakman, Ahmet Yorulmaz, Alev Alatlı, Orhan Pamuk, Mehmet Eroğlu, Feride Çiçekoğlu, Demir Özlü, and Sevgi Soysal.[250]

After Millas submitted his PhD. dissertation, Yaşar Kemal published the first volume of his novel in which he depicts the lives of the *Rum* and the Turks in an island just after the population exchange.[251] Millas could not classify Yaşar Kemal's novel *Fırat Suyu Kan Akıyor Baksana: Bir Ada Hikayesi* 1(The Euphrates Runs with Blood: An Island Story 1) because Yaşar Kemal does not have a Marxist or a Nationalist or any other approaches toward the *Rum*. Millas asserts that it was not easy to classify Yaşar Kemal's novel.[252] While we were working on this research, Yaşar Kemal was working on the 4th volume of his series and I had access to all four volumes which are *Karıncanın Su İçtiği: Bir Ada Hikayesi 2*, *Tanyeri Horozları: Bir Ada Hikayesi 3*, and *Çıplak Deniz, Çıplak Ada: Bir Ada Hikayesi 4*. In our view, Yaşar Kemal is a Humanist author because he does not discriminate the *Rum* against the Turks. He projects the *Rum* and the Turks as close friends, and during the deportation, the *Rum* entrusted their belongings to their Turkish neighbors.[253] Furthermore, Kemal emphasizes throughout his series that the *Rum* were the inhabitants of Anatolia for thousands of years and they culturally resembled the Turks. Kemal objectively narrates the lives of people including *Rum*, Turks, Circassians, Kurds, and Arabs whose lives were shaped by World War I and the Greco-Turkish War, and who clashed on *Karınca* island, which had been populated by *Rum* and Turks before the exchange. In Kemal's series of novels, *Rum* and Turks fight in the Ottoman army against the Allied Powers at the Battle of Gallipoli.[254] Moreover, *Rum* blame the Greeks for invading Asia Minor and destroying their peaceful lives.[255] Both *Rum* and Turks are the victims of those wars and they are all in exile either from the eastern part of Anatolia or the west. Kemal successfully

[250] Ibid.
[251] Ibid., 231.
[252] Ibid.
[253] Yaşar Kemal, *Fırat Suyu Kan Akıyor Baksana: Bir Ada Hikâyesi 1* (İstanbul: YKY, 1998), 88.
[254] Yaşar Kemal, *Çıplak Deniz, Çıplak Ada: Bir Ada Hikâyesi 4* (İstanbul: YKY, 2012), 208.
[255] Ibid., 212.

depicts the sufferings of the ordinary people, villagers or islanders, who were terribly affected by the wars and the population exchange.

As we were working on this research, a novel was published by Yılmaz Karakoyunlu, *Mor Kaftanlı Selanik,* about the population exchange. Karakoyunlu fictionalizes the decision process of the Lausanne Convention between Venizelos and İsmet Pasha. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is also depicted but he is not a central figure. Apart from the politicians, the novel projects the deportation of the Ottoman Greeks and the Muslims of Greece from Salonika, İzmir, Resmo, Drama, Mürefte, Şarköy, Eyüp, Ankara, and Athens. Although Karakoyunlu tries to depict the population exchange from the both sides of the Aegean, he still has nationalistic perspectives toward the *Rum*. While General Bekir and General İhsan deliver the news to the *Rum* of Mürefte, they are not cruel, but very compassionate. General İhsan's mother is in Kavala/Greece, and he is thinking of his mother as well.[256] On the other hand, in Resmo, Muslims of Crete are treated badly by the Cruel Dimitri.[257] The "Other" is depicted negatively, while the Muslim Turks are depicted positively. Furthermore, Karakoyunlu depicts the lives of some prostitutes in İstanbul who are *Rum*.[258] The *Rum* are depicted as morally corrupt by Karakoyunlu. As a result, we can say that Karakoyunlu retains a nationalist point of view of the population exchange even as late as 2012.

On the other side of the Aegean, almost the same pattern was followed. According to various perspectives of the Greek authors, Turks are also distanced as the "Other." The perception of the "Other" in Greek and Turkish society started with the process of nation-building. Before that, Greeks and Turks were not depicted negatively in Greek and Turkish novels. Millas remarks that, "The establishment of the two nation states, Greece in 1830 and Turkey in 1923, brought on the first phase in conflict perceptions identified here: this involved demonizing the 'Other' and exalting 'our nation'."[259] This first phase was completely nationalist. The second

[256] Yılmaz Karakoyunlu, *Mor Kaftanlı Selanik* (İstanbul: Doğan, 2012), 71.
[257] Ibid., 106.
[258] Ibid., 165.
[259] Hercules Millas, "Perceptions of Conflict: Greeks and Turks in Each Other's Mirrors," in *The Long Shadow of Europe, Greeks and Turks in the Era of Postnationalism*, eds. O. Anastasakis, K. Nicolaidis & K. Öktem, 95-114 (Netherlands: Brill, 2009), 96. For Greek and Turkish perception of

phase was initiated by Marxist authors who criticized their society for the conflict, and this phase started after 1920 in Greece and after 1950 in Turkey. Capitalism and state policies were criticized and blamed for the atrocities. Millas writes, "In the Greek case are Dido Sotiriou and Kosmas Politis, and in the Turkish case, Nazım Hikmet and Orhan Kemal. In many cases, these writers present class consciousness and the class struggle as more important than ethnic ideals and perceptions."[260] The third phase includes the writers of the third party who do not have strong ethnic or national sentiments towards Greeks and Turks. Furthermore, Greeks and Turks had already become critical of themselves without the external agents.[261]

Millas, in "*Tourkokratia*: History and the Image of Turks in Greek Literature," focuses "on two aspects of the Greco-Turkish relationship in particular: the Turks as either an abstract or concrete ethnic Other, and, connected to that, the notion of *Tourkokratia*, i.e. the period of Ottoman rule in Greek lands."[262] Abstract personalities that appeared in Greek novels were depicted negatively since they were the symbols and representatives of Ottoman rule, and those were generally historical figures such as sultans, officers, and dignitaries who had authority over the folk.[263] "The Turks as abstract personalities are portrayed as cruel, fanatical and perverted, a source of unhappiness and danger for 'the Greek Self', which is here uncritically equated with the collectivity of the Greeks."[264] No information is provided to the readers about their personal lives. On the other hand, Turks as concrete personalities are not portrayed negatively by Greek authors because they are ordinary people who do not have authority and rank in Ottoman society. "The reader is allowed to have glimpse of the inner life of these characters, to share their often unique personal stories. We know them by their names because in most cases they are the people next door."[265] Millas concludes that, Greek writers, especially of Asia Minor origin who

---

each other see also other works of Hercules Millas, *The Imagined 'Other' as National Identity: Greeks & Turks* and *Türk Yunan İlişkilerine Bir Önsöz*: *Tencere Dibin Kara.*

[260] Ibid., 99.

[261] Ibid., 105.

[262] Hercules Millas, "*Tourkokratia*: History and the Image of Turks in Greek Literature," in *When Greeks Think About Turks: The view from Antropology*, ed. Dimitrio Theodossopoulos, 47-61 (London & New York: Routledge, 2007), 48.

[263] Ibid.

[264] Ibid., 49.

[265] Ibid.

wrote novels and short stories about Asia Minor and the Catastrophe, had positive attitudes toward Turks due to their long existence together in Asia Minor.

Disaster and Fiction: Modern Greek Fiction and the Asia Minor Disaster of 1922 written by Thomas Doulis records important research that analyzes the impact of the Asia Minor Catastrophe on Greek intellectual and literary life. Doulis claims that, "it is only after 1922 that fiction becomes a forum where important issues are raised and discussed."[266] The Generation of the 1930s, who were mostly of Asia Minor origin and personally experienced the disaster, revived the theme in the 1950s and 1960s. Doulis explains that

> The Asia Minor Disaster has had a double impact. The first is its "theme," the direct representation in prose fiction of the events of 1922 and their aftermath. The second is the impact made on the life of letters and thought in Greece, including the result of this impact on the development of the novel. By the time the Civil War was concluded in 1949, the greater sources of conception and execution at the disposal of the writers of the 1950s and 1960s allowed them to view the Asia Minor Disaster (to *review* it, rather) in a totally different way.[267]

Obviously the disaster had a great impact on the development of the Greek novel. Perhaps it enriched the themes because the disaster was a political outcome of the *Megali Idea*. The disaster had social, cultural, political, and economic influences on Greece as well.

Just after the disaster, the experience of captivity and war (the labor battalions) were the major themes. The first work published in 1923, *From the Captivity*, was written by B.K., an officer in the Greek Air Corps.[268] The second work was by Stratis Doukas' entitled *The Prisoner's War Story* published in 1929, and the third one was by Ilias Venezis, *The Number 31.328* in 1931.[269] Venezis is from Aivali (Ayvalık) and he was literally saved by a Turkish doctor when he was in one of the labor camps.[270] Stories of captivity and war were written while Asia Minor

[266] Thomas Doulis, *Disaster and Fiction: Modern Greek Fiction and Asia Minor Disaster of 1922* (U.S.A: University of California Press, 1977), 6.
[267] Ibid., 46.
[268] Ibid., 49.
[269] Ibid.
[270] Ibid., 60.

refugees were trying to settle on Greek soil. After the 1930s more people started to write about the disaster and Anatolia became the "lost paradise" of the refugees. Doulis states that harmonious lives of Christians and Muslims in Anatolia were mostly reflected in Greek fiction by the Anatolians after World War II because time enabled them a new perspective.[271] The concept of the "lost paradise" and a mature perspective of the Catastrophe may have changed the attitudes of the authors. In our opinion, World War II, the famine, and the Greek Civil War had a great impact on the refugee perspective of the Catastrophe. Greece was invaded by the Germans and the Italians during World War II. Asia Minor refugees and the local Greeks suffered both from the war and the famine.[272] After those unfortunate and traumatic events, the Greek Civil War occurred and created more chaos in Greek society. Between 1922 and 1940, there was only one disaster for the writers to discuss and analyze; however, after 1945, there were four major disasters for Greeks to compare and debate. This could be the reason for the gradually changing perspective of refugee authors who were homesick.

According to Peter Mackridge, Asia Minor is a major theme in modern Greek fiction:

> There are three thematic strands in these novels and stories, each text concentrating on one or more of them: peacetime life in Asia Minor before the Catastrophe; the experience of war, captivity and/or expulsion; and finally the resettlement of the refugees in Greece, with the economic, social, and psychological difficulties that this entailed.[273]

Ilias Venezis, Dido Sotiriou, and Kosmaz Politis were the most popular writers who glorified Asia Minor with its fertility and beauty. Asia Minor became a "Promised Land" for the Greeks after the Catastrophe.[274] In their writings, they expressed their longing for their homeland. As for the image of the Turks in Greek fiction,

[271] Ibid., 215-216.
[272] For the famine in Greece see Violetta Hionidou, *Famine and Death in Occupied Greece, 1941-1944.*
[273] Peter Mackridge, "The Myths of Asia Minor in Greek Fiction," in *Crossing the Aegean*: *An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 235-246 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 236-237.
[274] Ibid., 238.

Mackridge notes that, "In most of the Greek novels and stories about Asia Minor the Turkish characters tend to appear merely as part of a colorful background to life in Anatolia."[275] They are not portrayed negatively because the refugee authors were not ignorant about the Turks who were their former friends and neighbors.

After decades of sufferings, misunderstandings, and prejudices, things have started to change in a positive way among the Greek and the Turkish scholars. Both sides are now more objective compared to the writers of the previous century. Conferences and seminars have been organized to compare the historical facts of the population exchange from various perspectives. Two international conferences were held on the population exchange. The first was organized by the Department of Sociology at Boğaziçi University in 1997 with the combined efforts of Greek and Turkish scholars at the initiative of Renèe Hirschon. The theme was 'Our Common Cultural Heritage' based on both oral and documented historical sources. This was an inspiration for Hirschon to organize a second international conference at The Refugee Studies Centre, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford in 1998. It commemorated the 75th anniversary of the Lausanne Convention.

The chair of the conference was Hirschon, who later compiled and edited the proceedings in a book titled *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*. Hirschon explains how she decided to establish a dialogue between two societies:

> Having carried out intensive fieldwork in an urban refugee settlement in the 1970s, I was familiar with the picture from one side. It was only later that I realized how much the story of what had happened to the exchanged peoples of both Greece and Turkey remained unknown to the other side. From 1995, I became aware of this when I first met Turkish scholars at international conferences. At that time I was Chair of the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of the Aegean (Mytilini, Greece), with the Turkish coast only a few miles away, and my position there, that of an outsider-insider, convinced me of the need to establish a dialogue across national boundaries in which an overall perspective on issues of common interest might be promoted.[276]

[275] Ibid., 243.
[276] Renèe Hirschon, preface to *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004).

Since then, Hirschon has been working to establish a dialogue between Greeks and Turks. The field work she mentions is recorded in *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe* published in 1989. Hirschon observed the lives of Asia Minor Greeks[277] in a refugee settlement in Kokkinia near Piraeus for seventeen months in 1972, not realizing until later that the refugees were the last Ottomans.

Another symposium was organized in 7-8 November, 2003, under the sponsorship of The Foundation of Lausanne Treaty Emigrants (hereafter FLTE) on the 80th anniversary of the Lausanne Convention. The proceedings were compiled by Müfide Pekin, vice-president of the Foundation, into a book titled *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi* (Population Exchange Reconsidered: The Compulsory Exchange of Populations between Greece and Turkey). Both volumes are very enlightening with a wide range of issues related to the compulsory exchange of populations from history to literature, art history, architecture, sociology, anthropology, and international relations.

In conclusion, the Lausanne Convention and the population exchange could not solve the problems of the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia and the Muslims of Greece. Both communities were asked to abandon their motherland for the sake of nation-state building. As Bruce Clark notes, "While traditional Ottoman society, with its peculiar, arbitrary mixture of cruelty and fairness, had allowed Christians and Muslims to live together, the modern states which were emerging from the Ottoman world would not."[278] Greece and Turkey wanted to create homogenized societies in the post-Ottoman era among people emerging from imperial legacy and tradition. Societies and traditions cannot alter overnight. The Ottoman legacy of the *millet* system at Lausanne clarifies how the Ottoman society was different from the national states of the modern world. Moreover, the Ottoman legacy was only influenced the negotiators of Lausanne, but also Greece and Bulgaria afterwards because both

[277] Another anthropological work on the Asia Minor refugees was held by Stephen D. Salamone titled *In the Shadow of the Holy Mountain: the Genesis of a Rural Greek Community and its Refugee Heritage*. Salamone lived with the refugees on the island of Amouliani, opposite Mount Athos, who were deported from the Marmara Islands of the Marmara Sea. Salamone's work is mostly on the economic survival of the refugees who earned their living in fishing.
[278] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 107.

countries adopted the *millet* system to rule their Muslim minorities.[279] In 1923 the population exchange seemed to be the best solution to divide the peoples of the Aegean. However, it was not an easy solution for the victims of the population exchange who faced the hardship of leaving their homes forever. Not only were they forced to abandon their motherland, but they also became the enemies of their previous neighbors.

[279] Stefanos Katsikas, "*Millets* in Nation-States: The Case of Greek and Bulgarian Muslims, 1912-1923," *Nationalities Papers*, 37:2 (Routledge, 2009):178. See also Kostas Tsitselikis, "Yunanistan'da Müslüman Toplulukların Örgütlenmesi: Süreklilik ve Ayrılık" (Organization of the Muslim Communities in Greece: Continuities and Inconsistencies).

CHAPTER 2

MEMORIES OF EXILE: WITNESSING THE CATASTROPHE

2.1. Oral History Archives of the Asia Minor Catastrophe

"Your history is the history of your village"[280] says Louis de Bernières. This statement narrows the scope of history to focus on the history of an individual rather than a state or a kingdom. Oral history is an individual history that focuses on the life stories of the individuals who are the witnesses of particular events such as wars, genocides, or natural disasters. Jan M. Vansina states that, "Eyewitness accounts are supposedly the fountainhead of all history."[281] Vansina, himself an historian, not only values eyewitnesses but also the oral traditions of societies. He classified the types of oral tradition from poetry to epic and realized the importance of oral tradition in reconstructing the past. According to him, oral history and oral tradition are messages and they both accumulate interpretations as they are being transmitted.[282] For Vansina oral tradition should be part of history writing because it reflects history: "The discipline of history evolves as much through reconsideration of older evidence as through the adduction of new evidence, and oral data should be part of this process."[283]

Oral history is a subjective history based on memory, as David Lowenthal explains in *The Past is a Foreign Country*: "All awareness of the past is founded on memory. Through recollection we recover consciousness of former events, distinguish yesterday from today, and confirm that we have experienced a past."[284] The past of an individual may differ on several points compared to the official history recorded by official historians. Elizabeth Tonkin, in *Narrating Our Past*, claims that people have a "history-as-lived" and a "history-as-recorded."[285] Oral history is "history-as-lived" based on memory, which is narrated by witnesses. By contrast, official history is the recorded history of the empires or the states

[280] Louis de Bernières, interview by author, London , August 22, 2012.
[281] Jan M. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (U.S.A: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 4.
[282] Ibid., 195.
[283] Ibid., 200.
[284] David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country* (U.K: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 193.
[285] Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts*, 2.

documented by historians. Paul Thompson, an oral historian, regards oral history as more democratic than conventional history because it allows different voices to be heard.[286] He also claims that the focus of standard history is essentially political, documenting the power struggles of kings and dynasties rather than the individuals who suffer from those power struggles.[287]

Tonkin and Thompson have clearly defined two histories: the history of the states, kingdoms and the politicians; and the history of the victims or the oppressed. The oppressors, for their own political benefit, tend to write the history of the oppressed through their own perspectives, mostly ignoring the sufferings of the victims. Gayatri Spivak describes the role of the subaltern in history writing in her essay, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak thinks that oppressed people can speak and know their conditions if they are given the chance to speak.[288] However, colonial powers silence the subaltern and obliterate the objectivity of the facts. In contrast to Spivak's colonial history, oral history voices the sufferings of the voiceless. Witnesses of wars and disasters write their personal histories based on their memories. Their experience is crucial for larger audiences because they want their past experiences to be heard rather than silenced. Through personal history and witness accounts, the audience develops empathy toward the sufferers since people get a chance to learn the names of the individual sufferers, which are generally missing in the recorded history that mostly mentions the names of the kings and the generals.[289] According to Paul Connerton, "The oral history of subordinate groups will produce another type of history: one in which not only will most of the details be different, but in which the very construction of meaningful shapes will obey a different principle."[290] Oral history provides the researchers and audience with a different perspective to evaluate the story of the witness because as Alessandro Portelli observes, "Oral sources tell us not just what people did, but what they

[286] Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (U.S.A: Oxford University Press, 2000), 9.
[287] Ibid., 3-4.
[288] Gayatri Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?," in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Aschroft, Gareth Griffiths, Hellen Tiffin, 24-28 (London: Routledge, 2003), 25.
[289] Thompson, *The Voice of the Past*, 9.
[290] Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (U.K: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 19.

wanted to do, what they believed they were doing, and what they now think they did."[291]

Oral historians have a different methodology compared to official historians who depend on documented past. Oral historians may choose the people that they want to interview, and through personal interactions they can easily discover some written documents as well as photographs that could otherwise be lost.[292] For that reason, oral historians have a chance to trace forgotten or neglected details of human history which might be crucial to a larger audience. The credibility of oral history is different, as Portelli argues: "Oral sources are credible but with a different credibility. The importance of oral testimony may lie not in its adherence to fact, but rather in its departure from it, as imagination, symbolism, and desire emerge. Therefore, there are no 'false' oral sources."[293] There are no false oral sources because "false" becomes a relative term in oral history, which is a personalized story of the witness. Conventional history may record historical facts in favor of politicians or states. There are several factors that manipulate the writing or recording of such history. However, "history as lived" is projected by witnesses who have experienced the past. For that reason, recorded history and oral history may not coincide or meet at the same spot due to their different ways of projecting history. As Nicholas Doumanis notes, "oral sources problematize the historiography and illuminate its blind spots."[294]

Tonkin argues that the past "is not only a resource to deploy, to support a case or assert a social claim, it also enters memory in different ways and helps to structure it. Literate or illiterate, we are our memories."[295] Oral history allows the interviewee to express what really he or she is because "what humans recall is strongly connected to their identities, which include their social roles."[296] Oral testimonies are important both for Greeks and Turks to understand who they really are and what happened

[291] Alessandro Portelli, "What makes oral history different," in *Oral History Reader*, ed. Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, 63-75 (New York: Routledge, 1998), 67.
[292] Thompson, *The Voice of the Past*, 6.
[293] Portelli, "What makes oral history different," 68.
[294] Nicholas Doumanis, *Before the Nation: Muslim-Christian Coexistence and its Destruction in Late Ottoman Anatolia* (U.K: Oxford University Press, 2013), 14.
[295] Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts*, 1.
[296] Ibid., 96.

during the fall of the Ottoman Empire to make them enemies after centuries of harmonious existence in the same cities and villages, and interfaith marriages that strengthened their kinship ties. Oral testimonies of Asia Minor Greeks are different from the recorded history of Greece and Turkey because, as Tamara Chalabi explains, "The time scale of memory is not the same as the time scale of history. Major periods of history can be summarized while minor periods can be expanded."[297] Obviously, the time scale of history is totally different for the historians and witnesses who have faced the traumas of the catastrophes. Oral testimonies of the witnesses contain social messages for future generations.[298] Social messages are crucial to prevent further atrocities and hatred among the younger generations. Tonkin remarks that, "Our intentions for the future are grounded in the past and without remembering we cannot see, for how else would we know what we see?"[299] People have become aware that history is not only the history of the kings, sultans, and generals. History has millions of heroes and heroines whose names and sufferings are suppressed for political reasons. Now it is time to listen to the victims of the catastrophes because oral sources "are particularly useful for the reconstruction of social or group mentalities, and for gleaning collective experiences of a given period of time."[300]

Renèe Hirschon, who lived with Asia Minor refugees in Piraeus during the 1970s, has devoted her life to voicing the unheard laments of the Asia Minor refugees. She is a social anthropologist with a special interest in oral history and memory because she thinks what really matters is the oral testimonies of the victims rather than conventional historiography. Hirschon's life work research, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe,* is an attempt to "study the lesson of being a refugee."[301] Her publications clarify that the history-as-lived is different from history-as-recorded. Hirschon reminds us that "some academics treat oral history and tradition with

[297] Tamara Chalabi, prologue to *Late for Tea at the Deer Palace: The Lost Dreams of my Iraqi Family* (U.K: HarperCollins, 2010).
[298] Thompson, *The Voice of the Past,* 9.
[299] Tonkin, *Narrating Our Past,* 104.
[300] Doumanis, *Before the Nation*, 13.
[301] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe,* xxviii.

skepticism and even summarily dismiss it for its 'unreliability'."[302] However, Hirschon believes that people should consult oral history more in order to understand history from a wider perspective, because she realizes that the oral testimonies of the refugees are different from the recorded history of Greek and Turkish historiography that she analyzes in the "Knowledge of Diversity." Therefore she believes that the memories of the Asia Minor refugees "should be preserved for the many insights of value which they impart to us in these critical times in which we live."[303]

The first oral history accounts of the Asia Minor Catastrophe are provided by The Center for Asia Minor Studies founded in 1930 in Athens by Melpo Logothesis Merlier, an ethno-musicologist trained in Paris, and Octave Merlier, professor of Greek Literature. The center has been "Greece's oldest and largest collection of oral history."[304] Merlier first intended to collect songs from all over Greece. However, after realizing the cultural diversity of the Asia Minor refugees, she decided to focus on the refugees whose cultural traditions were different from the local Greeks.[305] Merlier was surprised to realize that Asia Minor was an unexplored land as she wrote:

> Along with the songs we gathered the information and folkloric material which we needed in order to place our songs in context. In our search, especially as we moved away from the western coastline, Asia Minor was becoming increasingly revealed as a completely unexplored land. As unknown as this age-long land of Hellenism seemed, we were equally surprised by the variety and richness of the material which it provided as an inexhaustible source.[306]

Those materials were collected from the 1930s to 1970s from over five thousand refugees who were interviewed by the researchers of the CAMS.[307]

---

[302] Renèe Hirschon, "Knowledge of Diversity: Towards a More Differentiated Set of 'Greek' Perception of 'Turks'," in *When Greeks Think About Turks: The View from Anthropology*, ed. Dimitrio Theodossopoulos, 61-78 (London & New York: Routledge, 2007), 62.
[303] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, xxii.
[304] Penelope Papailias, *Genres of Recollection: Archival Poetics and Modern Greece* (U.S.A: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 103.
[305] Ibid., 104.
[306] Quited in Georgios A. Yiannakopoulos, "The Reconstruction of a Destroyed Picture: The Oral History Archive of the Center for Asia Minor Studies," *Mediterranean Historical Review* (8:2, 201-217):202. For Asia Minor Hellenism see Artemis Leontis, *Topographies of Hellenism*.
[307] Papailias, *Genres of Recollection*, 94.

Penelope Papailias visited the CAMS and observed, "On one wall hung bronze medallions of two refugees who had volunteered their services in translating documents from Ottoman Turkish and had been called affectionately "Fathers" (Pateres)."[308] Refugees also contributed to documenting the social, cultural, and political aspects of their homeland. Out of 2.163 Greek settlements, 1.375 were studied, and 5.000 refugees were interviewed, which makes 145.000 pages of data.[309] More than a hundred researchers worked on documenting the oral testimonies of the Asia Minor refugees.[310] Yiannakopoulos states that some refugees wrote their testimonies, and "Today 495 such manuscripts are kept at the Center for Asia Minor Studies, of which 44 were written prior to 1922."[311] The statistics about the Asia Minor settlements of the refugees is interesting:

> At this stage we should mention certain statistical facts which emerge from the processing of the material collected: 860 all-Greek settlements were located, 588 mixed Greek and Turkish settlements, while insufficient material exists for 715 settlements. The language of the Greek residents was Greek in 1.049 settlements and Turkish in 426 others. In 41 of the settlements where the residents are described as Grecophones or Turcophones, the population was bilingual. On the subject of language, information is lacking for 688 settlements.[312]

This statistic projects the ambiguity of Ottoman society in terms of language, religion, and ethnicity. It was a complex and dynamic society. Some Ottoman Greeks were bilingual, and some, like the Karamanlis, were Turcophone.

Merlier, who intended to document Asia Minor Hellenism, had hoped that the center's research would further the cause of Greek-Turkish reconciliation.[313] Therefore, she always hoped to find "signs of interethnic communion and cooperation in the Ottoman past."[314] She did not want the atrocities between Greeks and Turks reflected much in oral testimonies. "She herself did not do the fieldwork: she learned about the refugees, their past and their present, by reading about

[308] Ibid., 98.
[309] Ibid., 99.
[310] KAAM, *Göç*, 17.
[311] Yiannakopoulos, "The Reconstruction of a Destroyed Picture," 208.
[312] Ibid., 208.
[313] Papailias, *Genres of Recollection*, 101.
[314] Ibid., 102.

them."[315] However, she asked the researchers to find out the accounts that mentioned good relations. During the interviews with the refugees, another aspect of the research became clearer. Papailias states that,

> Refugees were treated—and classified—as representatives of their place and because of the emphasis on geography were routinely asked to describe and even physically sketch the topography of their villages and towns. The center's explicit aim was to "resurrect" the homelands of the refugees, and Merlier would often remind her researchers that they were the "builders" of these settlements, transplanting them onto Greek "ground" with the raw material of the informants' narratives.[316]

The research not only aimed to document the lives of Asia Minor Greeks, but also their settlements in Asia Minor were crucial to be able to understand Asia Minor Hellenism.

The culture and the communities of Asia Minor were not well-known by the Greek scholars and politicians even in the twentieth century. The Greek Consul of İzmir, Stamatois Antopoulos, traveled in Asia Minor in 1901 in order to get some information about Asia Minor and its Hellenistic culture that would connect the peninsula (Asia Minor) to mainland Greece. However, during his long journey, Antopoulos encountered different Orthodox Christian communities of Anatolia that he was not expecting.[317] After realizing how different Asia Minor was from mainland Greece, he criticized the Greek Kingdom for neglecting the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia who spoke Turkish and had no idea of Greece and Greek culture. The *Megali Idea* of Greece did not have strong arguments because Greece was not capable of reviving Asia Minor Hellenism among the Christians of Anatolia due to lack of knowledge.[318] On the other hand, scholars of Asia Minor from Cappadocia, Pontus, Smyrna, and Constantinople started to publish on the Byzantine heritage of Anatolia.[319] Greeks became aware of Asia Minor and its rich culture after the

[315] Ibid., 112.
[316] Ibid., 109.
[317] Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "Küçük Asya Araştırmaları Merkezi ve Küçük Asya'da Yunan Kültürel Geleneği," (The Center for Asia Minor Studies and Greek Cultural Tradition in Asia Minor), in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 27-37 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi ÜniversitesiYayınları, 2005), 27.
[318] Ibid., 28
[319] Ibid., 29.

Catastrophe, realizing that the refugees had different cultures and customs from the local Greeks. The Center for Asia Minor Studies was founded to collect data about the culture, history, geography, and sociology of Asia Minor, which was then not well known by the Greeks.

Asia Minor refugees were interviewed for the first time by the researchers of the center, and the interviews were compiled and published in two volumes titled *Exodus* in 1980 and 1982. "These testimonies were referred to as stories of "Exodus," consciously invoking Biblical themes of martyrdom, but also of redemption and transcendence."[320] The Biblical reference projects Greece as the "Promised Land" of Ottoman Greeks. Furthermore, the population exchange is projected one-way, as if Muslims of Greece were not displaced from their homeland by the Lausanne Convention. Hercules Millas compiled the most impressive interviews of the *Exodus*. Damla Demirözü translated those interviews into Turkish. The book is published in Turkey with the title *Göç: Rumların Anadolu'dan Mecburi Ayrılışı (1919-1923)* [Migration: Compulsory Displacement of *Rum* from Anatolia (1919-1923)].

The archive of CAMS also contains photographs of the refugees and the refugee settlements. Georgios A. Yiannacopoulos edited a volume titled *Refugee Greece: Photographs from the Archive of the Center for Asia Minor Studies* which was published in 1992. Most of the photographs were taken by the researchers of the CAMS. The photographs reflect more than words since the camera captures every detail that we may forget to record in words. The desperate faces of the refugees reflect the suffering during the deportation as well as during the Greco-Turkish War. Several photographs show refugees waiting for the Greek ships on the shores of Asia Minor: they look very desperate, miserable, and helpless as they are deported from their homeland. The scene does not change in Greece since poverty, famine, and misery were the same in Greece as well. Their clothes are torn, some are barefoot, children do not smile, and houses are in poor state. As you look at the photographs, you wonder how those people managed to survive under those terrible conditions. Most of them had been rich in Asia Minor. But we also know that some people could

[320] Papailias, *Genres of Recollection*, 94.

not survive deprived of their accustomed prosperity. Angela Katrini remarked that rich people could not survive due to the extreme poverty in Greece whereas poor people of Asia Minor managed to survive.[321]

On the other side of the Aegean, in Turkey, the children and grandchildren of the exchangees initiated the Foundation of Lausanne Treaty Emigrants in İstanbul in 2001. While the Greeks founded CAMS just after the Catastrophe, Turkish exchangees were late to unite and cooperate effectively to explore their origins and culture in Greece. According to Elçin Macar's article, "*Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı*," there are social, cultural, and political reasons for that silence and neglect. The very first reason was the different socio-cultural background of Asia Minor Greeks and Muslim Turks. Asia Minor Greeks were the inhabitants of big cities and they were literate; however, Muslim Turks had been villagers in Greece and most of them were illiterate. Thus, they did not immediately think of documenting their pasts. Furthermore, the Turkish government, just like the Greek state, perceived the population exchange as repatriation. Therefore, the exchangees preferred not to voice their differences in public in order to integrate into the Turkish society. The national discourse of that age encouraged silence and neglect.[322] Finally, with the emergence of several civil society organizations in 1990s, the FLTE was founded by the exchangees and their children. The FLTE was founded with its missions listed in their website: to preserve the cultural, artistic, and folkloric values, to do scholarly research on the population exchange and document them, to build friendship and mutual respect between Greece and Turkey, and to unite the children of immigrants for further cultural and social cooperation.[323]

FLTE has already conducted several projects since 2001 and published many books on the social, cultural, and political aspects of the population exchange.[324] For the 80th Anniversary of the Lausanne Convention, an international symposium was

[321] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 142.
[322] Elçin Macar, "Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı," in *Geleceğin Sesi: Türk-Yunan Yurttaş Diyaloğu*, comp. Taciser Ulaş Belge, 89-94 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004), 89.
[323] http://www.lozanmubadilleri.org.tr/hakkimizda
[324] The publications of the FLTE are *Mübadele Öyküleri* (Exchange Stories), *Belleklerdeki Güzellik: Mübadele Türküleri* (The Beauty in the Memories: Exchange Songs and Collections), *Belleklerdeki Güzellik Girit Manileri* (The Beauty in the Memories: Cretan Poems), *Meriç'in İki Yakası* (Both sides of the Maritsa), *Yanya- Ioannina Yemek ve Mezeleri* (Yanya-Ionia Cuisine), *Mübadil Kentler: Türkiye* (Exchanged Cities: Turkey), and *Mübadil Kentler: Yunanistan* (Exchanged Cities: Greece).

organized by the FLTE as we have already mentioned in the previous chapter. Müfide Pekin, who is an Instructor in the Department of Western Languages and Literatures at Boğaziçi University and one of the founders of the FLTE, has edited and compiled many publications of the FLTE. Perhaps her most impressive publication is *Mübadele Bibliyografyası* (Bibliography of the Exchange) that includes all published scholarly books, articles, unpublished M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations in various languages on the population exchange. The FLTE is also interested in architectural expressions of culture in Greece and Turkey, and they aroused public awareness of the architectural monuments in both countries with the project titled "Developing Local Awareness on Architectural Heritage left from the Exchange of Populations in Turkey and Greece." It was coordinated by Prof. Dr. Filiz Yenişehirlioğlu from the 18-23 September in Sinasos/Mustafapaşa in Cappadocia, and from 21-27 October 2004 in Rethymno/Resmo, Crete. The proceedings were published in English in 2005 titled *Common Cultural Heritage*.

The first research on the population exchange from a Turkish citizen was an M.A. thesis of Mihri Belli, "Turkish-Greek Population Exchange: An Economical Perspective," submitted to the University of Missouri in 1940. Although the original copy of the thesis was lost during the police search of Belli's house, the foundation managed to get a copy from the University of Missouri to Mihri Belli's surprise since he no longer had a copy. Sefer Güvenç, the General Secretary of the FLTE, called Mihri Belli to get permission to translate and publish his thesis in Turkish, and asked Belli to write a preface for the book, which was translated by Müfide Pekin as *Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi* (Turkish-Greek Population Exchange).[325] The foundation also organizes trips twice a year to Greece to enable the children and grandchildren of the exchangees to visit their hometowns and recollect the stories of their families.

[325] http://www.lozanmubadilleri.org.tr/yayin_turkyun.htm

2.2. Fictionalizing the Catastrophe

"Books about bad times are often read as testimonies"[326] says Herta Müller at the beginning of her paper presented at the Nobel Centennial Symposium on "Witness Literature" in 2001. Autobiographies, biographies, historical and biographical novels can be defined as witness literature because they project an era, a catastrophe from the perspective of authors who are the witnesses of their times. Scholars try to define what "witness literature" is and whether literature can bear witness or not. Peter Englund claims that, "Witness literature *is* a mongrel form of literature, and, like other mongrels, it is not infrequently full of life. Its links to actual events also endow it with undeniable charge. But, in spite of appearances, the genre is a difficult one, both in form and function. There are more failures than triumphs."[327] Obviously, as an historian, Englund does not think that witness literature can write the truth. It fails, he claims, because it is a mongrel form of literature. He also draws our attention to censorship, and he questions, "Perhaps the best works of witness literature are those not intended for any audience?"[328] In our opinion, he is right about the censorship because censorship does not let the authors reflect the truth. In this case, witness literature does not serve the good of the public but the good of the elite who want to have all the power. Ideally, witness literature, the written form of oral history, has a potential to be more democratic than the distorted and refined history of our contemporary world.

Englund oversimplifies the perspective and understanding of the witnesses as he writes: "Those who lived at the center of things know everything about how it felt but little about what it was: this is their tragedy. As their successors, we know a great deal about what it was, but nothing about how it felt: that is ours."[329] I think our tragedy lies in repressing the voice of the victims that may uncover the reality behind our perception or knowledge. When reality is manipulated, there remains no feeling

[326] Herta Müller, "When We Don't Speak, We Become Unbearable, and When We do, We Make Fools of Ourselves. Can Literature Bear Witness?" in *Witness Literature*, ed. Horace Engdahl, 15-32 (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2002), 15.
[327] Peter Englund, "The Bedazzled Gaze: On Perspective and Paradoxes in Witness Literature," in *Witness Literature*, ed. Horace Engdahl, 45-56 (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2002), 52.
[328] Ibid., 47.
[329] Ibid., 54.

or empathy toward the victims of a catastrophe. Another contributor to the Nobel collection is Gao Xingjian, who brings a different perspective to witness literature:

> Compared with history, the testimonies of literature are often much more profound. History inevitably bears the imprint of an authority and is therefore revised with each change of authority. However, once a literary work is published, it cannot be rewritten which makes the writer's responsibility to history even greater—even if it is not the writer's intention to undertake this burden.[330]

For Xingjian, writers of witness literature have more responsibility to reflect the truth inasmuch as being witnesses, their burden before history is greater than that of official historians. Kemal Arı, a Turkish historian, claims that historians need sympathy and a new way of understanding historical facts. They should be able to feel what people have gone through in the past and they need empathy in order to analyze history from various perspectives. Documents are collections of words, and they are not enough to understand and evaluate history thoroughly.[331]

Oral testimonies of the witnesses are indispensable sources of inspiration for fiction writers since, without oral testimonies, historical novels and documentary narratives would not be able to project the history of an era with reference to the daily lives of ordinary people. *Farewell Anatolia*, *Birds Without Wings,* and *Emanet Çeyiz* are based on both oral history, and conventional historiography. Oral history especially constitutes a great deal to the novels that I have selected to analyze. Dido Sotiriou, Louis de Bernières, and Kemal Yalçın did not just depend on conventional history as they were trying to voice the experiences of the voiceless. Each author depicted history through the eyes of the victims, not the victors. de Bernières takes our attention to this issue in his earlier novel *Captain Corelli's Mandolin:* "history is the propaganda of the victors."[332] The selected authors and their literary works did not write history for the propaganda of the victors, but definitely for the victims. Another commonality between the authors is that each had a more or less direct relation to the Asia Minor Catastrophe.

---

[330] Gao Xingjian, "Literature as Testimony: The Search for Truth," in *Witness Literature*, ed. Horace Engdahl, 113-127 (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2002), 118.
[331] Kemal Arı, "Tarih Bilimi Açısından Mübadele," in *Tarihi, Hukuki, Toplumsal Boyutları ile Mübadele*, ed. İstanbul Barosu Yayın Kurulu, 16-35 (İstanbul: İstanbul Barosu Yayınları, 2012), 28.
[332] Louis de Bernières, *Captain Corelli's Mandolin* (London: Vintage Books, 1994), 39.

Dido Sotiriou has a direct connection to the Catastrophe since she was one of the victims. *Farewell Anatolia*, published in 1962, is a collection of her memoirs together with her collected data on the Catastrophe. Xingjian claims that, "In contemporary literature, especially in the writing of fiction, it has become an increasingly widespread practice for writers to fictionalize their own personal experiences."[333] Sotiriou together with her autobiographical novel, *The Dead Await*, and *Farewell Anatolia* not only projected her time but also her life-story in Asia Minor and Greece. As recounted in *Emanet Çeyiz*, Sotiriou visited Asia Minor refugees in New Ephesus who were displaced from Şirince and listened to their stories.[334] Doulis, the author of *Disaster and Fiction*, received a letter from Dido Sotiriou dated 13 September 1971 from Vasilika. In her letter to Doulis, Sotiriou wrote the following sentences which are crucial for our study: "before and during the time I wrote [my books] I visited many eye-witnesses [of the Asia Minor events], elderly Anatolians, primarily of the working class. I read old books, even memoirs of generals, old archives, newspapers, periodicals from public and private libraries."[335] This letter of the author clearly states that she benefited from the oral testimonies of the victims together with other documents of the past.

Doulis gives further information on *Farewell Anatolia*: "Modeled on an actual character, Manolis Axiotis is the novel's narrator and- by what may be either a coincidence or an effort on the novelist's part to connect her work with a "tradition"—he is from Kirkinze (sic), the same village as Nicholas Kazakoglou, the narrator of Stratis Doukas's *Narrative of a Prisoner*."[336] There is no doubt that Nicholas Kazakoglou's life-story inspired Sotiriou. Interestingly, Yalçın met the daughter of Nicholas Kazakoglou, whose name was Panayota Katırcı, in New Ephesus.[337] She narrated the life-story of his father, which resembles the story of Manolis in *Farewell Anatolia*. Obviously, the authors not only depended on their experiences, but also on the experiences of other people.[338] Sotiriou, from her

[333] Xingjian, "Literature as Testimony," 119.
[334] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 144.
[335] Doulis, *Disaster and Fiction*, 204.
[336] Ibid., 204.
[337] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 144.
[338] Xingjian, "Literature as Testimony," 121.

experiences in Asia Minor and data she collected in New Ephesus, wrote her most celebrated novel, *Farewell Anatolia*.

Dido Sotiriou, a Greek novelist, journalist, and playwright, was born in Aydın/Asia Minor, daughter of Evangelos Pappas and Marianthi Papadopoulos.[339] Sotiriou was born Dido Pappas on 18 February 1909 as a citizen of the Ottoman Empire. She died on 23 September 2004, aged 95.[340] When Sotiriou published her second novel *Farewell Anatolia*—Matomena Chomata (Bloodstained Earth)—in 1962, it was the fortieth anniversary of the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the Lausanne Convention.[341] "It has since been republished 65 times and has sold half a million copies in ten languages, including Turkish."[342] Sotiriou was one of the best known and most widely read Greek writers in Turkey. Sotiriou's autobiographical novel, *The Dead Await* was translated into Turkish and published as *Ölüler Bekler* in 1995. *The Dead Await* is especially enlightening together with the 1990 documentary film on Dido Sotiriou directed by Erman Okay and Thomas Balkhenhol: *Anıların Tadı: Küçük Asyalı Dido Sotiriou* (Taste of the Memoirs: Dido Sotiriou of Asia Minor). This 60-minute documentary follows as Sotiriou travels in Aydın, Smyrna, and Athens and recollects her memories of Asia Minor.

Anıların Tadı (Taste of the Memoirs) consists of the oral testimony of Sotiriou. Throughout the documentary she narrates her life-story, and read some passages from *Farewell Anatolia* and *The Dead Await*, which are complementary since they resemble each other in theme. *The Dead Await* is Sotiriou's first novel and written before *Farewell Anatolia*. In a way, it was a preparation for *Farewell Anatolia*. Sotiriou narrated her life through a female protagonist named Aliki Magi who witnessed the catastrophe and migrated to Greece with her aunt. Aliki Magi is a fictional persona of the author herself. The first part of *The Dead Await* narrates the life of the Magis family in Asia Minor; the second part "is less concerned with the refugee as a type than with the proletarian who happens to be a refugee."[343] *The*

[339] National Book Center of Greece, "Dido Sotiriou (1909-2004)," http://www.ekebi.gr/frontoffice/portal.asp?cpage=NODE&cnode=461&t=390
[340] The Times, "Dido Sotiriou," London, September 29, 2004, Wednesday.
[341] Mackridge, "The Myth of Asia Minor in Greek Fiction," 236-237.
[342] The Times, "Dido Sotiriou."
[343] Doulis, *Disaster and Fiction*, 198.

Dead Await also projects the political ideology of Sotiriou, who was a socialist, and *Farewell Anatolia* was also written through a socialist perspective in which Sotiriou blamed the Great Powers for the destruction of Anatolia for their own interest in the Near East.

Sotiriou was eighty years old when she narrated her life story for *Anıların Tadı* (Taste of the Memoirs.) As Sotiriou recollected her past reminiscences for the documentary, she stated that she saw a girl playing on the stone-paved streets of Aydın, where she was born. She recollected her father's soap factory located in an old khan, and remembered her father's Turkish friends bringing gifts to them as example of the good relations between Christians and Muslims in Asia Minor. She felt herself part of all those trees and stones in Aydın although she probably remembered little as she left Aydın at the age of eight. But she believed that memories, both sad and happy, connected her to Asia Minor. Furthermore, even her confused memories were still exciting.[344] She remembered climbing trees in Aydın and narrating stories for herself at the top of the trees. Moreover, she used to ride a horse, and she was totally different from her siblings. Sotiriou believed that Asia Minor was very fertile because of the Meander River that watered the land. However, imperialist countries, France, England, and America, according to Sotiriou, watered that fertile land with bloodshed for their own interest.[345] That was the reason for the massacres and atrocities that the Greeks and the Turks committed against each other in Asia Minor.

Sotiriou situated *Farewell Anatolia* in a village in the Selçuk district of Smyrna/İzmir near Ephesus. Smyrna was one of the most beautiful cities of the Ottoman Empire, as Sotiriou recollected in the documentary:

> I first saw the sea in Smyrna as we were walking in Kordon (a district of İzmir on the coast) and I was amazed by it. Whenever I saw the Meander River in Aydın, I started to dream of the sea which was larger than the Meander. We used to walk along Kordon which was very impressive. The air smelt of jasmine, people were happy, and even women had their own cafes to spend time with their friends. Those women were ordinary people, but they used to

[344] Erman Okay and Thomas Balkhenhol, directors. *Anıların Tadı: Küçük Asyalı Dido Sotiriou*, a documentary produced by GİSAM: 1990, 60',http://odtutv.metu.edu.tr/index.php?form=arsiv&kod=8.
[345] Ibid.

> follow French or Ionian fashion in their clothing. They were free just like men, and they seemed to care about nothing. The three years we spent in Smyrna had a great impact on me. We had a large house in Smyrna and I used to invite my friends to our house. I used to act some theatre plays and made them cry. I do not remember now what types of plays they were, but they must have been touching. I used to frighten my sister, Despina, telling her some ghost stories, and she ended up crying. Then I tried to comfort her that those were not real, just stories. Those times were good.[346]

Sotiriou was a talented child, fond of plays and stories from her childhood. Asia Minor had a great impact on her talent and there is no doubt that her childhood memories contributed greatly to her writings. During the interview for the documentary in Smyrna, Sotiriou remarked that the smell of Smyrna was still the same, and through that smell she was able to recollect her childhood memories and she believed that was the secret that made Turks and Greeks understand her writing. Then a ferry passed as they talked and she concluded: "A ferry is coming, how nice. It reminds me of both good and bad memories."[347] Ferries reminded Sotiriou of both her happy childhood in Smyrna, and the migration of the Asia Minor Greeks to Greece.

Our second author is Louis de Bernières who was born and educated in England and was a descendant of French Protestants-Huguenot.[348] Huguenots were Protestants persecuted by the Roman Catholics in France in the sixteenth century.[349] Huguenots migrated to several European countries and defined those countries 'the Refuge,' which is the origin of the modern term 'refugee'.[350] In our opinion, de Bernières, himself a Huguenot and a refugee, developed an interest in the lives of the Asia Minor refugees who were displaced from their homeland due to their religious affiliations, just like the Huguenots. The ancestors of de Bernières migrated from France to England because they were Protestant and they were harassed by the

[346] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.
[347] Ibid.
[348] Robert Birnbaum, "Louis de Bernières," *The Morning News*, January 24, 2005, accessed March 30, 2012, http://www.themorningnews.org/article/birnbaum-v.-louis-de-bernires.
[349] David J. B. Trim, "The Huguenots and the Experience of Exile: (Sixteenth to Twentieth Centuries) History, Memory and Transnationalism," in *The Huguenots: History and Memory in Transnational Context*, ed. David J.B. Trim, 1-42 (Brill, 2011), 1.
[350] Ibid., 2.

Roman Catholics. Both the Asia Minor refugees and the ancestors of the author experienced a similar tragedy. Hence the interest of de Bernières in Asia Minor Catastrophe may have stemmed from his ancestral past.

The second reason of the author is his grandfather's past experiences at the Battle of Gallipoli during World War I. de Bernières dedicated *Birds Without Wings* first to the victims of the population exchange and second to his grandfather, Arthur Kenneth Smithells, who was severely wounded at Gallipoli during World War I. Through his grandfather and his special interest in the history of Asia Minor and Ottoman history, de Bernières is also connected to the Asia Minor Catastrophe. Our interview and discussion of *Birds Without Wings* were enlightening and contributed to our analysis of the novel as I gained first-hand information from the author. The author was very careful with the terminology he used during our interview and discussion: he preferred to say "Orthodox Christians" rather than "Asia Minor Greeks" when referring to the *Millet-i Rum* of the Ottoman Empire. He believes that Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were not Greeks, but definitely the folk of Anatolia.[351] His careful usage of the terminology is remarkable to project his anti-nationalist world view. His parents fought against fascism in the Second World War and that explains his upbringing and political outlook. He also reflected his own perspective of anti-nationalism in *Birds Without Wings* that we will discuss below.

I asked him what he thought about oral history and witness literature. de Bernières thinks that in the past there was a tendency to see history in terms of standing back from a distance to see the progress of grand events. In his own case he is coming from a generation whose parents were involved in the World War II and his grandfather was involved in the World War I. He grew up listening to the stories of those grand events from his family. Those stories are not found in standard history books and therefore personally he finds them more interesting. He thinks that a novelist clearly needs to know the big background because the novels are about the stories of individuals. Therefore a novelist needs to collect oral testimonies to make history more vivid. In his own case, he visited Kayaköy and met Ayşe Nine (Granny Ayşe) who was the last person who remembered the departure of the Christians.

[351] Louis de Bernières.

Ayşe Nine remembered the cries of the cats after the deportation of the Christians from Kayaköy.[352] The cats were left behind because the Christians could not take their cats with them. de Bernières told me that this information can only be found in oral history, not in history books. Therefore oral history is important for fiction writers, and he thinks that novels make history vivid and alive by bringing the lives of ordinary people to the center. de Bernières stated that oral history and witness literature are the same: the written literary form of oral history is called witness literature.

The author not only visited Kayaköy and Ayşe Nine for his novel. It is crucial to know how much research was done by the author of *Birds Without Wings*. Obviously, the author is not from the Aegean, he is a totally stranger who has a special interest in the history of Anatolia and Greece. In an interview with Sevda Korkmazgil, who interviewed the author at the 4th Culture and Art Festivals of Fethiye in 2011, de Bernières said: "It was not easy to write the novel since I did not know much about Turks. It is easy to communicate with Greeks and make friends. However, Turks are very respectful and they prefer to distance themselves. It takes time to make friends with Turks."[353] However, the author was lucky to meet many people who helped him in his research. There was a book-store in London owned by someone from the Republic of Southern Cyprus who did not have any prejudice against Turks and who stocked many books on Turkish literature in his book store. Moreover, de Bernières had a close friend who was a cultural attaché in the Greek Consulate as well as an expert on the population exchange. He also made friends with the people in the Turkish Embassy in London. He thinks that it was worth going to the Turkish Embassy even just for the delicious Turkish food. The Turkish diplomat helped him a lot as his grandmother had been originally Serbian and he was well aware all human beings are hybrid beyond our perception. Kerim Uras, a diplomat, searched the British archives for him and brought him piles of documents that were the correspondences of a British Lord. de Bernières knew that Britain had acted as police in Anatolia during those times and all correspondences were in

[352] Louis de Bernières.
[353] Sevda Korkmazgil, "Fethiye'de Bir Aşk Hikâyesi Anlatıcısı: Louis de Bernières," *Yolculuk* (Nov. 2011, no: 89):63.

French since French was the diplomatic language during World War I and the Greco-Turkish War. Since he knew French, he had read all those documents and learned about the War of Independence.[354]

de Bernières was very much interested in the Gallipoli Battle since his grandfather had been shot three times in one day by Turkish snipers. He needed more information about the Gallipoli Battle since there were no books in English written from the perspectives of the Ottomans. He realized that the Turks were very proud of the Gallipoli victory:

> After all, they fought against the most powerful states of those times, England and France. They sent us back. I stayed in Gallipoli for a couple of days, rented a car and met Turkish people to learn more about the Gallipoli War from the perspective of the Turks. I really found very interesting details. For example, the French had a bomb in black color to attack the soldiers behind the front. As it fell onto the soldiers, it sounded like a cat. Ottoman soldiers used to call the bomb the black cat. I would not be able to learn that information in London.[355]

Here again de Bernières emphasizes how crucial oral history is for novelists and clearly stated that oral history constituted an important part of his own novel. The author also realized that the Turks were very interested in history. He met a chef named Faruk in Gallipoli and told him his mission, after which Faruk used to gather people to share whatever they knew about the Gallipoli Battle. de Bernières continued: "I used to go Faruk's restaurant after my trips to the battlefield. People came to the restaurant to share some photos and to tell some stories of the war. It was the most interesting and lovely research I have ever done. I was eating delicious food and collecting data for my novel."[356]

Writing *Birds Without Wings* was not an easy task—not just because the author was a stranger to the Aegean and Anatolia, but also for political reasons. Both Greeks and Turks tend to be very nationalistic and sensitive when the issue is the Greco-Turkish War. Therefore, the novel includes some actions that both sides may find offensive. Here is what the author said about this sensitive issue:

---

[354] Ibid.
[355] Ibid.
[356] Ibid.

> I want to say that it was not easy to put yourself into the shoes of those people. You need to think and imagine their lives; thus it took ten years to complete the novel. I wanted to be sure that I managed to feel how those people felt and what they did. I sent the novel both to my Greek and Turkish friends. The risk was the novel might offend some people. My Greek friends did not like the sections about the War of Independence which depicted how the Greeks acted during the war. Perhaps, there are some parts that the Turks may not be happy with. However, if I managed to offend both sides equally, it would be a positive step for me.[357]

Not only has de Bernières never received any negative reaction from his Turkish readers, but he is one of the most warmly welcomed guests of the annual spring Culture and Art Festivals of Fethiye. He visits Kayaköy every year, reads some passages from his novel to his audience, and autographs his book.

de Bernières regards *Birds Without Wings* as an historical novel. He included chapters documenting the biography of Atatürk because he realized that Atatürk was the only person who was in every place when important things happened.[358] In a series of chapters interspersed throughout the novel, the author depicted the life of Atatürk as Tolstoy depicted the life of Napoleon in *War and Peace*. For that reason, these two novels resemble each other in terms of their literary structure. Atatürk's life story reflects the history of the time. de Bernières believes that a novel not only projects what happened in the past, but also what could have happened or should have happened. A novelist, he argues, is allowed to tell lies because novelists do not have restrictions. de Bernières thinks that Atatürk was a liberal dictator totally different from the other dictators of the world— an idealist whose mind was engaged with an ideal state for his people. de Bernières explained to me why Atatürk was different from other dictators. First Atatürk was not an expansionist: he did not dream of a "Greater Turkey" for the Turks. He founded the Turkish Republic limited to Asia Minor. Second, he believed in democracy and founded an opposition party to oppose the ruling party in parliament. Normally dictators do not like to share their

[357] Ibid.
[358] Louis de Bernières.

power with other parties. Third, Atatürk passed a law for the voting rights of women in his country even before many European countries did.[359]

Turkish readers, who have been taught the life of Atatürk since their childhood, confront a detailed biography of Atatürk in *Birds Without Wings*, a biography which may appear different from the official Turkish historiography. Atatürk's biography, which is well-documented history in the novel, is necessary to show the reader how the Greeks and the Turks became enemies during the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, the readers will thoroughly understand why the compulsory exchange of populations was regarded as a solution for the policy makers of that time. Without the historical context, which fills the gaps in readers' minds, the population exchange would appear as an ordinary migration of people from one place to another. Atatürk, who was born in Salonika, could be regarded as one of the first refugees migrating from Greece to Turkey to found a nation-state for Muslim Turks. The life story of Atatürk is narrated by the author in 22 chapters. Actually, de Bernières acted like a teacher, teaching the historical background of the Asia Minor Catastrophe to his readers. He has an objective point of view in his narration of history and the life story of Atatürk. He cleverly conveys the similarities of Turkish and Greek cultures in his novel, and history reflects where these similarities come from.

Birds Without Wings also has several real characters, including Atatürk who was one of central figures of the history as well as the novel. Like Sotiriou, who was inspired by real people, de Bernières also included real people in his novel. He imported Abdulhamid Hodja from Rhodes. One of his friends informed the author that there used to be an imam who had a magnificent white horse with the brass decorations around its neck. Abdulhamid Hodja was an extraordinary man whose real name was not known by the author. de Bernières depicted Abdulhamid Hodja as a great scholar who knew theology and Sharia Law well. Furthermore, the author did not want to have any stereotypes in his novel.[360] Thus every character is distinctive and unique. Another real character is Georgio P. Theodorou, the Greek merchant, whose name was written on the fountain in Kayaköy. Most likely, he had

[359] Ibid.
[360] Ibid.

commissioned that fountain for the people of Eskibahçe. de Bernières situated his novel in an ancient town that he admired: "In truth, the town seemed to have been marvelously designed by some ancient genius whose name has been lost, and there was probably no other place like it in all of Lydia, Caria or Lycia."[361]

de Bernières' epic novel, *Birds Without Wings*, set on the south-west coast of Turkey, takes place over the period from 1900 to 1922 in a village called Eskibahçe, in Fethiye, a district of Muğla, where Christians and Muslims used to live peacefully until World War I. The author described how he imagined Kayaköy for his novel:

> As I was describing the Kayaköy of those times, I think I managed to describe the real town. Christians and Muslims used to live together in the town. I do not know but I guess there were some Armenians and Jews in the town. But there was a pharmacist, as well as a potter and a coppersmith. There were also cisterns next to the houses to collect water. Generally, the houses were two-stores; animals were kept in the basement during winter to warm the upper floor where the family lived. Actually I do not know who used to live in Kayaköy. Therefore I imagined a town that resembled Kayaköy. This was how I narrated as many lives as I wanted. The irony of our job is to create lives that resemble the reality.[362]

The author succeeded in depicting Eskibahçe vividly and his epic takes the reader into the heart of the events that surrounded the people of Eskibahçe in the 1920s. The author projected the lives of those unfortunate people through their own eyes. I think giving voice to each character is the key to the success of the novel and its author.

With the exchange of populations, Eskibahçe lost its beauty and spirit. Barbaros Tanc, who did field work in Kayaköy, described the village, one of whose old names was Livisi:

> It is something of a ghost town. In 1914 the population of the town was 6.500, mainly orthodox Christians sharing a single geographical space with neighboring Muslims. Today the population is 600 Muslim Turks, a mixture of long-term residents and more recent settlers. There are around 3.000 empty houses, most of them ruined, and a host of old public and commercial buildings: two big churches, around 20 chapels, an old school, a library, a pharmacy and many different types of shops. Many of

[361] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 29-30.
[362] Korkmazgil, "Fethiye'de Bir Aşk Hikâyesi Anlatıcısı," 62-63.

> these structures are now in ruins and serve as a constant material reminder of the unmixing of the Ottoman past.[363]

Kayaköy is a ghost town because the former inhabitants, the Christians, left the village, and only a few Greek Muslims settled in the village. Since the numbers of exchanged Muslims were less than the exchanged Orthodox Christians, there are now many ghost villages and towns in Turkey. Kayaköy is one of those ghost towns no longer inhabited by Orthodox Christians.

de Bernières recreates the history of Ottoman Greeks and Turks in Eskibahçe at the beginning of the twentieth century in his novel. The new century did not bring peace and friendship, but hostility and blood for the inhabitants of Asia Minor. Ottoman Greeks and Turks, nurtured by the same earth, started to drink their own blood for the sake of nationalist sentiments. The opening poem of *Birds Without Wings*, titled *The Cat* by Spyros Kyriazopoulos, is a perfect description of that time:

> She was licking
> the opened tin for hours and hours
> without realizing
> that she was drinking
> her own blood.

Birds Without Wings successfully reflects the social and political involvement of the Ottoman Empire with the European Powers as well as the cultural and religious lives of the Ottoman subjects of an Anatolian village during the fall of the empire. About the name of the book, *Birds Without Wings*, de Bernières commented:

> I think that is an actually a saying from the Middle East but I got confused on this issue, there is also a song by [Mikis] Theodorakis, who wrote the music to Zorba, called "I Am an Eagle Without Wings," and I know perfectly well what he means by that. We want to be splendid and free and beautiful, but we are earthbound. And it's a metaphor for the condition of mankind.[364]

[363] Barbaros Tanc, "Where Local Trumps National: Christian Orthodox and Muslim Refugees since Lausanne," *Balkanologie*, Vol. V, No. 1-2 (Dec. 2001):278.
[364] Anita Sethi, "Interview: Louis de Bernières," *Granta*, August 4, 2009, accessed March 30, 2012, http://www.granta.com/Online-Only/Louis-de-Bernieres.

Orthodox Christians, because of their experience of migration from Asia Minor to Greece, are depicted by the author as "birds without wings."

Our third author is Kemal Yalçın who also has connections to the Asia Minor Catastrophe like the other two. First of all, he is a Turkish citizen. Second and the most important in this context is that his family used to live in a village inhabited by Ottoman Greeks and Turks in Denizli during the Ottoman era. Moreover, his grandfather had been entrusted with a trousseau by his Orthodox Christian neighbors during the population exchange, a legacy he tried to return to its rightful owner years later. Due to the trousseau, his connections with Asia Minor Greeks continued with a promise made by his father to his grandfather to return the trousseau. Upon his father's request, to fulfill this promise Yalçın started his journey that would culminate in a documentary narrative based on the oral testimonies of Asia Minor refugees. As Yalçın searched for the Minoğlu family in Greece, he visited villages and cities in which Asia Minor refugees lived, and he listened to their past experiences. His documentary narrative, *Emanet Çeyiz*, is completely based on oral history, which will throw light on our analysis of *Farewell Anatolia* and *Birds Without Wings* together with *Göç: Rumlar'ın Anadolu'dan Mecburi Ayrılışı (1919-1923)*.

The genre of Yalçın's *Emanet Çeyiz* may confuse the readers since it is not a novel that contains fiction and other novelistic elements, but is a collection of interviews with the Asia Minor refugees in Greece, and the Muslim exchangees in Turkey. Aslı Iğsız explains to us the genre of the text and the decision of Kemal Yalçın:

> But it raised questions regarding its genre: was this really a novel or a collection of oral history accounts? When I asked him why he chose to present this book as a novel, even though there was little fiction in it, Yalçın replied that, at that time, he did not think the Turkish public was "ready" for another genre to introduce this tragedy and that he reached a larger audience through presenting his story as a novel. This choice was strategic and his book is one of the earliest examples in Turkey of the now recurring genre, "documentary novel."[365]

[365] Iğsız, "Documenting the Past," 452.

Yalçın's strategic approach is an important sign showing us how little emphasis has been given to the population exchange in Turkey since 1923. Considering the neglected aspect of the population exchange, Yalçın was cautious in presenting his work to his Turkish readers knowing that Turkish nationalism has always been strong in Turkish society. Although Kemal Yalçın presented his work as a documentary novel, I think it will be more appropriate to call *Emanet Çeyiz* a documentary narrative.

Emanet Çeyiz had a great impact on the founders of the FLTE because they "identified the role of both the 1999 earthquakes in Turkey and Greece and *Emanet Çeyiz* in raising an awareness of their family's cultural background."[366] The earthquakes and Yalçın's work have started friendly interaction and communication between both societies of the Aegean. Sefer Güvenç states that those who wanted to help to the victims of the earthquake were mostly the exchanged peoples of the Aegean.[367] They wanted to help their previous neighbors and friends. Official reactions to *Emanet Çeyiz*, however, were not universally positive:

> Turkish state officials, on the other hand, first honored the novel with the Ministry of Culture's 1998 Novel Success Prize. However, in 2002, other state officials filed a complaint and prosecuted the book and author, citing the content of the book as "offensive" and an "insult" to Turkish national identity.[368]

This unfortunate event proved that Yalçın was right in naming his work "novel." Luckily, "The novel and its author have subsequently been acquitted."[369]

I asked Kemal Yalçın his opinion about oral history.[370] Yalçın thinks that official history is not the only way to learn the dynamics of history and life, which are both subject to change in time with shifting ideas, ideologies, and contradictions. Life can only be understood through multi-dimensional approaches because life as a whole is a union of contradictions. Official history projects history from the

[366] Ibid.
[367] Sefer Güvenç, "80. Yılında Mübadele: Genel Değerlendirme," (Population Exchange Reconsidered: General Assessment), in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 447-452 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 450.
[368] Iğsız, "Documenting the Past," 452.
[369] Ibid.
[370] Kemal Yalçın, e-mail message to author, August 25, 2012.

perspective of the rulers of that time. From primary school to university, the Turkish Republic has projected history through a nationalist ideology. In Turkey, the liberation day of the cities are celebrated, not the foundation of the cities. To celebrate the foundation of a city would actually mean embracing life as a whole, accepting the history of that city as well. For example, to celebrate the liberation day of İzmir on the 9th of September ignores the ancient history of Smyrna because the Turkish Republic considers the history of İzmir from the 9thof September, 1922, which is the end of the Greco-Turkish War. Official history does not care about the lives of the ordinary people who are the direct victims of historical and political decisions. The Lausanne Convention displaced almost two million people from their homeland, both Christians and Muslims, and official history documents the total number of people who were displaced; however, it does not document the suffering of each victim. The cries of those displaced people are unheard. Kemal Yalçın, as an oral historian, gives greater consideration to the real life experiences of the victims.[371] He does not write history books, but documentary narratives that reflect life as a whole, with its ironies and contradictions. Therefore oral history is crucial for his writing.[372]

Yalçın also believes that official history and oral history shouldn't be regarded as opposing forces because they are different from each other in terms of their purpose and style. When writing was not wide-spread, the histories of states or kingdoms were written by the official historians of the rulers. That history is crucial to the history of the states or the kingdoms in general terms. Yalçın thinks that the historical facts and their dates narrated by the witnesses must be compared with the official history in order to have a real and objective past. Before going to Greece to meet the refugees, Yalçın read several objective history books on the Ottoman Empire, Greece, and Turkey. He believes that a particular event has to be narrated by several witnesses at different times and different places in order to get an objective view of the past. Some narrators may narrate events as if they experienced it. Others may imagine the past and narrate it through their own imaginations. An oral historian

[371] Kemal Yalçın also documented the oral testimonies of the Armenians in Turkey and Germany in *Seninle Güler Yüreğim* and *Sarı Gelin-Sari Gyalin*.
[372] Kemal Yalçın.

has to be careful. Yalçın personally preferred to compare documented history with the testimonies of the refugees to get a clear narration of the past. He interviewed more than a hundred refugees in both countries and selected those that seemed to him the most real and objective testimonies of fifteen Asia Minor refugees and fifteen Muslim exchangees for *Emanet Çeyiz.*[373]

Yalçın narrated the adventure of writing *Emanet Çeyiz* in the introductory chapter of the book. When Yalçın's parents, Ramazan and Ümmühan Yalçın, visited their son in Germany during the 1990s, Ramazan Yalçın talked about his childhood friend Sophia Minoğlu (Ramazan Yalçın used to call her Safiye) in Honaz/Denizli. During the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922), Yalçın's father Ramazan Yalçın was seven or eight years old, and his father (Yalçın's grandfather) had been fighting against the Greeks in the Turkish army. Ramazan Yalçın's father returned home safely after the war, and with the Lausanne Convention, the Christians had been deported to Greece. Ramazan Yalçın remembered their Orthodox Christian neighbors, the Minoğlu family, who had two daughters Eleni and Sophia. While Eleni had been of marriageable age, Sophia was two or three years older than Ramazan Yalçın, and she had been his playmate. Ramazan Yalçın said that they had been farmland neighbors in Karaköprü for many years, and they had never had any conflict. Ramazan Yalçın used to tell his son how much they were saddened by the population exchange since Sophia's mother entrusted her daughters' wedding trousseau to his father. Both Muslims and Christians cried during the deportation of Asia Minor Greeks from Turkey including the grandfather who promised to keep the trousseau till the Minoğlu family came back.[374]

It was a real surprise for Yalçın that he had such a family history and an entrusted trousseau from the 1920s. He was both honored and surprised by the request of his parents. He was honored and proud of his family for keeping the trousseau for more than 70 years with great care and respect to their former Christian neighbor. However, he did not know how to find the Minoğlu family in Greece since they had no information about the Minoğlu family, and Greece had a population of 12 million then. During the population exchange, some Muslim exchangees were

[373] Ibid.
[374] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 15.

settled in Honaz, the hometown of the Yalçın family, and his father told him that he would try to find an address in Greece for him to start his search. That day, Yalçın believed that he could easily find the Minoğlu family. He was not well-informed about the population exchange then and he realized what a traumatic experience it was when he arrived in Greece and started searching for the Minoğlu family.[375]

It is important to explain what a wedding trousseau is and its significance for the folk of Anatolia. A wedding trousseau contains many elaborately hand-made clothes, towels, linens, and table cloths which take several years of the girl and other female members of the family (the mother, sisters, aunts) to complete before they marry. A wedding trousseau is an elaborate collection of artistic handcrafted items that require time, energy, effort, patience, love, hope, and enthusiasm of a girl who wants to show her talent and skills to the family of the groom, because the girls are appreciated according to the beauty of their handicraft. A wedding trousseau reflects the talent and the creativity of the girl. Tamara Chalabi claims that "A trousseau was often looked upon by in-laws as a barometer of a girl's background and her family's ability to provide for her. A luxurious trousseau suggested a cared-for girl, who might be treated with more consideration than a girl who came to her groom without much."[376] Therefore a wedding trousseau is significant for the girls of Anatolia since it symbolizes the talent, wealth, and dignity of the bride's family.

The following story will illustrate the significance of a wedding trousseau in Anatolia. Angela Katerini of Çirkince was seven years old when the Greek army and Turkish army were heading to Smyrna.[377] Due to the chaos, Angela Katerini's family went to Ayasülük. They were taken from Ayasülük to Smyrna and were kept in Smyrna 5-10 days. People were getting lost in the chaos and her mother lost one of her babies. Her father was taken captive. Women, girls, and children were left behind.[378] Chettès (irregular bands) started to take the belongings of the women. A girl was hiding a bag that contained her trousseau. When a chettè member wanted to get it, the girl did not want to give her trousseau away and ran after it with tears in

[375] Kemal Yalçın.
[376] Chalabi, *Late for Tea at the Deer Palace*, 50.
[377] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 137.
[378] Ibid., 138.

her eyes. Her mother ran after her and advised her to leave it otherwise she would be killed by the chettès.[379] This tragic scene clearly shows what a wedding trousseau means for the girls of Anatolia. It is something very precious because girls spend days and night to prepare their trousseau. The girl risked her life for her trousseau and perhaps she lamented the loss of her trousseau throughout her life if she was lucky to survive. That is why Sophia's trousseau was kept for seventy years.

There is no limit to a wedding trousseau. It can be some towels and linens as well as a house. Renèe Hirschon devotes a chapter in *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe* to discuss the significance of a dowry for Asia Minor Greeks:

> Recollections of the older people showed that the provisions of dowry had always been a matter of considerable parental, indeed corporate familial concern. They recalled that marriage proceedings in their home communities, in regions as diverse as Broussa, Ankara, Smyrna, and Pontus, a girl was expected to provide a certain amount of wealth on marriage. In some regions this was a house but in others it took the form of movable goods such as cash, gold coins, or household linen and equipment, items regarded as endowment for the new family and returnable to the girl if the marriage failed.[380]

A wedding trousseau is the most important step toward the marriage and it belongs to one girl. A common saying goes: "The baby in the cradle and the dowry in the trunk."[381] That explains why Eleni and Sophia had their wedding trousseau when they were very young, which was the custom in Anatolia. Yalçın's grandfather, aware of the traditions and customs of Anatolia, kept the trousseau for seventy years and never gave it to anybody else since he believed that a girl's wedding trousseau never brings happiness to another girl. Furthermore, the wedding trousseau is also a symbol of the honor of the girl. The grandfather did not let his stepdaughter, Fatma, have Sophia's wedding trousseau since he hoped that Sophia and her family would come back one day to take the trousseau back.[382]

---

[379] Ibid., 139.
[380] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 117. See also Hirschon, "Under One Roof: Marriage, the Dowry and Family Life in Piraeus, Greece."
[381] Ibid., 129.
[382] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 173.

2.3. Sophia's Trousseau: Recollecting the Past

Sophia's entrusted trousseau took Kemal Yalçın to Greece in 1994, after the refugees had been in exile for seventy years. They were the witnesses of the catastrophe; that's why Yalçın was lucky to get first-hand information about the population exchange and the refugee experiences of the Catastrophe. Most of the refugees were over eighty years old, but they were healthy and their memories were fresh. As Lowenthal says, "Memories in all these senses tend to accumulate with age. Although some are always being lost and others altered, the total stock of things recallable and recalled grows as life lengthens and as experiences multiply."[383] This is true for the refugees as well because not only the Catastrophe, but also the German invasion of Greece and the Greek Civil War had a great influence on the lives and narratives of the refugees. In seventy years, their memories accumulated a lot of unfortunate events. As Tanc states, "The past is not only history but connected to the present through individuals' interpretation of their lives and the world around them. The narrator not only remembers the past, but is thereby linked to a larger social group."[384] The refugees connected their past with their present lives through their memories. Hirschon also emphasizes the crucial role of memory for the refugees: "in order to reconstitute their lives memory becomes a critical link, the means of a cultural survival, a kind of capital without which their identity would be lost."[385]

Yalçın, himself in exile since the military coup of 1980, arrived in Athens/Greece on 27 June 1994, to return Sophia's trousseau. Having started his search without proper preparation, it was both easy and difficult for Yalçın to communicate with the Asia Minor refugees in Greece. Some refugees were very suspicious about Yalçın and did not want to talk to him, fearing that he might be a spy. Vasili Vasilyadis, for example, hesitated to talk since Yalçın was a Turk.[386] Some refugees preferred to talk at midnight because they did not want their tears to be seen by others. Another tragedy was the fear of the refugees who were partisans of the Communist Party and were sent into exile in Uzbekistan in 1940s. They were

[383] Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, 194.
[384] Tanc, "Where Local Trumps National," 283.
[385] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 15.
[386] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 85.

allowed to return in 1974 by a special agreement between the Soviet Union and Greece. One of them was Petro, from Amasya, who preferred to talk at midnight in the farmland rather than at home, fearing that his conversation could be heard by others.[387] Learning that Kemal Yalçın was himself an exile like the refugees, mutual trust developed and they started to narrate their past memories of Asia Minor.

Kemal Yalçın met the Turkish-speaking refugees in Greece. As a fellow countrymen, Yalçın's mother tongue is also Turkish, so language was not a problem. He also talked to them in Greek as he had learned some Greek from his childhood friends who were among the Muslim exchangees. Yalçın thinks that speaking some Greek also helped him to establish mutual trust during the interviews.[388] Refugees opened their hearts to Yalçın since they shared the same culture and language which is an important factor in oral history. Tonkin notes that

> Anyone who has lived and worked as an outsider in a community with an unfamiliar language and culture— or even just a different dialect of the same language and a different body language— will know how difficult it could be to evaluate speakers' remarks. Gesture, intonation, bodily stance and facial expressions are all clues, in the *oral* ambience, to topic orientation as well as the speakers' claim to authority.[389]

In order to get more information from the interviewees, the oral historians should be natives of the community they do research on. Sharing the same culture and language with the interviewees strengthens the reliability of the oral testimonies because body language and gestures, which are the cultural expressions of a community, will be best understood by the native oral historians. Furthermore, an easy way of communication will immediately be established between the oral historian and the interviewees due to their mother tongue and culture. In the light of this crucial information, one can say that Yalçın and the refugees managed to establish intimate relations with mutual respect and understanding.

Emanet Çeyiz contains the stories of the displaced peoples of the Aegean, and oral history enables us to touch their lives closely and feel their sorrows and

[387] Kemal Yalçın.
[388] Ibid.
[389] Tonkin, *Narrating Our Past*, 40.

lamentations. The biographies of the refugees resemble each other in one way or another, but some stories have to be analyzed further because they highlight the social, cultural, political, and religious aspects of the Ottoman Empire as well as Greece and Turkey in the first quarter of the twentieth century. As we read the life stories of the refugees, we learn how much they have longed for their motherland. Some refugees asked for a bag of soil and a bottle of water from the homeland. Some longed for the food they used to have in Asia Minor. Some regretted not converting to Islam in order to stay in Asia Minor. Some refused to change their surnames for Greek ones. Some narrated the most tragic moments of their lives. Some narrated the German occupation of World War II and the Greek Civil War.

Yalçın interviewed Elefteria Staboulis, a high school teacher in Greece, whose father, Lazaros, was from Kayseri. Her mother's name was Sofiya Kalinikidu who lost four of her six children during their deportation to Greece. Elefteria was born in Greece after the deportation. In order to sail to Greece, her family had travelled from Kayseri to Yozgat, from Yozgat to Sinop, from Sinop to Çanakkale, and finally from Çanakkale to Greece. Elefteria listened to several stories from Asia Minor since Lazaros used to narrate his life in Kayseri to his children. He always wanted to go back to Turkey. However no permission was given until 1974. When the permission was first given to Asia Minor refugees to visit Turkey, Lazaros asked Elefteria to visit his hometown, Kayseri, on his behalf since he was not young enough to travel to Turkey. Lazaros said: "My daughter, I am old now. I cannot go to Kayseri. You go there. Here's our address. Here are the names of our neighbors. Go and find our home. Bring me a bag of soil from our garden; if it is still there, and a bottle of water from our fountain. Before I die, I want to drink the water of our fountain and kiss the soil of our country!"[390] Elefteria went to Kayseri to fulfill her father's wish and found their family house. She found out that a family was residing in their family house. Moreover, the house was not in good condition and she did not feel strong enough to enter the house. Instead she spent some time in the garden. She listened to the atmosphere, and the water running in front of their house. Then she got a bag of soil and a bottle of water as her father requested. Lazaros put the soil

[390] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 40.

inside his pillow, slept on it till he died, and drank the water of their fountain.[391]

Another refugee who took some soil from his hometown was Prodromos Vasilyadis, born in Salihli/Manisa in 1910. He was 12 years old in 1922 when he and his mother were deported to Greece. His mother had been widowed long ago. His father had left a shop and a vineyard in Salihli the grapes of which they used to sell to the Americans before the war. After the defeat of the Greek army in 1922, Prodromos escaped to Smyrna with his family because the chettès (Greek and Turkish irregular bands in Asia Minor) were harming them, not the soldiers of Kemal.[392] Then, they were taken to Salonika. In 1924 Prodromos moved to Katerini and worked hard to survive. He married in 1935 and in 1974 he visited his home in Salihli.[393] When Prodromos set foot in Salihli, he started to cry. Somebody saw Prodromos crying and called Ali Ağa, one of the elders of Salihli, to help Prodromos find his family house. Ali Ağa remembered his father Panayot and welcomed him sincerely, and then took him to their family house. A woman opened the door and welcomed Prodromos inside. However, Prodromos could not enter and preferred to sit on the stairs with tears on his eyes. He brought back a bag of soil from Salihli. As he concluded his narration, he cried and said that he wished to go to Salihli again.[394]

Vasili Karabaş, born in Kayseri in 1903, also had a strong emotional attachment to his motherland and mother tongue. He was asked to change his surname by the Greek state; however, he refused to change saying that he was born Karabaş and would prefer to die Karabaş.[395] Vasili was twenty years old and single when he arrived in Greece. Back in Asia Minor, Orthodox Christians used to have good relations with their Turkish neighbors as they invited each other to weddings and celebrations like brothers and sisters. In 1914, World War I started and his father had been conscripted into the Ottoman army. No men were left in their village except the old men, women, and children. People had hard times because women and children could not harvest the crops and they lived in poverty. When the Armenians were deported in 1915, elders of their village thought that Greece would protect them

[391] Ibid., 41.
[392] Ibid., 133.
[393] Ibid., 134.
[394] Ibid., 135.
[395] Ibid., 76.

against the Turks saying: "Greece is backing us. Turks cannot harm us. We have a state. Armenians do not have a state."[396] This statement clearly shows that some Christians of Anatolia had already become aware of nationalism and nation-states. This issue will be analyzed in the next chapter below.

During the Greco-Turkish War of 1919-1922, the elders of the village decided to migrate to Greece since they felt insecure due to the outlaws and bandits that started to harass them. They traveled from Kayseri to Mersin and then sailed to Chios Island which was very close to Çeşme, a district of İzmir. The Greeks of Chios gave them some food and sent them to Salonika. When they settled in their new village in Salonika, the Greek Muslims were still there. They lived with Muslims for six months without any problem or conflict. The Muslims of Salonika were speaking Greek; whereas Asia Minor Greeks were speaking Turkish. They could not communicate well; however they got on well with the Greek Muslims. Vasili knew some Greek and had a friend named Sabri, a Greek Muslim, who helped Vasili to make his living.

Vasili also described to Yalçın their relations with local Greeks. Since Asia Minor Greeks did not speak Greek, they were discriminated against and humiliated as Turks. No marriage was arranged between the refugees and the locals. They did not get on well with the local Greeks. Vasili believed that Asia Minor refugees were the ones who worked very hard to improve the conditions of the country. The city was in mud when they first arrived. Between 1923 and 1934 there was a famine in Greece after which people started to work hard because refugees were then given their land registration, and their living conditions started to improve a little bit. However, in 1941 another disaster, World War II, broke out. After 1945, the Greek Civil War made their life even worse. Greeks, as well as refugees, suffered during those years. Life started to become normal for refugees after 1953.[397] Vasili had always longed for his village Beşkardeş in Kayseri, always dreaming of the fertile land of his Asia Minor village.[398]

[396] Ibid., 78.
[397] Ibid., 82.
[398] Ibid., 83.

Vasili Karabaş was definitely right in his comment that Asia Minor Greeks worked hard and developed Greece. Pentzopoulos explains the role of the refugees on the economy of Greece:

> Having to compete with the native inhabitants of Greece, usually from a position of inferiority, and realizing that their survival depended on their work, they applied themselves with tenacity and courage and exhibited a truly inventive and progressive spirit. During this second phase, they became an asset to the Greek economy, assisting its development to a great extent.[399]

Refugees, desperate and homesick, devoted themselves to their work because their struggle was for survival in a foreign country. "They were courageous and intelligent people, eager to work, possessing a spirit of inventiveness and boldness that the native Greeks lacked"[400] says Pentzopoulos. Greece, an underdeveloped country during those times, became a prosperous country due to the contributions of the refugees to the economy.

Yalçın interviewed Tanasis Bakırcıoğlu, an Orthodox Christian from Burdur. He was born in 1908 and his father, Alexi Usta, was a coppersmith. They used to have good relations with their Muslim friends and neighbors. There were no Orthodox Christians in the villages of Burdur because they used to live in the city center while Turks resided in the villages of Burdur. When Turks went to Burdur to sell their harvest at the market place, they used to stay at the houses of their Christian friends. Their relations with their Muslim friends were very good. Ishak Usta, a coppersmith like his father, always invited them for the Feast of Sacrifice and his father also invited Ishak Usta for Easter.[401] There used to be mutual friendship and respect. Tanasis also recollected the variety of food in Asia Minor. For him, there was nothing to eat in Greece; however, Asia Minor was very rich in terms of food.[402] He did not get used to living in Greece and regretted not having converted to Islam and staying in Burdur as he said: "I regret coming to Greece. I have never seen good people in Greece. I tell you as I tell everybody. I wish I had become Mehmet and

[399] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 144.
[400] Ibid., 150.
[401] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 112-113.
[402] Ibid., 115.

stayed in Burdur."[403] As we have already mentioned, some Orthodox Christians converted to Islam in order to stay in Asia Minor. Tanasis regretted not doing the same since he never liked Greece. His statement demonstrates his emotional attachment to his homeland. Tanasis also informed us about the Greek occupation of Asia Minor. He said: "Why did they come? Who were they looking for? Were they looking for their lost child? This was the trick of the British. They destroyed our lives."[404]

When Greeks and Turks started fighting for Asia Minor, like other Christians, Tanasis and his father were sent into exile in order not to support or join the Greek army. On the way to Kayseri, his father passed away and Tanasis buried his father and arrived in Kayseri and got a job as a handler in Süleyman Bey's villa. Süleyman Bey was a governor in Kayseri who was a decent man with a good heart. He had saved an Armenian woman, İyo Yaya, during the deportations of Armenians. In 1924, just before the population exchange, some Christian women had been sent into exile to Kayseri. Süleyman Bey took very good care of those women and their children, sending them to a Turkish hamam, providing them with clean clothes, and securing food. Tanasis stayed in Kayseri for 22 months, almost 2 years. During the population exchange, he traveled to Mersin with 200 people, and waited for the ferry for 15 days, and then sailed to Greece. The women of his family walked to Antalya to be taken to Greece.[405]

Tanasis reunited with his family in Greece. First they settled in Karacaova when the Greek Muslims were still there. Then in 1925 he moved to Veria and married at the age of 18. His parents were both dead and his sister insisted that he marry. His wife Galipronia, now deceased, was an orphan from Burdur. They had four children and a very good married-life. In 1935 he joined the Communist Party and read Lenin, Enver Hojda, and Mao. In 1940, when Greeks and Italians started to fight, Tanasis left his family and fought for Greece. After the Italians, the Germans arrived in Greece. He served in the army for 3 years. He ate the flesh of the dead horses because of the famine during the war. In winter one of his fingers was frozen;

[403] Ibid., 116.
[404] Ibid.
[405] Ibid., 118.

therefore his finger was amputated and he was hospitalized for 3 months in Athens. Between 1946 and 1949 the Greek Civil War took place and his seventeen year old son fought against the Germans. When the partisans were defeated in 1949, they ran away to Poland, Hungary, mostly to Russia, and Tashkent. They returned in 1974 by the decision of Karamanlis.[406] Tanasis was imprisoned for 25 days for not fighting against the partisans. He thought that it was unfair when rich people lived in peace and poor people suffered. He noted that he suffered a lot because his life was wasted in wars and conflicts. He also blamed the British for encouraging Greece to invade Smyrna. He concluded his narration with good wishes for the future generations of Turks and Greeks.[407]

Yalçın's next visit was to Father Yorgo who was from the Ayancık town of Sinop, a city of Pontus. When Yalçın kissed Father Yorgo's hand, Father Yorgo said, "Did you see he has kissed my hand. He is a Turk. This is a tradition in our culture. Hands of the elders are kissed."[408] Sophia Kappatos, who wrote the life-story of her father in *The Promised Journey: Pontus-Kefalonia*, also mentioned the traditions of Asia Minor people. Sophia's father, Yiannis Karatzoglou, was an Orthodox Christian from Balıklar village of Bafra, Samsun, another city of Pontus. In Balıklar village, the hands of the elders are kissed and the elders are greatly respected by the younger generation.[409] Due to the respect shown to the elderly, parents do not show any affection to their children in the presence of their mothers and fathers. Furthermore, the feet of the father are washed as sign of respect and obedience.[410] All those customs are exactly the same in traditional Muslim families of Anatolia in modern Turkey as well. They are all part of Anatolian culture, where various civilizations have flourished since time immemorial. Father Yorgo, who shares the same culture with the peoples of Anatolia, was happy to meet Yalçın—someone from his homeland.

[406] Ibid., 119.
[407] Ibid., 120.
[408] Ibid., 123.
[409] Kappatos, *The Promised Journey*, 69.
[410] Ibid., 225.

Father Yorgo was born in 1906 in Ayancık. His father was a tailor, and they had been wealthy in Anatolia.[411] His maternal uncle was a wealthy man who had made boats. In Ayancık, there were 80-90 Orthodox Christian families, and the rest of the population were Turks and Armenians, among whom there were no problems. His father was conscripted into the Ottoman army during World War I, and his uncle took care of them. When the Armenians were deported, they all started to feel insecure.[412] The Russians invaded Trabzon in the following year. Christians of the Black Sea area were sent into exile to Çankırı, Kastamonu, Amasya, Taşköprü, and Boyabat in case they support the Russians against the Ottomans. Father Yorgo and his family were deported to Çankırı, Kastamonu, and Amasya. When they were resettled in the houses of the Armenians, they were afraid of being killed. However, Father Yorgo explained that the elders did not panic as they said, "Armenians have nobody to back them, no state to give support. We have greater Greece to protect us. They cannot treat us badly."[413]

The following year, the Russian army left Trabzon, and the Turks were defeated in World War I. Father Yorgo's family returned home; however, nothing was as tranquil as it used to be in Ayancık. People started to migrate to İstanbul because Topal Osman was the nightmare of Ottoman Greeks. Father Yorgo claimed that Topal Osman fought in the Balkan Wars and lost one of his legs, and then he returned to his home town, Giresun, and started to harass Christians. Everybody was afraid of Topal Osman, even the Turks. One day Topal Osman asked for money from the folk of Ayancık. He escaped as the folk of Ayancık tried to shoot him. Father Yorgo noted that Topal Osman was killed by the order of Mustafa Kemal, and he heard it when they were in Greece.

His maternal uncle had a close friend, a gendarme who advised him to take his family to Istanbul. His father was still in the army then, and Greeks had already landed in Smyrna.[414] Father Yorgo's uncle decided to sail from Samsun to İstanbul. They were hosted by their relatives in Kumkapı, and had a peaceful life again. One

[411] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 123.
[412] Ibid., 126.
[413] Ibid.
[414] Ibid., 127.

of his maternal uncles was a tailor in Kapalıçarşı (The Grand Bazaar) and made uniforms for gendarmes. At 16, Father Yorgo started to work in a shoe shop in Karaköy. Every day he used to walk from Kumkapı to Karaköy, passing through Tahtakale, Kantarcılar, and Galata Bridge. One day as he was passing Galata Bridge, somebody called his name. It was his father standing in a boat. He immediately ran into Kapalıçarşı to inform his uncle.[415] After bribing the gendarme, his father was released and they stayed in İstanbul for 2 more years. Father Yorgo played football for the Galatasaray team and enjoyed the beauty of İstanbul; swam at Kadıköy beach, sailed to the Prince Islands. In 1923 the Lausanne Convention was signed, but Father Yorgo and his family wanted to stay in İstanbul. However, only those who resided in İstanbul before 1918 were allowed to stay in İstanbul. The rest had to migrate to Greece according to the Lausanne Convention. They stayed in Istanbul illegally for a year and migrated to Greece a bit late. They tried to find a place that resembled Ayancık, and finally decided to live in Platamona. They lived in tents for 2 years, and in 1926 the Greek government provided them with refugee houses. He made his living by farming and shoemaking.[416]

Father Yorgo remembered Ayancık and talked about its beauty and what a happy life they had there. He stated that nobody in Ayancık joined the Greek army during the Greco-Turkish War; however some Christians of İzmir joined the Greek army. He blamed England for backing the Greeks to invade Asia Minor and destroy their peaceful lives in Turkey. According to Father Yorgo, Mustafa Kemal was a great man; however, he should not have sent Christians to Greece because Turkey lost the most educated and skillful folk of its own. Pentzopoulos remarks that "Many of the refugees, coming from two of the most commercial centers of the Eastern Mediterranean, Constantinople and Smyrna, had vast experience in business. Among them were merchants who, already having branches in Athens, proceeded to make the Greek capital their business headquarters."[417] What Turkey lost was a gain for Greece because, "this was one of the reasons that the Anatolian disaster was called a

[415] Ibid., 128.
[416] Ibid., 129.
[417] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 165.

blessing in disguise for the hellenic world."[418] Father Yorgo informed us that they expected to be forgiven by Mustafa Kemal so that they could go back to their home country. He advised the new generations of Greek and Turkish nations not to fight again, but work hard to make peace.[419] Yalçın was surprised to see Father Yorgo stronger than his own son and asked for the secret of his strength. Father Yorgo answered: "I drank the water of the Black Sea; that's why I am strong. It is a remedy and makes me strong."[420] Another question that Yalçın asked Father Yorgo was about his fluency in the Turkish language. Father Yorgo answered proudly: "Turkish is the language of my motherland; I will not forget it."[421]

On his first visit to Greece,Yalçın could not find the Minoğlu family to return the trousseau. Asia Minor refugees requested that he go to Asia Minor on their behalf and visit their villages. Thus Yalçın went to Turkey and visited his home town, Honaz/Denizli after thirteen years of exile in Germany. He had left Turkey during the 1980 military coup and had not been to Turkey since then. His longing for his country never decreased but grew each year.[422] He realized that Asia Minor refugees have longed for their homeland for seventy years. He wondered how those people coped with that suffering and longing for seventy years while he had only suffered for thirteen years. His journey to find the Minoğlu family turned out to be an inner journey in which he tried to find himself. He says he has changed a lot since his meeting with the victims of the Lausanne Convention. He is interested in history as well as the lives of the witnesses and their concrete cultural monuments which were left damaged both in Greece and Turkey as a result of the ethnic cleansing. He believes in peace more than ever and thinks that those mosques and churches that were abandoned are calling us for peace. He has a wish that both countries restore those monuments to establish peace. On the same day and at the same time, churches in Turkey and mosques in Greece should call both communities of the Aegean for mutual peace, friendship, respect, and love. Yalçın believes that we should establish

[418] Ibid., 115.
[419] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 130.
[420] Ibid., 131.
[421] Ibid.
[422] Ibid., 159.

peace in order to avoid all kinds of displacements around the world.[423]

Yalçın initially felt hopeless about his search for the Minoğlu family; however, his father encouraged him to continue.[424] His father recollected his childhood memories as well and remarked that they got on well with their Christian neighbors. Safiye and Ramazan Yalçın were playmates and spent most of their time together in the orchard. The orchards of Asia Minor Greeks were given to the Muslim exchangees. However they cut the fruit trees and ruined the orchards because of their ignorance of fruit growing. Ramazan Yalçın was saddened by their actions, and longed for his Christian neighbors as he recollected the beauty of their village and orchards. He also mentioned that the ecological balance of the environment was also destroyed due to the destruction of the trees.[425]

Ramazan Yalçın's father Kemal Yalçın (the author is named after his grandfather) had a small shop. A finance officer of the Turkish state visited the grandfather in his shop and told him to give them whatever the exchangees needed, and the charge would be paid by the state. Since the Greek Muslims did not speak Turkish, İsmail Efendi, a teacher who knew Turkish, was appointed by the state to the shop as a translator and an accounting officer. This continued for two or three years until they started to earn their own money. There were a couple of orphans who lost their parents during deportation. Kemal Yalçın, the grandfather, adopted a girl named Fatma, looked after her like a daughter, and helped her marry and settle her life. Ramazan Yalçın had good recollections about Fatma.[426]

Kemal Yalçın was impressed by his grandfather's honesty towards his neighbors. He remembered his grandfather, Kemal Yalçın, who had been conscripted into the Ottoman army during World War I (1914-1918) as he was a student in the Süleymaniye Madrasah. He fought at Gallipoli, and then in the Greco-Turkish War against the Greeks. He was an aide-de-camp of İsmet İnönü, and he witnessed General Trikopis' capture.[427] Yalçın continued: "My grandfather fought against the invaders but never harmed the Minoğlu family; moreover, he saved the trousseau of

[423] Kemal Yalçın.
[424] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 160.
[425] Ibid., 169.
[426] Ibid., 170.
[427] Ibid., 171.

their daughter."[428] Yalçın thought that his grandfather was an honorable man whose life included contradictions but he managed to overcome them successfully. He both fought against the Greeks and protected his Orthodox Christian neighbors and their trousseau. After talking about the grandfather and the trousseau, Ümmühan Yalçın, the author's mother, opened her trunk to show Sophia's trousseau. Ramazan and Ümmühan Yalçın entrusted the trousseau to their son. Yalçın, who was honored by this mission, promised his parents that he would go to Greece again to continue his search for the Minoğlu family.[429]

Yalçın also remembered his playmate, Afero, who was a Muslim exchangee, settled in Honaz and taught him some Greek. Almost one thousand exchangees were settled in Honaz. They were given the houses of the Christians on the other side of river Kurudere. Local Muslims and the exchangees lived in different quarters and there was only one bridge between the two. In the 1950s and 60s, Yalçın was a schoolboy and he remembers stoning the kids of the exchangee families as they were passing over the bridge. Exchangees were also humiliated at school. Yalçın regrets about his actions and is ashamed of acting like that. Interestingly, the elderly people never told them not to throw stones at those kids. They got on well with the neigboring exchangee families with whom they used to cultivate land, pick fruits, and eat their meals together. Sometimes those exchangee boys and girls sang songs of their hometowns and told them how beautiful their hometowns were. However it never occurred to Yalçın to ask why his neighbors migrated from those beautiful places to Honaz. Exchangees were always unhappy, but he never asked them why they migrated to Turkey.[430]

Yalçın is ashamed of his indifference toward his neighbors and their history. He thinks that his indifference stemmed from the state policy and the national education system. His interviews with the Asia Minor refugees enabled him to realize the population exchange fully. Yalçın interviewed the Muslim exchangees as well. Emotions, longings, lamentations and sufferings were the same with the Asia Minor refugees. They were the fellow-sufferers of the Lausanne Convention on the

[428] Ibid., 172.
[429] Ibid., 174.
[430] Kemal Yalçın.

other side of the Aegean. Interviews with the Muslim exchangees will not be analyzed here because this study intends to analyze the lives and identities of the Asia Minor refugees. Yalçın's visit to Şirince is a special occasion that we need to narrate since *Farewell Anatolia* takes place in that village and Yalçın was requested by the Asia Minor refugees to visit Şirince on their behalf.

Yalçın met Nejat Atam, previous headman of Şirince, currently the president of Conservation and Development Association of Şirince. Atam's parents were from Kavala, Greece, and he was born in Şirince. Upon his retirement, he moved to Şirince since he spent his childhood in that lovely village, formerly inhabited by Asia Minor Greeks. Atam informed us that Şirince was inhabited by the Muslim exchangees after the population exchange; however, refugees were used to cultivating tobacco, not fruits and olives. Therefore, they cut down the trees of the orchard to have farmland for tobacco. Aktar emphasizes that, "there was a substantial amount of ill-considered and inappropriate settlement in both Turkey and Greece."[431] For that reason some exchangees could not orient themselves easily to the new places that they were settled. Exchangees, who could not make their living on tobacco, migrated to İzmir, and the rest tried to find solutions for survival.[432] With the support of the governor, they planted fruit and olive trees after thirty years. Atam stated that Dido Sotiriou used to visit Şirince very often and her name was given to a restaurant in Şirince.[433] Formerly, Sultan Abdul Hamid had commissioned a school in Şirince that had marble stairs and a fountain. The school, which was built in 1900, was a present to the villagers of Şirince from the Ottoman Sultan because European countries claimed that the Christians were neglected by the Turkish authorities. Therefore, it was a response to the critics of the European countries. In 1922, as the Turkish army was heading to İzmir, people left their homes without taking anything with them. Asia Minor Greeks left their tables set and their bread baked in the oven. The village was completely abandoned. Then people of neighboring villages plundered Şirince.

[431] Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation," 88.
[432] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 276.
[433] Ibid.

With the settlement of the Greek Muslims in Şirince, destruction of old monuments and buildings did not stop.[434] Nejat Atam confessed that they could not take good care of the village, its houses, and its church. He also mentioned Sabahattin Ali's visit to Şirince and his disappointment narrated in *Sırka Köşk*. Some Asia Minor refugees, who lived in Neo-Ephesus/Greece, visited Şirince a couple of years ago. New residents of Şirince welcomed them, and tried to comfort their guests.[435] Asia Minor refugees were disappointed to see Şirince in bad condition. Atam said that the villagers of Şirince have recently started to realize the importance of preserving the authentic atmosphere of the village, which caused them to found Conservation and Development Association of Şirince. Moreover, Atam knew that Asia Minor refugees were right to criticize their behavior of not preserving the village well, and he promised to make Şirince more beautiful than ever.[436]

In his collection of short stories, *Sırça Köşk* (1947), Turkish writer Sabahattin Ali included a short story titled "Çirkince." Sabahattin Ali visited Çirkince when he was a child and he remembered playing with Orthodox Christian boys.[437] He paid a second visit to Çirkince in 1947, and realized that everything was changed with the arrival of Greek Muslims because Muslims, who used to cultivate tobacco in Greece, were not capable of cultivating olives in Çirkince. That's why the landscape of the village was different from what he saw before.[438] He says, "Çirkince is a village of seven, eight hundred houses located on a mountain. I have been wondering since my childhood why this beautiful village is called Çirkince."[439] In the Turkish language Çirkince means ugly; that's why Sabahattin Ali was surprised by the contradiction. The village is now called Şirince in modern Turkey.

On his second visit to Greece, Kemal Yalçın met Aleko Ferteklidis who was from Nevşehir, Central Anatolia. He started his narration with a photo of his taken in front of *Rum* School when he was 5 years old. Aleko had a big library on the literature, art, social, and cultural aspects of Nevşehir, prepared by the Nevşehir *Rum*

[434] Ibid., 277.
[435] Ibid., 278.
[436] Ibid., 279-280.
[437] Sabahattin Ali, "Çirkince," in *Sırça Köşk* (İstanbul: YKY, 2011), 96.
[438] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 101.
[439] Ali, "Çirkince," 96.

School and published in Istanbul. The language of the books was Turkish but printed in Greek script.[440] Obviously, Aleko was one of the Karamanlis who was a native speaker of Turkish. He remembered going to the *Rum* School, which was built as a factory first and later served as a school.[441] The Greek Kingdom established schools for the Orthodox Christians to revive the Greek language among the Turkish-speaking Christians. Toynbee stresses that,

> The prominence of the schools and the number of the teachers are the most striking features of Kirkinje, and zeal for education has gone hand in hand with economic prosperity. Since the beginning of the present century the revival of the Greek language, through schools largely staffed and supported from the Kingdom, has started among the distant Christian minorities in Karaman and Cappadocia.[442]

Publication of books to educate the Christians of Asia Minor was crucial as well. Balta notes that

> A pioneer in this effort was Neophytos Mavromatis, Metropolitan of Naupaktos and Arta, who in 1718 published the first Karamanli book…The publications were intended to preserve the religious identity of the Orthodox Christian Turkish-speaking communities initially from Islamization and subsequently from missionary propaganda.[443]

Interestingly, publication of Karamanlı books continued in Salonika and Athens after the exchange of populations in 1923.[444]

According to Aleko, there were nearly eight thousand *Rum* in Nevşehir, and the Turks were the majority in the city. His father had a store in the *Büyük Çarşı* (Grand Bazaar) in the Turkish quarter, and his brother Mina had a store in the *Küçük Çarşı* (Little Bazaar) in the *Rum* quarter.[445] Aleko explained his name, "My real name is Alexandros. Turks used to call me Alihsan. Since we speak Turkish, I am called Alihsan at home. Here they call me Aleko."[446] He was six years old when

[440] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz,* 307.
[441] Ibid., 308.
[442] Tonybee, *The Western Question,* 124
[443] Balta, *Beyond The Language Frontier,* 58-59.
[444] Ibid., 60.
[445] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 308.
[446] Ibid., 309.

Lausanne was signed. He remembered taking the icons of Panayia Church with his friends before their departure. His father sold his store and his Turkish neighbors were unhappy about their neighbors' deportation and told him not to leave his home but stay in Nevşehir. In 1982 Aleko visited his hometown, Nevşehir. Their family house was empty and not in good condition. He delivered some water from the fountain that flowed in front of their house.[447] In Greece, they had hard times. His brother was killed by the Germans. He was conscripted into the army, and he fought against the partisans for 3 years. He was wounded in the war. After the war, he settled down, got married, had children, and opened a dry goods store. However, he never forgot his house in Nevşehir. For him that house was the most beautiful house in the world. His mother's grave was still there. Aleko said that the Greek state prohibited the *zeybek* dance and the *saz* both for local Greeks and Asia Minor refugees. He concluded: "Benden selam söyle Nevşehir'e!"[448]

Finally, with the help of Aleko Ferteklidis, Yalçın managed to find the Minoğlu family. Yalçın and Aleko Ferteklidis visited Yanni Minoğlu and his wife Stella in their store. Yanni and Stella knew a few words of Turkish. Aleko introduced Yalçın and told his mission, and his struggle to find the Minoğlu family. Yanni hugged the author several times with surprise and happiness and said, "You have been looking for us?"[449] He could not believe that someone from Turkey had been looking for them for two years. Then he narrated his grandfather's attitude when he was asked to change his surname. His grandfather acted just like Vasili Karabaş, and said: "I was born Minoğlu, and will die Minoğlu."[450] That's why Yanni's surname was Turkish. Yanni Minoğlu had some relatives from Denizli; however, most of them died during the deportation. Sophia's granddaughter lived in Volos. Yanni arranged a dinner at his house to bring Yalçın and Sophia's granddaughter, İrini, together. İrini was born after the wars, that's why her name was İrini, meaning peace. İrini was Stella's daughter, and she was teaching history. Sophia Minoğlu died in 1980, and Stella died in 1988. İrini had a brother, Hristo who lived in Athens. She had two children, but she did not talk about atrocities between

[447] Ibid., 310.
[448] Ibid., 311. Say 'Hi' to Nevşehir for me!
[449] Ibid., 319.
[450] Ibid.

Greeks and Turks in front of her children because she did not want her children to be nationalists. Her grandmother Sophia used to talk about the beauties of Asia Minor rather than miseries and atrocities, and she always longed for her hometown.[451]

After the dinner, Yalçın returned the entrusted trousseau of Sophia Minoğlu to her granddaughter, İrini, recounting the whole story from the past to the present. İrini was surprised to see her grandmother's trousseau coming from Turkey after seventy years. She smelled and kissed every piece of the trousseau and admired the beauty of the embroideries. İrini thanked Yalçın: "Even if you bring us just a handkerchief, it would be more precious than gold. You have brought us the trousseau and are now taking our hearts away."[452] The story has a happy ending because Yalçın fulfilled his mission both to the refugees, and his family, who kept the trousseau for seventy years with care and respect for their former Orthodox Christian neighbors. This touching story of exchanged peoples of Asia Minor indicates that Turks and Greeks were capable of living together before the rise of nationalism. The author's father passed away before Yalçın's second visit to Greece, so he never learned that his son fulfilled their mission. As I was writing this dissertation, Kemal Yalçın emailed me that his mother, Ümmühan Yalçın, passed away on 24 July, 2012 at the age of 100. She was the one who kept Sophia's trousseau in her trunk with her own wedding trousseau. She was one of those many Anatolians who kept the entrusted belongings of their former Christians neighbors with the hope of meeting again.

Interviews revealed how the Asia Minor Catastrophe was remembered by Asia Minor refugees. They all longed for their motherland, and emphasized that everything related to the motherland was beautiful and unique because the motherland was a paradise that was lost with the Catastrophe. The Greek state never fulfilled their desires and expectations because Asia Minor is more beautiful and fertile compared to Greece. Regardless of the hardships during the deportation and the war, nothing changed their strong attachment to Asia Minor. Tanasis Bakırcıoğlu never got used to living in Greece and regretted not becoming a Muslim and staying in his homeland. He emphasized the beauty of Asia Minor as he remembered his

[451] Ibid., 320.
[452] Ibid., 321.

childhood and his life with his Turkish friends. Asia Minor refugees suffered both in Asia Minor during the Greco-Turkish War and in Greece afterward; however, Asia Minor remained for them most beautiful country in the world because their roots were there and their mothers, fathers, and relatives were buried in Asia Minor. They had houses, farmlands, and businesses in Asia Minor where they made their living. The exchange of populations marked the end of their beautiful lives in Asia Minor, and the beginning of their refugee lives in Greece.

Asia Minor refugees expressed their lost homeland through the songs, fruits, and vegetables of the homeland. During the interviews Yordanis Orfanidis, Angela Katrini, and Hristo Kıryakidis sang folkloric songs of Anatolia. Bottles of water and bags of soil taken from Asia Minor helped them to connect themselves to their lost homeland. Iğsız claims that, "Visions of the departed land, the smell and taste of the water and agricultural products, but also music, songs from the lost land, are part of these nostalgic sensescapes that communicate a yearning for the lost homeland and a sensory return to this place."[453] Tanasis Bakırcıoğlu believed that there was nothing to eat in Greece, while his hometown Burdur was fertile and rich in agricultural products. Yogurt, cheese, grapes, and the bread of Burdur were totally different from what they had in Greece. Anatolian cuisine was rich.[454]

Asia Minor refugees blamed the Great Powers, especially England, for backing Greece to invade Asia Minor and destroy their peaceful lives. Bela Horvath, who travelled in Asia Minor in 1913, indicated that Turks were very helpful not only to their co-religionist but also their Christian neighbors. If the father of a Christian family went to İstanbul for a short period to set up a business, the family did not accompany him, they stayed behind. The family was taken care of by the Turkish neighbors. Christians entrusted their family to their Turkish neighbors. Horvath stated that some of the Orthodox Christians of Dilmesu village of Niğde migrated to the United States, and their children were taken care of by the Turks.[455] There was both cooperation and trust between Asia Minor Greeks and Turks, and Horvath was surprised to witness that during her investigation in Asia Minor. Refugees also

[453] Iğsız, "Documenting the Past," 467.
[454] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 115.
[455] Horvath, *Anadolu 1913*, 93.

narrated similar stories and emphasized the mutual benevolence, trust, and cooperation between Christians and Muslims before the fall of the Ottoman Empire.

Some Turkish friends and neighbors were very helpful during their deportation, and most of them cried as they left Asia Minor. Yalçın's family felt very sorry for the deportations of their Orthodox Christian neighbors. Refugees believed that the Great Powers made Orthodox Christians and Muslim Turks enemies for their own interest in the Near East. As Layoun notes, "The outcome of this series of events was, on the one hand, the further carving up of the oil-rich Middle Eastern territories of the former Ottoman Empire into protectorates, mandates, and spheres of influence by England, France, the United States, and, nominally, Italy."[456] The interest of the Great Powers in the Near East served for the politicians to homogenize the populations of Greece and Turkey. According to the refugees, Christians and Muslims got on very well before the rise of nationalism as they frequently referred their good relations back in Asia Minor.[457] Refugees were able to discuss the political atmosphere of their time, blamed the guilty party for the exchange, and wished a peaceful Aegean for Greeks and Turks. "Gratified that our memories are our own, we also seek to link our personal past with collective memory and public history"[458] notes Lowenthal. Refugees linked their personal past with collective and public history of Turkey and Greece during their narration. As readers, we can understand their time and their reaction to the Catastrophe in a wider perspective.

The arrival of Asia Minor Greeks in Greece was a traumatic experience since they were packed into the ships without any humane facilities. The journey was disgusting, as Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. ambassador to the Sublime Porte before the Lausanne Convention, narrated in *I was sent to Athens.* When Venizelos asked for assistance to the whole world, Morgenthau was sent to Athens by the U.S. government to assist. He later wrote *I was sent to Athens* about his experiences in Greece. He witnessed one of the ships delivering Asia Minor Greeks to the port of Athens:

[456] Mary N. Layoun, *Wedded to the Land* (London: Duke University Press, 2001), 32.
[457] Hirschon, "'We got on well with the Turks'."
[458] Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, 197.

> The condition of these people upon their arrival in Greece was pitiable beyond description. They had been herded upon every kind of craft that could float, crowded so densely on board that in many cases they had only room to stand on deck. There they were exposed alternately to the blistering sun and cold rain of variable September and October. In one case, which I myself held, seven thousand people were packed into a vessel that would have been crowded with a load of two thousand. In this and many other cases there was neither food to eat nor water to drink, and in numerous instances the ships were buffeted about for several days at sea before their wretched human cargoes could be brought to land. Typhoid and smallpox swept through the ships. Lice infested everyone.[459]

The conditions of the ships were terrible. They suffered during the journey; they lost their families and relatives, they were sick, tired, cold, and infested by lice. They were caught up in a range of tragedies and traumas from Asia Minor to Greece, and their tragedy did not end in Greece, either. Sotiriou also talked about the arrival of the refugees to the port of Piraeus. She said that she saw many ships transporting the refugees to the port as she was sitting and crying all day for her family whom she left behind in Asia Minor. The arrival was a tragedy since people were mad; a woman was hugging a pillow as if it was her baby, and a man was carrying dry-okra as if it was money. Sotiriou concluded that people were not aware of their behavior; the world had already gone mad.[460]

Asia Minor refugees always indicated that they had worked very hard to survive. What they meant was not normal or standard working conditions and hours because, "the producers quite often took advantage of the misfortune of the refugees to impose upon them certain terms, concerning hours and shifts, clearly unfair to them."[461] Refugees were unfortunate since they desperately needed to work and that is why "most of the factories built during this period were located near the urban settlements where the labor force was abundant."[462] Urban refugee settlements were perfect sources of cheap labor for the producers who exploited these hopeless people of Asia Minor. Women of Asia Minor were talented in carpet weaving and greatly

[459] Henry Morgenthau, *I was sent to Athens* (U.S.A: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1929), 48.
[460] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.
[461] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 162.
[462] Ibid., 161.

contributed to the carpet industry greatly in Greece as Sotiriou remarks.[463] Pentzopoulos states, "It was not until 1923 that the true carpet industry developed in Greece with the transfer of the Ionian Greeks."[464]

Unfortunately, the refugees were exploited by their employers. Within those working and living conditions, communism flourished among the refugees in Greece. Yiani Selinidis, a Communist activist, reported that "The refugees were simply a cheap labor force, which was used and exploited without recourse to justice and fairness."[465] Refugees were well aware of their exploitation.The Greek communists not only targeted the workers and peasants, but also the refugees who were forced to work beyond the standards.[466] This explains how communism found a way to influence the refugees as well as Dido Sotiriou, whose socialist point of view is reflected thoroughly in *Farewell Anatolia* and *The Dead Await*.

After recovering from the shock of the disaster and displacement, the refugees wanted to punish the persons who were responsible for their deportation from their homeland. In 1922, six high officials and generals who worked for the Asia Minor campaign were executed, and this event is called "The Execution of the Six" in Greek history.[467] Refugees supported Venizelos, and accused King Constatine for their displacement from Asia Minor. During World War I, Asia Minor Greeks were sent into exile by the Young Turks (the ruling party of the Ottoman Empire) in case they supported the Greek army. Some Asia Minor Greeks fled to Greece in order to save their lives. George Th. Mavrogordatos states that Venizelos supported those refugees against the Anti-venizelists. Therefore refugees supported Venizelos for his caring attitude toward them.[468] Kontogiorgi asserts that "Although it was Venizelos who signed the Convention for the Exchange, he was not held responsible for this outcome in the eyes of the refugees. They blamed King

[463] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.
[464] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 164.
[465] Selinidis, *Son of Refugees*, 115.
[466] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 191.
[467] Ibid., 179.
[468] George Th. Mavrogordatos, *Stillborn Republic: Social Coalitions and Party Strategies in Greece, 1922-1936* (U.S.A: University of California Press, 1983), 199.

Constantine and the Populists for the Catastrophe and their expulsion from their ancestral homes."[469]

Anti-Venizelists wanted to regard the refugees as minorities, not full citizens of the Greek state, because they were blamed for being lazy. Furthermore "The right-wing press even went so far as to demand that the government impose fines on the refugees for their low productivity and supposed laziness, and to take back the land they had been given to cultivate and return it to the 'people who were really entitled to it: the native Greeks'."[470] The right-wing press "systematically attacked the refugees, often called for their extermination, and once (in 1933) even proposed that they be required to wear yellow armbands so that the natives could avoid any contact with them."[471] Obviously, the local Greeks were discriminative against the refugees. Yiannis Karatzoglou, the father of Sophia Kappatos, received his high school diploma with a special seal which was inscribed REFUGEE.[472]

Refugees transformed Greek society in social, political, and cultural aspects. The arrival of the refugees on Greek soil was a turning point for the Greek state because most of the refugees were well-educated and had a cosmopolitan outlook. They also brought their culture and music to Greece. Stathis Gaunlett states that "Asia Minor refugees are widely credited with having first introduced into Greece the *bouzouki*, now the national instrument, and the internationally popular type of Greek song known as *rebetika*."[473] Nicholas G. Pappas notes that,

> The performers who arrived in Greece after 1922 from urban centers in Anatolia came from a long-established tradition of musical innovation and originality that had sought to blend Greek language with eastern modality and rhythms—an initially awkward yet ultimately rich juxtaposition. Many of these had received some training in classical Turkish music that had significantly broadened the various frameworks within which they composed and

[469] Elisabeth Kontogiorgi, *Population Exchange in Greek Macedonia: The Forced Settlement of Refugees 1922-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 186-187.
[470] Ibid., 187.
[471] Mavrogordatos, *Stillborn Republic*, 195.
[472] Kappatos, *The Promised Journey*, 247.
[473] Stathis Gauntlett, "Between Orientalism and Occidentalism: The Contribution of Asia Minor Refugees to Greek Popular Song, and its Reception," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 247-260 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 247.

performed.[474]

Refugees found the locals even in urban centers still performing rural music and songs of the 1821 revolution, and the upper class was listening to Western music of operattas and tangos.[475] Refugee musicians were very influential and popular until 1937, when the Westernizing dictatorship of Metaxas censored Anatolian music in Greece. He tried to eliminate the distinctive musical culture of the refugees. His act was regarded as 'genocidal'.[476] Aleko Ferteklidis also mentioned the prohibiton of the *zeybek* dance and the *saz* in Greece during his interview with Yalçın.[477] "The role of Asia Minor refugees in the production, distribution, and consumption of rebetika was undeniably immense, both in Greece and in the U.S.A."[478] Anatolian music was popular, and until the censorship in 1937, refugee musicians recorded songs in Turkish due to the demand in Salonika.[479]

Life was hard in Greece, and Asia Minor refugees always hoped to return to their motherland. That was the reason that they entrusted their belongings to their Turkish neighbors. That feeling was mutual since Yalçın's grandfather kept the trousseau of Sophia Minoğlu for seventy years, hoping they would return one day. Both Christians and Muslims did not realize that the exchange was permanent, with no return allowed. Gülper Orfanidis stated that they thought they would be back in a month.[480] Moreover they expected Mustafa Kemal Atatürk to forgive them and let them return to their homeland as Father Yorgo said before.[481] During the interviews, they kept on asking: "What was our guilt? Why did they deport us from our motherland?" Until 1974, they were not allowed to get a visa to Turkey. They waited for fifty years to visit their motherland. Yiannakopoulos notes that, "In the memory and heart of these people, their homelands — distant in terms of location and time—remained alive. From their recollections the image of the cities and

[474] Nicholas G. Pappas, "Concepts of Greekness: The Recorded Music of Anatolian Greeks after 1922," *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 2, (October 1999):354.
[475] Ibid.
[476] Gauntlett, "Between Orientalism," 247-248.
[477] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 311.
[478] Gauntlett, "Between Orientalism," 250.
[479] Ibid., 253.
[480] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 71-72
[481] Ibid., 130.

villages in which they had lived appeared in relief."[482] The most tragic end of the trip was a bag of soil and a bottle of water that they delivered from their homeland to Greece to alleviate their longing.

[482] Yiannakopoulos, "The Reconstruction of a Destroyed Picture," 203.

CHAPTER 3

NATIONALISM IN ASIA MINOR: RESOLUTION OF A CONFLICT

3.1. Greeks and Turks: Imagined Communities

Greece became an independent state in 1829, while Turkey declared its independence only in 1923 after defeating an attempt by Greeks to carve out Izmir and its environs in order to incorporate the area into Greece itself. Greeks and Turks fought each other and advocated nationalism in order to separate peoples whose regions had been geographically overlapping for centuries. Hirschon remarks that, "After World War I, the nation state was the preferred political form, and consequently the imposition of an ideology of homogeneity necessitated the rewriting of history."[483] The history of each nation was rewritten according to the newly emerging phenomenon: nationalism. Both Turks and Greeks tried to erase their political, social, cultural, and religious ties with the Ottoman Empire in the name of nationalism. They were no longer citizens of the Ottoman Empire, but citizens of their own nation-states, Greece and Turkey. The Balkan Wars, World War I, and the Greco-Turkish War lasted for twenty years, and thousands people died for the sake of nationalism in a very short period of time. This chapter will analyze the rise of nationalism in Asia Minor in selected literary texts: *Farewell Anatolia*, *Birds Without Wings* and *Emanet Çeyiz*.

Dido Sotiriou's *Farewell Anatolia* takes place in Şirince. Before the population exchange the village was called Kırkıca by the Orthodox Christians who inhabited the village. The village was also called Çirkince in the past, and now it is Şirince in modern Turkey.[484] Manolis Axiotis describes Kırkıca thus: "If paradise really exists, Kırkıca, our village, was a little corner of it. We lived close to God,

[483] Renèe Hirschon, "History's Long Shadow: The Lausanne Treaty and Contemporary Greco-Turkish Relations," in *The Long Shadow of Europe: Greeks and Turks in the Era of Post-nationalism*, eds. O. Anastasakis, K. Nicolaidis & K. Öktem, 73-94 (Netherlands: Brill, 2009), 73.
[484] For the change of the toponymes in Turkey see Kerem Öktem's article, "The Nation's Imprint." For some historical and touristic information of Şirince see Şükrü Tel, *Şirince/Once Upon a Time Çirkince*.

high up on a hillside among forested mountains with the sea in the distance."[485] *Farewell Anatolia* is narrated by an Orthodox Christian, Manolis Axiotis, who is a Greek nationalist with a strong belief in the *Megali Idea*. The novel starts in 1910 and covers the Balkan Wars, the World War I, and the Greco-Turkish War. Manolis is both the narrator and the protagonist who is transformed throughout the novel.

During World War I, Manolis is taken to the Labor Battalions as were most of the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. The landing of the Greek army changes everything in Asia Minor and Manolis joins the Greek army to fight against the Turks. The Greco-Turkish War changes the ideology of Manolis because he learns why and how the Greeks and the Turks were taken into the war. The Greek army was defeated by the Turkish army, and Smyrna was burned to ashes after three years of fighting and bloodshed. Manolis, as well as many Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor, leave their homeland before the Lausanne Convention. The novel ends with the burning of Smyrna, and we have no other information about the lives of the refugees in Greece in *Farewell Anatolia*.

Birds Without Wings also takes place on the western coast of Anatolia populated by Orthodox Christians. Louis de Bernières set his novel in Eskibahçe, a town of Fethiye (Telmossos). Eskibahçe is a multi-ethnic town inhabited by Muslims, Orthodox Christians, Armenians, and Alevis. The novel does not have a plot and it has 95 chapters and 6 epilogues narrated by different characters in the novel. Those characters are Iskander the Potter, Philothei, Drosoula, Ayşe, Georgio P. Theodorou, Karatavuk (Abdul), and İbrahim the Mad. The author tried to give voice to as many characters as possible in order to have diverse narration of life in Eskibahçe. This makes the novel more effective since we have different points of views. The biography of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is narrated by the author.

The novel opens with the prologue of Iskander the Potter who is the father of Abdul (Karatavuk). He is identified through his occupation. Since the surname law did not exist in the Ottoman Empire, people were identified through their occupations, talent, or physical features that might be different from the others. Nicknames were very common in Ottoman society for purposes of identification. A

[485] Dido Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, trans. Fred. A. Reed (Greece: Kedros, 1991), 15.

surname law in the Republic of Turkey was passed in 1934. Therefore the characters of *Birds Without Wings* do not have surnames but nicknames such as Iskander the Potter, Ali the Snowbringer, Mohammed the Leech Gatherer, Ibrahim the Mad, and Lydia the Barren. The Asia Minor Catastrophe is mentioned at the beginning of *Birds Without Wings*. Iskander the Potter in Eskibahçe, and Drosoula, exiled in Cephalonia, narrate their memories of Eskibahçe when Muslims and Christians lived happily before the Catastrophe. The novel starts with the Prologue of Iskander the Potter who confesses that "Life was merrier when the Christians were still among us, not least because almost every one of their days was the feast of some saints."[486] However, with the displacement of the Christians, the colorful life in Eskibahçe is destroyed. Iskander is an important character for this study since he remembers the past and informs us what it was like to live in a multi-ethnic town.

Drosoula, who might appear as a minor character, is actually the most important character of the novel in this context because she not only narrates their life in Eskibahçe, but also their deportation, and their new life in Greece. Interestingly, Drosoula is one of the main characters of *Captain Corelli's Mandolin*. In *Birds Without Wings*, we first read her childhood, then as a young lady married to Gerasimos and mother of a little boy, Mandras who happened to be the boyfriend of Pegalia, the heroine of *Captain Corelli's Mandolin.* Drosoula narrates their lives in Cephalonia during the occupation of the Italians in World War II and then the Greek Civil War. There is an interesting coincidence in both novels. Eskibahçe was occupied by the Italians during the Greco-Turkish War, and Cephalonia was also occupied by the Italians in World War II. Drosoula's son Mandras becomes a Communist and tries to rape Pegalia, his former fiancée, and Drosoula curses Mandras and disowns his son, remembering the death of Philothei during their deportation from Asia Minor.[487]

Philothei, the most beautiful girl in the town, is betrothed to Ibrahim since her childhood. She is also the best friend of Drosoula. The author praises her beauty and the beauty of the town throughout his novel because both of them share an unfortunate destruction at the end. Philothei and Ibrahim cannot marry because

[486] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 1.
[487] de Bernières, *Captain Corelli's Mandolin*, 451.

Ibrahim fights both in the World War I and the Greco-Turkish War without returning home for seven years. All those wars and bloodshed affect his psychology and they postpone the wedding. Meanwhile, the population exchange is approved and Philothei gets upset because she is ready to marry him and become a Muslim. She falls off a cliff while quarrelling with Ibrahim since she is torn between her family and her fiancée. Her death symbolizes the destruction of Eskibahçe.

Emanet Çeyiz has a central plot with several real characters and their oral testimonies. Kemal Yalçın tries to find the Minoğlu family in Greece to return the trousseau. It is a real story of the Minoğlu family and their trousseau with relation to Yalçın's family in Honaz/Denizli. According to Aslı Iğsız, Sophia's trousseau is the protagonist of the documentary narrative that was entrusted to Yalçın's grandfather in 1923.[488] But I think Yalçın's work has several protagonists because the peoples of the exchange are actually the protagonists of their own stories. The author interviews both the Asia Minor refugees and the Muslim exchangees in Greece and Turkey. We have several narrators together with the author, who travels and meets the refugees. His documentary narrative has a longer time period compared to others. The oldest refugee Yalçın interviewed was Anastasia from Kayseri, who migrated to Greece at the age of 25-26, and when she was interviewed, she was over a hundred. *Emanet Çeyiz* covers almost a century that also includes World War II and the Greek Civil War. The survivors of the Catastrophe also faced other disasters and wars in Greece. *Emanet Çeyiz* not only describes the Catastrophe, but also the lives of the refugees in Greece.

While Eskibahçe of *Birds Without Wings* is a multi-ethnic town, Kırkıca is inhabited only by the Orthodox Christians. Manolis explains that the *Karakol* (police station) is the only Turkish institution in Kırkıca.[489] Angela Katrini, a refugee from Kırkıca interviewed by Kemal Yalçın, said that Çirkince was a *Rum* village, and only the policemen in the police station were Turks.[490] Panayota Katırcı, another refugee,

[488] Iğsız, "Documenting the Past," 462.
[489] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 17.
[490] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 140.

narrated exactly what Angela Katrini said before about the inhabitants of the village.[491] Manolis describes the lives of the *Rum* in Kırkıca:

> The Turks from the surrounding villages—Kirsecli, Havuzlu, Balaçik—respected and admired us….Never a day went by that Turkish villagers didn't come to market with firewood, charcoal, poultry, cream, eggs and cheese, all the delicacies of Anatolia. They sold their products at our village bazaar, and bought whatever they needed from our stores. And in the evening they returned home to their villages. But some would stay over as guests in the homes of their friends. They ate bread alongside us and slept in our beds. Our people did the same thing when they visited the Turkish villages to buy cattle, horses, or the year's milk supply. And when our paths crossed on mountain paths we exchanged greetings, bows, and how-do-you-do's. "Sabahlariniz hayri olsun!" "Akşamlariniz hayri olsun!"[492]

Panayota Katırcı clarified that there were Turkish villages around Çirkince, and the Muslim Turks and the Orthodox Christians used to invite each other to their religious feasts.[493] The folk of Çirkince named their new settlement in Greece New Ephesus, which is located on the skirts of Mount Olympus.[494]

The folk of Eskibahçe speak Turkish and write the Turkish language in Greek script. Iskander the Potter says, "In those days all of us spoke Turkish, but those who could write did so in the Greek script."[495] The folk of Kırkıca speak Turkish as well, but we do not know about their writing system since Manolis only mentions the spoken language: "No Turks lived in our village, even though we spoke Turkish."[496] Angela Katrini confirmed this when she said, "We used to speak Turkish. Turkish was our language."[497] If we remember the boundaries of Cappadocia described by Evangelia Balta, we can assume that people of Kırkıca also wrote Turkish in the Greek script. Arnold Toynbee says that "Even at Kirkinje, an Orthodox village in the hills above Ephesus, a few miles from the coast and a few hours by train from Smyrna, the boys are only just learning Greek at school and the men have still to talk

[491] Ibid., 146.
[492] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 21-22.
[493] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 147.
[494] Ibid., 144.
[495] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 8.
[496] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 21.
[497] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 142.

Turkish at home to their wives, who show no signs of becoming bilingual."[498]

Birds Without Wings puts more emphasis on the issue of language. In chapter 17, "Of Reading and Writing", Nico (Mehmetçik) teaches Abdul (Karatavuk) how to read and write since Abdul only learns the Holy Quran and the life of the Prophet at school, but he is not taught how to read and write. In chapter 56, "The Letter from Karatavuk," Abdul writes a letter to his mother, Nermin, in Greek alphabet from Gallipoli as he fights in the Ottoman army in the World War I against the Allied Forces. Iskander the Potter, father of Karatavuk, cannot read the letter and takes it to Leonidas, the teacher of the town. Leonidas reads the letter to Iskander unwillingly. In chapter 58, "Karatavuk at Gallipoli: Karatavuk Remembers" (2), the commander questions Karatavuk about his letter to his mother. Karatavuk is suspected of being a Christian. Lieutenant Orhan clarifies the conflict: "There are places where Turkish is spoken and written in Greek, I have heard that is quite common on the west coast, and in particular in the south-west where this soldier comes from. The people are sometimes called Karamanlides."[499] As we mentioned in the first chapter, the Karamanlis were Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians of Anatolia who used to write the Turkish language in Greek script.

It should not be assumed that all Orthodox Christians used to speak Turkish as their mother tongue; some were bilingual, speaking both Turkish and Greek. The characters of *Farewell Anatolia*, *Birds Without Wings*, and the refugees of *Emanet Çeyiz* are Turcophone. Throughout *Farewell Anatolia* — originally written in Greek and then translated into English— the readers encounter several Turkish words such as *Sabahlariniz Hayırlı Olsun* (Good Morning), *Akşamlarınız Hayırlı Olsun* (Good evening), *Uğur ola* (Goodbye), *Otur oğlum* (Sit down, young man), *Selam söyle Anadolu'ya* (Farewell Anatolia), *Kahrolsun sebep olanlar* (Curse on the guilty ones).[500] According to Peter Mackridge, who analyzes the theme of the Asia Minor Catastrophe in Greek fiction, Sotiriou used those Turkish words to make the novel exotic:

[498] Toynbee, *The Western Question*, 120.
[499] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 340.
[500] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 22-23-64-298.

> Sotiriou's narrator-hero in *Bloodstained Earth* is a turcophone Christian for whom Greek is his second language, and his Greek speech has what the author takes to be a strong Turkish coloring. Sotiriou is obliged to resort to footnotes to interpret many of her narrator's regionalisms, while she leaves many others uninterpreted, as though their function is to contribute to the exotic atmosphere rather than to be clearly understood.[501]

According to my own understanding as an insider, it is an orientalist point of view to say that Turkish words were used for exotic purposes. In my opinion, those Turkish words were not used for exotic purposes since Sotiriou was trying to build bridges between the Greeks and the Turks to emphasize their common cultural background and language. Furthermore, her characters in *Farewell Anatolia* are Turkish-speaking, so it is natural to use Turkish words to make the reader feel the atmosphere fully. The Turkish words of *Farewell Anatolia* are a means of connecting both societies rather than separating them. The author tried to make Greeks and Turks come closer, communicate and understand each other on cultural, social, and linguistic grounds, not on political or nationalist grounds that divide people on minor differences.

Birds Without Wings, written in English, also contains many words of Turkish words such as *Nazar Değmesin* (God preserve us from the evil eye), *Maalesef* (Unfortunately), *Merhaba* (Hello), *Hoşgeldiniz* (Welcome), *Çok güzel* (Very good).[502] de Bernières knew a little Turkish. His Turkish friends in the Embassy helped him with those Turkish words. He wrote the Turkish words for an artistic purpose as well as to give people the atmosphere of the place, to give the feeling of the strangeness of it or the otherness of it. He has done it in other novels of his as well.[503] For the people who are outsiders, not familiar with the history of the Ottoman Empire, Turkey and Greece, those Turkish words might appear strange. An Orthodox Christian speaking the language of the enemy is a strange detail for contemporary people who are highly influenced by nationalism.

[501] Mackridge, "The Myth of Asia Minor in Greek Fiction," 241.
[502] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 9-75-120-155-235.
[503] Louis de Bernières.

Hirschon observes during her fieldwork that Turkish was the first language of the many refugees as well as the new generation in Greece:

> Many of the older people I got to know were barely literate yet most were familiar with at least one other language, and some were bilingual in Turkish and Greek. In the 1970s Turkish was still used as the first language of the older generation in some families, so that the children and even the grandchildren became familiar with it to different degrees. Cinemas in Kokkinia regularly showed Turkish films, which were especially popular among the elderly woman, who praised them for their high moral tone. Outings to the cinema provoked nostalgic reminiscences, providing glimpses of the countryside and landmarks of their former homes. I heard Turkish proverbs quoted, and in some families naughty children were threatened with the 'stick of Sultan Mehmet'.[504]

Asia Minor refugees continued speaking Turkish and passed it on to their children. It was the Ottoman legacy that they inherited from their past. Even the cinemas showed Turkish films that served as a means of alleviating their longing for Asia Minor, and they went to the cinema to be able to see their hometown on the silver-screen. Kemal Yalçın was surprised to witness how fluent Father Yorgo of Sinop was in Turkish. Father Yorgo stressed that Turkish was the mother tongue of his native country and he would never forget it.[505]

Asia Minor Greeks and Muslim Turks did not have any serious conflicts until 1908 when the Committee of Union and Progress with its nationalist ideology took control of the Ottoman State with their leader Enver Pasha.[506] Enver Pasha was regarded as a Turkish Napoleon by the Ottoman subjects as well as the Germans.[507] Enver Pasha's domestic and international policy was a turning point in the peaceful lives of the Greeks and Turks because nationalism started to dominate Anatolia. Anthony Smith clearly defines how nationalism destroys peaceful co-existence of people:

> Nationalism, the doctrine that makes the nation the object of every political endeavor and national identity the measure of every

[504] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 28.
[505] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 131.
[506] Toynbee, *The Western Question*, 131.
[507] Charles D. Haley, "The Desperate Ottoman: Enver Paşa and the German Empire-I," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.30, No.1 (January 1994): 9.

> human value, has since the French Revolution challenged the whole idea of a single humanity, of a world community and its moral unity. Instead nationalism offers a narrow, conflict-laden legitimation for political community, which inevitably pits culture communities against each other and, given the sheer number and variety of cultural differences, can only drag humanity into a political Charybdis.[508]

Farewell Anatolia has a very strong tone on the rise of nationalism in Asia Minor among the younger generation of Orthodox Christians. Manolis is one of those who glorify Greek culture and heritage that will flourish when the Greeks capture Constantinople and make it the capital of the Byzantine Empire just like in the old days. Pentzopoulos explains how and why Greeks have wanted to be ruled from Constantinople:

> To understand this nationalist behavior one must always bear in mind that the Greek feels emotionally much closer to Byzantium than to ancient Athens. The classical world is admired, venerated, and studied—but it is dead. The Byzantine Empire, on the other hand, is very much alive in the heart of every Greek and has conditioned all his reactions since 1453. The Turkish occupation was always temporary and from the first years of childhood every boy and girl was taught that eventually all the Greeks will be united again and form one nation with its capital in Constantinople, or as the Greeks usually say, with its capital in "Polis".[509]

This had been the main argument and purpose of the *Megali Idea* since the French Revolution. For Sotiriou, Greeks and Turks were happy together before the manipulations of the Great Powers. Therefore, *Farewell Anatolia* curses the guilty ones, the Great Powers, for their imperialist ideologies. Sotiriou, with a socialist point of view, narrates how the Great Powers manipulated the Greeks against the Ottomans in order to control the Middle East and its rich oil reserves.

Birds Without Wings of de Bernières, with its rich motifs, glorifies the peaceful co-existence of Christians and Muslims with respect to each other without any nationalist feelings or ambitions until the Greco-Turkish War. de Bernières' narrative contains many episodes which show the amicable relationship between

[508] Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (England: Penguin, 1991), 18.
[509] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 26.

Christians and Muslims. Abdul and Nico, Ayşe and Polyxeni, Abdulhamid Hodja and Father Kristoforos, Iskander the Potter and Charitos are very good friends; moreover, the novel also contains a love-story between Philothei and Ibrahim who were betrothed since their childhood. The refugees of *Emanet Çeyiz* mostly emphasized the peaceful co-existence of the Christians and the Muslims in Asia Minor during the interviews. Although atrocities between the Greeks and the Turks were also narrated in *Emanet Çeyiz*, refugees concluded their stories with reference to their good relations with their Turkish friends and neighbors.

The characters of the selected texts have different approaches to politics and nationalism. The characters in *Farewell Anatolia* are political and the villagers of Kırkıca are irredentist nationalists who believe in the *Megali Idea*.[510] Throughout *Farewell Anatolia*, Asia Minor Greeks perceive themselves as the most talented, intelligent, and powerful compared to the Turks. Manolis is proud of living in a village without Turks. In his own words, he notes, "No Turks lived in our village, even though we spoke Turkish. Love for our Greek motherland burned like an eternal flame in our hearts. The Turks from the surrounding villages— Kirsecli, Havuzlu, Balaçik—respected and admired us; we were clever people, they said, and hard-working."[511] The folk of Kırkıca, despite their good relations with Turks, perceived themselves as superior to Turks because they were clever, and that's why Turks admired them. One day, Şevket's father gets sick and Şevket was worried about his father's health. Manolis tells Şevket to bring his father to Kırkıca and informs his friend about the doctor who can heal the sick people with medicines. "Like all the Turkish villages his was backward. Doctors and teachers? Never heard of them"[512] says Manolis. Turkish villagers do not have teachers and doctors; they have a hodja who tries to heal the sick through the verses of the Holy Quran. Hodja cannot cure Şevket's father, and Şevket takes his father to Kırkıca. Manolis and his family host them very well and the sick man gets better in a week and says, "What kind of people are these *Rum*? Does Allah (God) always create them clever?"[513]

[510] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 58.
[511] Ibid., 21.
[512] Ibid., 25.
[513] The quotation is translated by me from the Turkish translation of the novel: Dido Sotiriyu, *Benden Selam Söyle Anadolu'ya* (İstanbul: Sander Yayınları, 1980), 28.

Sotiriou, in a way, tries to show that the Ottoman Greeks were developing a superiority complex toward Turks due to their nationalist feelings. Manolis tells Şevket that he was going to Smyrna to become a trader. "The little Turk froze, and asked 'what is a trader'?"[514] remarked Manolis because Şevket was an ignorant little Turk who had no idea about trade or traders. Ottoman Greeks were capable of engaging in trade whereas Turks were incapable of trading due to their lack of intellect and skills. Manolis, who is sent to Smyrna to learn trade, is shocked to witness his boss, Mihalakis Hadjistavris, a *Rum* merchant, deceiving a very poor Turkish peasant who came to his shop to sell his raisins.[515] As a farmer in Kırkıca, Manolis becomes disappointed at the exploitation of the peasants by the rich Greek merchants of Smyrna. Sotiriou also depicts the financial inequality of the Christians and the Muslims in Asia Minor as well as the role of the Levantines in Asia Minor that we will discuss later in this chapter.

Sotiriou depicted Christians as politically stronger than the Muslims in *Farewell Anatolia* as well. The atrocities of the Ottoman Greeks on Muslim Turks are observed by Manolis during his stay in Smyrna. One of his bosses, Yannakos Louloudias, is a smuggler whose nickname is "Dirty dog" since he has killed many Turks.[516] Another man, Stelios Tirlalas, "would kill a Turkish patrolman or gendarme one evening and take his coffee the following morning at the Bella Vista, stroking his mustache, without the authorities daring to touch a hair on his head."[517] Ottoman Greeks and Turks do not seem to have good relations in Smyrna. Moreover, the Christians are powerful and can dare to kill Muslims without any reaction from the Turkish authorities. The *Rum* of Smyrna believe that they are the ones who rule the empire, as one of them says, "We are the brains. The simple Turks know it, and they love us."[518] The Turks are simple people who admire the intellect of the *Rum*. Sotiriou clearly shows that the *Rum* and the Turks speak the same language, Turkish, they share the same culture that they had created together; however, financial inequalities have created enmity between the two. For the people of Kırkıca, Muslim

[514] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 27.
[515] Ibid., 44.
[516] Ibid., 48.
[517] Ibid., 49.
[518] Ibid., 71.

Turks are the "other" who have simple behavior and intellect compared to themselves.

On the other hand, most of the characters in *Birds Without Wings* are apolitical and do not humiliate the Muslims except Daskalos Leonidas, the teacher of the town, and Leyla Hanım, the Circassian mistress of Rüstem Bey whose real name is Ioanna. She is not an active nationalist. Leonidas is an active Greek nationalist just like Manolis. He advocates the *Megali Idea* and has great ideals to die for. However, he never joins the Greek army because

> He lived in constant fear of arrest, and had no illusions as to his treatment in the event. Certainly he was prepared to suffer and to die for Greece, but he knew that he was not made naturally in the heroic mould. His life was a kind of martyrdom, believing so much in a great ideal and an historic mission, but at the same time knowing perfectly well that he was no Agamemnon or Achilles.[519]

Leonidas with his great ideals "defied his father firmly, and went to Eskibahçe to try and educate the Greeks back into being Greeks. He wanted to knock the Turkishness out of them. He wanted them to speak Greek instead of Turkish, and learn about the classical past."[520] "He hated having to speak Turkish, but in this town nobody spoke anything else, albeit larded with odd off cuts of Persian, Arabic and Greek."[521]

Interestingly, de Bernières did not depict a nationalist Ottoman Greek who fought for the "Greater Greece" in the Greek army against the Turkish army in *Birds Without Wings*. Readers might expect to read the adventures of an Ottoman Greek in the novel. I asked him the reason for this in our interview. He answered that in his own understanding the Orthodox Christians of the Ottoman Empire were not nationalistic because they were enjoying more privileges in Asia Minor compared to the citizens of the Greek Kingdom. Furthermore, Christians regarded themselves as very cultured, sophisticated, and cosmopolitan. There were no major conflicts between the the Christians and the Turks until the labor battalions initiated in World War I that converted the Orthodox Christians to nationalism.[522] For that reason, *Birds*

[519] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 325-326.
[520] Ibid., 261.
[521] Ibid., 81.
[522] Louis de Bernières.

Without Wings does not have a nationalist Ottoman Greek fighting in the Greek army. It appears the author also did not want to destroy the peaceful atmosphere of Eskibahçe through a Greek nationalist character. Eskibahçe was destroyed by the external nationalist forces. The villagers, who were apolitical, were actually the victims of those external political and nationalist ideologies that affected their lives. Leonidas remains as an inactive and voiceless character.

Ioanna is not an active nationalist character in the novel; however, her last comments during the deportation with Asia Minor Greeks are important. She humiliates Asia Minor Greeks for not being "real" Greeks since they do not speak Greek. We will analyze her comments in Chapter 4. Since Ioanna is a mistress, the women of Eskibahçe avoid talking to her. For Asia Minor Greeks, she is morally corrupted. She only has two friends to talk to: Philothei and Drosoula. Philothei is her maid, and Drosoula is accompanying her best friend. Here is what Drosoula recalls in Cephalonia:

> Leyla Hanım said something in a foreign language and we just stood there dumbly and looked back at her. Then she said, 'I thought you people were Greek.' We didn't know what she was getting at, and we felt uneasy, and then she said, 'Doesn't anybody speak Greek?' Philothei said, 'Daskalos Leonidas does. He tries to teach it to the boys. And Father Kristoforos, he does.'[523]

Ioanna is disappointed since she is looking forward to speaking Greek in Eskibahçe.[524] One day, Ioanna calls Drosoula "Drosoulakimou", but the girls again do not understand that it is Greek. She also tries to teach some Greek to Philothei and says: "This language is the language of your forefathers that the Christians in this place have gradually forgotten."[525] According to Ioanna, the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor were ethnically Greek, but they had forgotten their ethnic origin under the reign of the Ottomans. They adopted the language of the ruler, Turkish, and forgot Greek, their mother tongue.

In *Emanet Çeyiz*, refugees tell of the good relations between Christians and Muslims back in Asia Minor. Nicholas Kazakoglou, father of Panayota Katırcı, was

[523] Ibid., 215.
[524] Ibid.
[525] Ibid., 220.

the only person mentioned in the book that joined the Greek army spurred on by nationalist feelings, as he later confessed.[526] As Vasili Karabaş and Father Yorgo stated, elderly people of their villages believed that the Greek Kingdom was backing them against the Ottomans and there was nothing to be afraid of. Kiriakos Miçopulos, interviewed by CAMS, narrated that his father shouted at some Jewish people who humiliated Armenians and the Christians in a discussion: "We have our King to protect us. Who do you have for protection?"[527] This was a common belief among nationalist Ottoman Greeks— that Armenians and Jews did not have their own national state or kingdom to protect them. However, they were not hopeless because the Greek Kingdom was protecting them against the Ottoman Empire. Obviously, Asia Minor Greeks were gradually becoming nationalistic before the Catastrophe.

The rise of nationalism in Kırkıca happened systematically. The folk of Kırkıca were not aware of their ancient history and historical monuments in Ephesus before. Manolis conveys that

> Nearby was the ancient city of Ephesus, which, to tell you the unvarnished truth, really didn't interest us. Even so our houses, from door-stoops to main staircases, were decorated with ancient fragments. But the best part was that our village was mentioned in Greek books. *Oreine Ephesus* they called it, and it showed how far back we went.[528]

This awareness of the ancient Greek history revived due to the efforts of the school teacher who arrived from Samos to Kırkıca who was named Pythagoras Larios.[529] Larios was successful in his mission to teach Greek nationalism to the folk of Kırkıca. Manolis describes how they were proud of their ancient history:

> When Europeans or Americans appeared in Ephesus with their western clothes and their foreign languages, accompanied by learned Greeks, poking and prodding around in our ruins, well, the villagers— and Father first and foremost—puffed up with pride. Call it what you like, there had to be something special about our homeland. "In the fullness of time…. the marbled king will rise

[526] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 151.
[527] KAAM, *Göç*, 142.
[528] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 19.
[529] Ibid.

> again…" said the priests, and the longing for union to Greece welled up inside us.[530]

Manolis inevitably became a nationalist due to the atmosphere of Kırkıca in which the villagers were indoctrinated to be ruled from Constantinople once the Byzantine Empire was revived. "Love of our Greek motherland burned like an eternal flame in our hearts"[531] says Manolis.

On the other hand, Leonidas is not successful at teaching the Orthodox Christians the Greek language. He is one of those teachers appointed by the Kingdom to teach the Greek language to the Orthodox Christians. However, he fails to revive Greek nationalism in Eskibahçe. He is well-educated, and a member of *Philika Etairia* (Friendly Society), a revolutionary organization of the Greek nationalists founded in Odessa in 1814.[532] It was founded to liberate the Orthodox Christians from Ottoman rule, and to establish a "Greater Greece" as in the old days. Leonidas cannot revive nationalism, but he manages to teach the Turkish language written in Greek script. This is his only achievement and this is how Nico learns writing Turkish in Greek letters. Upon Abdul's request, Nico teaches Abdul how to read and write Turkish in Greek script. Mirsini Kapsali, whose mother tongue was Turkish and interviewed by CAMS in Greece, said that her school was in the garden of their church in Balıkesir: "We learnt Greek at school; however we do not speak Greek. We spoke Turkish both at home and outside."[533]

Greeks regarded themselves as having been a nation dating back to Homeric times and believed that European civilization was based on Ancient Greek thought and philosophy. The Byzantine Empire had been Greek; therefore, Greeks believed that it was their right to revive the Byzantine Empire with its capital in Constantinople. Koliopoulos and Veremis explain how Greeks perceived themselves as they were heading for rebellion against the Ottomans:

> i)The Greeks were a nation distinct and separate from the Turks; ii)The Greeks were subjects of masters who imposed obligations on their subjects but showed no respect for their rights; iii)The Greeks

[530] Ibid., 21.
[531] Ibid.
[532] Heraclides, *The Greek-Turkish Conflict*, 32.
[533] KAAM, *Göç*, 97-98.

> had been subjugated by force and had signed no treaty with their suzerain, who exercised illegitimate authority over them; iv)The Turks were foreign to the lands of Europe they lorded over and should be forced to abandon these European lands; v)The Greeks had the right to rejoin the European family of nations, which owed so much to the Greek classical legacy.[534]

According to some Greek nationalists, the glorious history and civilization of the Greeks had been destroyed by the Ottoman Empire. Since then the Greeks had been the slaves of the Ottomans for four hundred years. Furthermore, they regarded themselves as chained by the Turks, and it was time to revolt against the "barbarian" Ottomans.

Adamantis Korais, who lived in Paris and was very much influenced by the ideals and thoughts of the French Revolution, initiated the Greek Enlightenment. He perceived "classical Greece as the foundation of modernity and the Ottoman Empire as a reactionary force which had held back and corrupted Greeks. A return to original, pure Greek values was thus crucial to the modern achievement of Greek national independence."[535] Korais was appointed as the leader of the *Philika Etairia*, and influenced intellectuals to "agree that the Greeks have a very long history, that the modern Greeks are descendants of the Ancient Greeks and that the 'Turks' are the traditional enemy and are 'uncivilized', essentially 'barbarians', up to the present day."[536]

Alexandros Ypslantis, a young Phanariot[537] General in the Russian army, launched the Greek Revolution on 21 February 1821, at Kishinev in Russia. With the support of Britain, France, and Russia, Greeks gained their independence with the Treaty of Edirne (Adrianople) on 14 September 1829. Greece was recognized as an independent state by the instigating European nations, Britain, France, and Russia on

[534] Koliopoulos and Veremis, *Modern Greece,* 16.
[535] John Breuilly, "Bringing History Back into Nationalism," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, ed. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızıkyürek & Umut Özkırımlı, 1-17 (U.K: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 3.
[536] Heraclides, *Greek-Turkish Conflict*, 9.
[537] A Phanariot was a member of Greek elite in Constantinople. Ottoman Sultans appointed Phanariots as governors in Moldavia and Wallachia.

3 February 1830.[538] Not all Greeks were in favor of an independent state as Salahi Sonyel remarks:

> It was the overseas Greeks who first conceived a Greek rebellion as a nationalist movement on the European model; and it was they who provided the initiative and the organization which launched the rebellion. With the establishment of the secret 'Friendly Society' in 1814, with the aim of promoting a rebellion in the Ottoman Empire, the members were given the responsibility of finding new recruits, who were admitted into the society with weird ceremonies of initiation and oath of secrecy.[539]

David Brewer notes that "The Great Idea became practically an article of faith with Greek politicians and to hate the Turks became an important part of being a Greek, an attitude fostered in education from primary school to university."[540]

Although Leonidas lives in a multi-ethnic town, he does not have any close friends among the Turks. Moreover, he does not like Turks and helps them unwillingly when he is asked. He isolates himself from the society and the Turks. He is always busy writing letters to another member of the local *Philika Etairia* in Smyrna.[541] When Karatavuk sends a letter to his mother in Greek script, Iskander the Potter asks help from Leonidas to read the letter to him. Leonidas reads the letter unwillingly, and also is surprised to see that a Turk of a small town is able to write a beautiful letter.[542] When Leonidas writes back to Karatavuk, he admits that, he "had become accustomed to believing that Turks are intellectually idle to the last degree."[543] The negative and ill feelings are mutual and Iskander the Potter declares his feelings towards Leonidas:

> This Leonidas, however, was one of the ones who was fussing and campaigning, saying that the Christians should speak Greek and not Turkish. He forced the children to learn the Greek tongue that to them was like chewing stones, and he stirred up resentment in them with stories about how we Osmanlis had taken the land from the Greeks, and that the land was rightly theirs. I have heard it

[538] Heraclides, *Greek-Turkish Conflict*, 34.
[539] Sonyel, *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire*, 173
[540] David Brewer, *Greece, the Hidden Centuries: Turkish Rule from the Fall of Constantinople to Greek Independence* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2010), 6.
[541] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 326.
[542] Ibid.
[543] Ibid., 354.

> said that this place belonged once to a people called Lycians, that the Greeks took it from them, so why did this teacher not tell the children that all land is originally stolen? Why did he not say 'Let us find the Lycians, and give it back?[544]

Leonidas does not have a good reputation in the town and he is not liked by the people of Eskibahçe. Georgio T. Theodorou, a friend of Leonidas and his father who is a merchant and a philanthropist of Smyrna, says that he is one of the few people who like Leonidas.[545]

When Greece founded an independent kingdom in 1829, Asia Minor was inhabited by Ottoman Greeks, who were mostly Turkish-speaking and had no idea of Greece. Most of them were fairly rich and did not need any support from the Kingdom of Greece on the other side of the Aegean. Wealthy Greeks were notable merchants in the society. Georgio T. Theodorou is one of those who became rich by supplying some essential items to the Ottoman authorities during World War I.[546] While the Greeks of Greece were willing to rebel, the Ottoman Greeks did not have any idea of rebellion against the Ottomans due their privileges and wealth in Asia Minor. The following paragraphs will reflect the conflict between Leonidas and his father who disagrees about the *Megali Idea*.

The father of Leonidas, who is a rich merchant in Smyrna, does not want to be a citizen of the Greek Kingdom. He gets very angry at Leonidas when he learns his son's affiliation to *Philika Etairia*, and starts shouting at him showing their richly decorated house with the carved furniture and the heavy carpets: "Do you want us to lose everything?"[547] Leonidas gets pale and says that his struggle was for Greece. His father gets furious and continues shouting at him:

> Those idiots with their Big Idea! They have no idea! Can Greece win a war against the Turks? Do you know how many of them there are? You're crazy! You want to be ruled from Athens? Have you ever been to Athens? It's a shitty little village, that's what! A shitty little provincial village with some ruins and no theatre worth going to, and the people with no education and no culture, and the

[544] Ibid., 8.
[545] Ibid., 257.
[546] Ibid., 257.
[547] Ibid, 258.

> houses with all the paint peeled off, and they can't even speak Greek properly! Is that what you want? You're a fool.[548]

For the father, Greece is not a country that can compete with the empire. He even looks down on Greek culture and language. There is nothing attractive in Greece for the father, who has already had a luxurious life in Smyrna, a cosmopolitan city with high culture.

Leonidas tries to defend himself and says that the new Greece would be ruled from Constantinople just as the old Greece was. His father reminds him that they had already been ruled from Constantinople referring to the Ottomans, and ignoring the real intention of Leonidas. Leonidas reminds his father that they were ruled by the Turks, which was in itself an insult for the Greeks. Then his father explains to him why they should not care about it at all:

> Well, why should we care precisely? Here in Smyrna we have the most pleasant and delightful city in the world. We are all prosperous. We don't have to give a damn about what happens in the capital. We virtually make our own laws. We are in paradise, and you and your friends want to mess it up with your stupid Big Idea, for God's sake! It is nostalgia, pure and simple! Do you want us all to go to the wall for the sake of nostalgia? We are all Ottomans now. Times have changed. Anyway, look at all my servants. What are they? They are all Turks. Look at Georgio's servants. They are all Turks. Who digs the road and carries away the night-soil? Turks. Who slaves in the fields to grow the produce that we sell on? Turks. Don't tell me we are governed by Turks, when the evidence to the contrary is right in front of your eyes. What could we do without them? How can a son of mine be so stupid? That's what I want to know! And you want to destroy everything we are!"[549]

The father thinks that they are all Ottomans, and time has already changed. He identifies himself as an Ottoman living in Asia Minor. *Megali Idea* is pure nostalgia that would mess everything up. There were many Ottoman Greeks who shared the same idea with the father of Leonidas, as Clark states: "Wealthy Ottoman Greeks were enjoying much greater commercial opportunities than the struggling Hellenic kingdom could offer them, and they were in no hurry whatever to join the new

[548] Ibid., 259.
[549] Ibid.

kingdom."[550]

The father of Leonidas describes Turks as their servants. The same issue was also mentioned several times in *Farewell Anatolia*. This was totally the opposite of the Greek historiography that claimed that Ottoman Greeks were the 'subject people' or 'slaves' for four hundred years. Hirschon remarks,

> In formal terms at certain periods Christians actually felt superior. This can be explained by the particular structuring and identity generated by the *millet system*, which promoted vertical rather than horizontal (class-based) cleavages. Their sense of superiority is conveyed in commonly heard phrases, such as 'we were well-off there; we had the Turks as our servants, one might say. They used to work for us' (*Kala eimastan ekei, mallon tous eichame sklavous, doulepsan yia mas*).[551]

Oral testimonies and Hirschon's analysis demonstrate the structure of the Ottoman society, which was not composed of classes that grouped its subjects according to their wealth and position. Therefore, it was not unusual for both Christians and Muslims to be the masters or the servants. Obviously, both Greeks and Turks served each other as they lived together in Asia Minor. This is part of life, not a matter of ethnic superiority of one group over another.

Leonidas cannot convince his father. Furthermore, the conversation goes back to Alexander the Great and his Hellenistic culture that Leonidas admires. His father does not glorify the Hellenistic age, and criticizes Alexander the Great and his actions:

> Spreading our culture and civilization all over the world? Well, forgive me my heterodoxy, but he did it by spreading slaughter and destruction from Macedonia to India. How many weeping widows and raped virgins went and thanked him for his culture, do you suppose? Don't you know what inevitably arrives in the wake of glorious military conquest? Famine and disease, famine and disease.[552]

This was exactly what happened in the Greco-Turkish War as well. Thousands of Greeks and Turks were killed, suffered from famine and disease, and almost 1.5

[550] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 7.
[551] Hirschon, "Knowledge of Diversity," 70.
[552] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 260.

million people were deported from their motherland for the sake of "Greater Greece" and the highly cultured Hellenism of Asia Minor.

Georgio T. Theodorou, a rich merchant of Smyrna, is also against the idea of joining the Greek Kingdom and explains why wealthy Asia Minor Greeks oppose the idea of "Greater Greece":

> We Asia Minor Greeks are caught between the hot-headed idealists and nationalists who wanted to turn the world upside down in the name of a beautiful vision of Byzantium, and the sensible fellows like me and Leonidas's father, who wanted a nice comfortable life trading in commodities and getting whatever we wanted because we were clever and rich enough to get it. I do remember that in those days everyone thought they were entitled to an empire, and perhaps Leonidas and his friends were just a symptom of the times, like Mussolini. Personally, I liked the idea of a new Greater Greece, in theory, but I couldn't see the point of risking anything for it, and I couldn't stop thinking of the mainlanders as at worst a bunch of crazy foreigners, or at best like embarrassing cousins with too many halfwits in the family. I wasn't in any kind of mood to die for them, and no one was more surprised than me when they decided to come over and die for us. I can't say I was very surprised, however, when the fiasco concluded with all us losing everything, and it was we who died for them.[553]

Asia Minor Greeks, who opposed the *Megali Idea*, did not want to be disturbed by the Greeks and their irredentist policy. Sotiriou also mentions the wealthy Ottoman Greeks in Constantinople who do not have any patriotic feelings toward the Greek Kingdom. Melidis says to Manolis: "You should see the rich Greeks of Constantinople; it's unbelievable! Gold-plated dining rooms! But patriotism? Forget it. Everything for their purses."[554]

Ottoman Greeks used to have different attitudes towards the *Megali Idea*. It is crucial to know that not every single Orthodox Christian subject of the empire was irredentist and advocated Greek nationalism. Greeks had different attitudes and ideas on the revival of Hellenism. Hercules Millas classifies the attitudes of the Greeks and the Ottoman Greeks before and after the Greek Revolution and Independence in *Yunan Ulusunun Doğuşu* (The Birth of the Greek Nation). Millas enlightens us about

[553] Ibid., 261.
[554] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 163.

Rēgas, who wanted to have a democratic state for all subjects of the Ottoman Empire inspired by the French Revolution, and the Republicans who wanted to have an independent Greece. Özkırımlı and Sofos states that

> Rigas was possibly the first in a line of thinkers who were convinced that the long coexistence of the peoples of the Ottoman Empire had created bonds, solidarities and a sense of a common destiny too precious to give up, and therefore were reluctant to see this 'Ottoman' heritage vanish under the force of the nationalist movements emerging at the time.[555]

There were also Conservatives who believed that the best solution for the Ottoman Greeks was to live under the reign of the Ottomans. Demetrios Katartzes, one of the Conservatives and a Phanariot born in 1730 in İstanbul, supported the idea that the ancient Greek language be taught and learned.[556] Phanariots always spoke Greek because a cultured Phanariot had to know the Greek language, literature, and culture.[557] It was how they were educated in İstanbul; but nationalism was not very popular among the Phanariots. Katartzes claimed that there were no longer ancient Greeks since they disappeared with paganism, and it was better to live as Ottoman Greeks because Greeks were not capable of founding their own state. Katartzes believed that Orthodox Christians were privileged under the reign of the Ottomans. Moreover, the Ottomans were sent by God to protect the Orthodox Christians. After all, states were founded by the will of God and subjects of the state had to obey the rules and be faithful to the ruler.[558] Athanasios Parios and Nikēforos Theotokēs were other Conservatives who believed that the best choice for the Ottoman Greeks was to live with the Turks under the reign of the Ottomans.[559]

The ideology of Conservatives reminds us of the declaration of Papa Eftim, the spiritual leader of the Orthodox Turks, who also believed that Orthodox Christians of Anatolia had to obey the Ottoman State that had been protecting them for centuries, and were sent by God for their own good. Ahmet Efiloğlu has a different interpretation of Helleno-Ottomanism. He claims that people who

[555] Özkırımlı and Sofos, *Tormented by History*, 19.
[556] Herkül Millas, *Yunan Ulusunun Doğuşu* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2006), 113.
[557] Ibid., 112.
[558] Ibid., 116.
[559] Ibid., 126.

advocated Helleno-Ottomanism were not faithful to the state. However, they wanted to Hellenize the institutions of the Ottoman Empire by acquiring high positions in the administration. Helleno-Ottomanism could not gain any popularity among the Ottoman Greeks because the *Megali Idea* was more popular than Helleno-Ottomanism.[560] Nilüfer Erdem claims that Helleno-Ottomanism was a program of political action revived at the beginning of the twentieth century that aimed to gain control of the Ottoman Empire.[561] According to some historians, this was a strategy of some Ottoman Greeks to have the control of the Ottoman state secretly.

Although Leonidas and Manolis are nationalists, there are several differences between them. First of all, the villagers in Kırkıca and Eskibahçe have different attitudes towards the *Megali Idea*. Leonidas is the only character who openly supports the *Megali Idea* in Eskibahçe, whereas in Kırkıca everybody has strong beliefs in the *Megali Idea*. Panagis and Mihalis, brothers of Manolis, are conscripted into the Turkish army during the Balkan Wars in 1912. Mihalis deserts from the Turkish army and joins the Greek army. Manolis reports: "It is a sacred thing he's done," Father said, while the priests and the schoolmaster and the village elders secretly praised his actions as something to be emulated."[562] The villagers are glad that Mihalis deserted and joined the Greek army. Manolis is not alone in his mission as is Leonidas. The life of Manolis Axiotis is different from the life of Leonidas. Manolis lives in a village with no Turks. However, he has a close friend, Şevket, a Turk from a neighboring village. He does not hate Turks or Turkish language. He gets on well with the Turks. However, Leonidas does not have any Turkish friends although he lives with the Turks in Eskibahçe. Moreover he hates Turks and Turkishness.

Another important difference between the two is their way of fighting for "Greater Greece". Leonidas never fights on the battlefield for the sake of "Greater

[560] Efiloğlu, *Osmanlı Rumları*, 16.
[561] Nilüfer Erdem, "Yunan Osmanlılığının En Önemli Temsilcilerinden Suliotis-Nikolayidis'in Kaleminden 'İstanbul Örgütü' ve II. Meşrutiyet Dönemindeki Etkinlikleri," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yakın Dönem Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi,* No.12 (Haziran 2007): 89-90.
[562] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 58.

Greece" since "he is not Agamemnon or Achilles."[563] In January 1915, Manolis is taken to the labor battalions in Ankara with seventy of his fellow villagers during World War I.[564] He faces hardship and says that "Turkish government did not trust the Christians; all were to be conscripted, but without weapons or uniforms. They were to join units baptized *Amele Taburu* (Labor Battalions)."[565] When the war breaks out between Greece and Turkey, Manolis joins the Greek army to fight against the Turks. While Leonidas fights intellectually, Manolis fights physically for the *Megali Idea*. Vretu Meneksepulu, from Şile, stated that Ottoman Greeks were conscripted to the Ottoman army during the Balkan Wars; however some of them joined the Bulgarian army when Ottomans were fighting against the Bulgarians or the Greek army when Ottomans were fighting against Greeks. Ottoman Greeks were not conscripted to the army during World War I. They were taken to the labor battalions instead and were not given weapons.[566]

Çağlar Keyder states that "Greek and Armenian conscripts were mostly stationed in labor camps in the interior to work on road projects. Many of them died either during the march to the camps or later as they work."[567] Nico (Mehmetçik) in *Birds Without Wings* is an Orthodox Christian who does not want to be taken to the labor battalions as most of the Christians were taken during the World War I and the Greco-Turkish War. Mehmetçik wants to fight against his co-religionists in World War I with the aim of protecting his Sultan.[568] However he is told that it is a Holy War against the Franks, which means against non-Muslims. Therefore Christians cannot fight in a Holy War. He is taken to the labor battalion, and he also deserts and becomes an outlaw in the mountains.[569] The term 'Franks' referred collectively to the Great Powers, and not only to the French, who influenced and inspired Ottoman society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As Karatavuk fights in Gallipoli, he understands with whom the Ottomans allie: "I had not been aware that Franks were divided among themselves, and I thought it strange, as I still do, that these

[563] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 326.
[564] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 93.
[565] Ibid., 70.
[566] KAAM, *Göç*, 167-168.
[567] Keyder, "Consequences," 42.
[568] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 292-293.
[569] Ibid., 579.

German Franks were fighting alongside us when our Christians were forbidden to do so."[570]

When Mehmetçik comes back home, he meets Karatavuk, his best friend, and confesses that he took it as an insult when he was not allowed to serve the Sultan on the battle field.[571] Nico says, "Suddenly it matters that I am a Christian, where it mattered only a little before."[572] de Bernières depicted Nico as a faithful Ottoman subject who was not a Greek nationalist. There is an irony here. In modern Turkey, all Turkish soldiers are called Mehmetçik. Turkish society has always held the army in the highest regard and the soldiers, since defending the country is considered a sacred duty. The irony here is that, Nico, as a Christian, is named Mehmetçik but cannot fight in the army despite his willingness to do so.

The Ottoman Empire had differing requirements for military service. Up to 1908, non-Muslims were exempted from the service. It was a privilege for them. They used to pay taxes in-lieu of military service. However, poor Christians could not pay the tax and they were taken into the army after 1908. Keyder asserts that

> When the war began and the government called up the reserves for military service, it was still possible to buy one's way out. Poorer Greeks, however, could not pay the compensation and so had to face conscription (up to the age of forty eight), but many either did not present themselves for service or deserted at a later date. Some of their families were deported.[573]

Vasili Karabaş said that his father was taken to the army in 1914, and died as he was fighting against the Great Powers.[574] Vasili Vasilyadis, another refugee, said that his father died in the Balkan Wars as he was fighting against the Greeks.[575] Hristo Kıryakidis never had a chance to know his father since his father died in 1916 in World War I.[576] Anastasia, the oldest refugee that Kemal Yalçın interviewed, said that her husband and the men of their village were sent into exile.[577] This exile must

[570] Ibid., 338.
[571] Ibid., 580.
[572] Ibid., 296.
[573] Keyder, "Consequences," 42.
[574] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 77.
[575] Ibid., 100.
[576] Ibid., 296.
[577] Ibid., 106.

be the labor battalions. Petro Kabasakaloğlu also said that his father was taken to the labor battalions in Van, Bitlis, and Yozgat. His father and two of his nephews managed to desert and went to Egypt. After that, they sailed to Salonika.[578]

3.2. Imperialism in Asia Minor

Dido Sotiriou, who was a socialist, cursed the guilty ones for the destruction of Asia Minor in *Farewell Anatolia*. Doulis remarks that, "Mrs. Sotiriou's objective, as in *The Dead Await*, is not merely to document events but to interpret them in the light of an ideology."[579] Sotiriou's socialist ideology leads her to the view that it was the Great Powers that destroyed the good relations between the Turks and the Greeks.[580] She asserted that the Great Powers promised Greece to revive the Byzantine Empire. However, it was a political strategy to keep Turkey and Greece busy fighting so that they could grab the oil in Mosul easily.[581] Demosthenes Kourtovik explains that the Greek left-wing used to blame the Great Powers for the Catastrophe.[582] Sotiriou reflects her socialist perspective during the Greco-Turkish conflict through her characters. She depicted World War I through the labor battalions on which Manolis served, and described the prevailing political atmosphere of the era through dialogue between the characters of the novel. Doulis notes that "Manolis acts as the moral guide of the reader from the turn of the century to the upheaval of the Disaster."[583]

Manolis, an honest man, is informed about the politics of the era by the other characters of the novel. Barba Yakoubis, who "was a peasant, but a perceptive and kind-minded fellow,"[584] explains to Manolis why the Levantines are dangerous to the

[578] Ibid., 26.
[579] Doulis, *Disaster and Fiction*, 203.
[580] See also Dido Sotiriou's non-fictional work on western imperialism, *Hē Mikrasiatikē Katastrophē kai hē stratēgikē tou imperialismou stēn anatolikē Mesogeio* (The Asia Minor Catastrophe and the Strategy of Imperialism in Eastern Mediterranean).
[581] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.
[582] Demosthenes Kourtovik, "Anadolu'nun Sonelere İlham Kaynağı Olmaktan Çıktığı Zamanlar: Küçük Asya Felaketi'nin Yunan Edebiyatındaki Yankıları," (Echoes of the Population Exchange of in Greek Literature), in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 205-219 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 207.
[583] Doulis, *Disaster and Fiction*, 203.
[584] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 56.

Ottoman Greeks:

> Today our quarrel is with the Levantines; they're the thorn in our sides. Silver spoons, that's what they eat off of, them and their extra-territorial status. European leeches sucking Turkey's blood straight from the vein, that's what they are. They leave their own countries behind, come here to take over everything. Pus and boils I say, a curse on the lot of 'em. Just remember what I say; they'll be the death of us, not the Turks.[585]

For Barba Yakoubis, the Levantines were dangerous, not the Turks, because the Levantines were interested in the resources of Asia Minor. Sotiriou narrated her socialist point of view through Barba Yakoubis who foresees the danger threatening the Ottoman Greeks. He says, "Big things are being discussed here tonight, big things. Greece has raised her head, it seems. She's up in arms again. Liberty is on the march. But the more liberty—may God protect her!—marches in Greece, the worse it will be for us here. Understand?"[586]

Sotiriou criticizes the German influence on the Ottoman Empire and its administration. She says that, the German Bank of Palestine distributed propaganda brochures to Turks which indoctrinated hatred toward the Greeks. David Welch claims that

> One of the most significant lessons to be learnt from the experience of the First World War was that public opinion could no longer be ignored as a determining factor in the formulation of government policies. Unlike previous wars, the Great War was the first 'total war' in which whole nations, and not just professional armies, were locked in mortal combat.[587]

Propaganda was one of the most important weapons of the states during World War I.[588] According to Sotiriou's oral testimony, the Ottoman Greeks first blamed the Young Turks for those brochures; however, they later realized that it was the

[585] Ibid., 57.
[586] Ibid.
[587] David Welch, *Germany, Propaganda and Total War, 1914-1918: The Sins of Omission* (London: Athlone, 2000), 1.
[588] See also Erol Köroğlu, *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity: Literature in Turkey during World War I.*

Germans who had plans for the Middle East.[589] Sotiriou notes that "The Turks no longer rule Asia Minor alone; now there were the Germans to contend with. Germany was the brain, Turkey the muscle. One drew up the plans, the other carried them out. A German pasha arrived in Smyrna: a cold, hardhearted man in Prussian uniform with the cut of a conqueror named Liman von Sanders."[590] He was a merciless general who sent the Orthodox Christians to labor battalions to construct the railway to Mosul according to Sotiriou. Since Sotiriou has a socialist perspective on the Catastrophe, she claims that labor battalions were like Hitler's camps, and it was the idea of Liman von Sanders, not the Turks.

de Bernières notes that von Sanders "is an intelligent and determined officer who seldom makes mistakes, and has placed Germans rather than Turks in positions of command in most of the crucial places, causing much animosity among Ottoman officers."[591] Sotiriou blames von Sanders for the labor camps that had bad conditions and caused diseases.[592] According to Sotiriou, the plan was to cleanse Asia Minor of Greeks and Armenians. She writes, "Turkey has fallen asleep! The *beys* had turned soft and left the *reaya* to rule, to become the minds of Asia Minor. In a word, the Greeks and the Armenians were serious obstacles to German interest; they had to be pushed aside."[593] It was not just Sotiriou who blamed the Germans and von Sanders for the destruction of Asia Minor Greeks. Doulis claims that,

> In most of the fiction set in Anatolia and published after World War II, there is the clearly stated assumption of harmony existing between Greeks and Turks before 1914 and the execution of Liman von Sanders's policies. This arises in a number of incidents whose total effect is to exonerate the common Greeks and Turks from the crimes of the past. The blame, perhaps conveniently, falls on others, men who bore the responsibility for decisions that had been proved disastrously wrong, men who were in position of power when the forces of history appeared to favor Greek irredentism, when "the ripe fruit" of Anatolia was ready to fall into Greek laps.[594]

[589] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*. For Germany's plan to destroy the *Rum* of Anatolia see also Mihail Rodas, *Almanya Türkiye'deki Rumları Nasıl Mahvetti* (How Germany Destroyed the *Rum* of Turkey).
[590] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 73.
[591] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 349.
[592] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.
[593] Ibid., 74.
[594] Doulis, *Disaster and Fiction*, 215.

Yorgo Andreadis also mentions the role of the Germans in the destruction of the Christians in Asia Minor.[595]

Kaiser Wilhelm II had commercial interests in the Ottoman Empire and visited Sultan Abdulhamid II in 1898 for the second time in nine years and continued his journey toward the Holy Land.[596] Moreover, German consuls and vice-consuls were stationed all over the empire. Trumpener explains that

> By 1912, German consular posts in Asiatic Turkey alone numbered close to twenty, including three in the Mesopotamian region (Mosul, Baghdad, Basra), over half a dozen in 'Syria' and Lebanon (Aleppo, Damascus, Tarabulus, Beirut, Haifa, Jaffa and Jerusalem), two in Cilicia (Adana and Mersin), and two on the Black Sea coast (Samsun and Trabzon).[597]

The Ottoman Empire was not alone in decision-making. Germany had an effective control over the empire due to the rich resources of Asia Minor. Sotiriou thinks that the Germans eliminated the Christians of Asia Minor because "The deeply-rooted Christian populations who held in their hands the wealth and the keys to Anatolia had to be eliminated. They were an obstacle to German expansionism, and later, to the great capitalists who stood behind the Entente.[598] It is a well-known fact that World War I led to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and reshaped the whole Near East according to the interest of the Great Powers. David Fromkin remarks that "It was an era in which Middle Eastern countries and frontiers were fabricated in Europe."[599]

Sotiriou first depicts Manolis as an irredentist Ottoman Greek. However, she develops him from a nationalist to a socialist. In a way, Manolis is the voice of Sotiriou. After Barba Yakoubis, another tutor educates Manolis on world politics. A well-educated Cretan student Nikitas Drosakis plays an important role for Manolis to

---

[595] Yorgo Andreadis, *Tamama: Pontus'un Yitik Kızı*, translated by Ragıp Zarakolu (İstanbul: Belge, 2012), 78.
[596] Ulrich Trumpener, "Germany and the End of the Ottoman Empire," in *The Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Marian Kent, 107-136 (Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005), 108.
[597] Ibid., 109.
[598] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 138.
[599] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace: Creating the Modern Middle East 1914-1922* (England: Penguin, 1991), 17.

understand the real intention of the Great Powers. Drosakis becomes a mentor for Manolis since Manolis is raised in a village where "people went frantic with joy"[600] when the Greek army landed in Smyrna. "And when the first distant bugle notes rang out the old, the young, women, children, everybody knelt and pressed their foreheads to the ground, weeping and repeating with pathos: "Greece, our Greece! Our mother!"[601] The atmosphere where Manolis had lived inevitably shaped his ideology. Toynbee observes that Greek national feeling was strong in Smyrna: "The Greek element in the city is far the largest aggregate of Greek population in Anatolia, and has the most frequent and direct communication with Athens. Many Smyrna Greeks are Hellenic subjects, either by immigration or by naturalization."[602]

The landing of the Greek army in Smyrna in 1919 started the Greco-Turkish War in Asia Minor. It is important to have some information about Sotiriou's experience of the Greek army's landing before we analyze that event in *Farewell Anatolia*. Sotiriou was a little girl then and she narrated her memoirs of that important moment in the documentary:

> The Greek army landed in Smyrna in a day of May. My parents locked me in to protect me from the chaos; however I found a way to go out and ended up in a boulevard. The Patrick and other Greek ferries arrived to the city, and the dispute started. All of a sudden, I recognized my mother and father on a balcony of a hotel, but the gate of the hotel was locked due to the crowd. People were crying and kissing the soil believing that freedom had already arrived. Then I knocked the door and luckily a woman who recognized me before in the crowd took me in where my parents were; however, they could not recognize me due to the shock of the events. Meanwhile, I was standing next to them and witnessing a historical event.[603]

The event that Sotiriou told us in the documentary was also mentioned in *The Dead Await*. Aliki Magi says that her parents did not let her join the initiation ceremony of the Greek army organized by the people of Smyrna; however, she managed to get out of the crowd and joined her parents in the hotel where the ceremony took place.[604]

---

[600] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 179.
[601] Ibid.
[602] Tonybee, *The Western Question*, 126.
[603] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.
[604] Dido Sotiriu, *Ölüler Bekler*, trans. Kriton Dinçmen (İstanbul: Arion, 1995), 91.

Sotiriou does not mention the ceremony and her parents' joy to welcome the Greek army in the *Anıların Tadı* (Taste of the Memoirs). *The Dead Await* narrates the joy of people in Smyrna. The landing of the Greek army meant the end of slavery to the people of Smyrna.[605] Ceremonies and parties were organized by the Ottoman Greeks of Smyrna with the arrival of the Greek ships. Celebration for the expected victory of the Greek army started even before the war. Ottoman Greeks of Smyrna were pretty sure of the victory even from the first day of the occupation of Smyrna which lasted from 15 May 1919 to 9 September 1922.

Pelin Böke interviewed the elderly people of İzmir, both the Turks and the Levantines, who witnessed the landing of the Greek army and the Catastrophe in İzmir. Her book, *İzmir 1919-1922/ Tanıklıklar* (İzmir 1919-1922/Witnesses), collects the oral testimonies of the witnesses in İzmir during the Greek occupation. Böke remarks that İzmir was not a battlefield during the occupation because the war took place in the interior of Asia Minor: Kütahya, Afyon, and Eskişehir. Furthermore, communication was cut between İzmir and other parts of the country due to the Greek occupation.[606] Müzeyyen Canoler, born in 1908 in İzmir, emphasized that the Turks were disarmed by the Greek authorities before the occupation. It was done to prevent Turks from resisting.[607] Mehmet Baloğlu approved the disarmament of the Turks during the Greek occupation.[608] Toynbee writes that "The local Allied control-officers were instructed to disarm and remove the Turkish troops remaining in the city, in accordance with Articles 5 and 20 of the armistice."[609] The armistice he mentioned was the Mudros Armistice that was signed in 1918 after World War I between the Ottoman Empire and the Great Powers. Moreover, there were not many able-bodied Turkish men since most of them had died in the World War I. The city was full of widowed women, children, and the infirm.

Müzeyyen Canoler narrated some interesting details about that period. There was heavy rain on the day the Greek army landed in İzmir. People thought that the rain prevented further atrocities between the Greek army and the disarmed Turkish

[605] Ibid., 88.
[606] Pelin Böke, *İzmir 1919-1922/Tanıklıklar* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2006), 66.
[607] Ibid., 81.
[608] Ibid., 89.
[609] Toynbee, *The Western Question*, 78.

people. During the Greek occupation, families were afraid to send their sons out for shopping. They were sending the girls and Müzeyyen Canoler was one of them. While going back home from shopping, she talked to a Greek soldier and was shocked to learn that the soldier was a Muslim from Salonika called Ramazan.[610] Not only Müzeyyen Canoler, but also Ramazan could not figure out what kind of a game was going on and why he was in the Greek army to fight against the Muslims, his co-religionists. This reminds us of the Orthodox Christian soldiers of the Ottoman army during the World War I and the Balkan Wars. Both Christians and Muslims, without their intentions or will, ended up fighting against their co-religionists. This is a remarkable example of a situation where people were co-opted to fight for ideals that they did not understand.

The Greek occupation of İzmir was not hostile in every part of the city. While Mehmet Reşat Karakaya, Muammer Öztürk, and İkbal Aytemur narrated the atrocities of the Greek soldiers against the Turks in İzmir,[611] Hüseyin Avni Çiftçi noted that the Greek soldiers were nice towards them in Aliağa district of İzmir.[612] İzmir witnessed good and evil; friendship and hatred, good intentions and atrocities during the occupation. Not all Greek soldiers acted badly toward the Turks. Mehmet Baloğlu noted that some Greek soldiers did not interfere in their daily prayers and even encouraged them to pray in the mosque.[613] When we think of Ramazan from Salonika, perhaps the picture will be clearer. Not everybody was willing to fight. This shows the nature of human beings and their motivation for their objectives. Some Ottoman Greeks were against the landing of the Greek army. Mehmet Rahmi Ergun noted that elderly Ottoman Greeks of Smyrna were against the Greek occupation knowing that their peaceful lives would be destroyed by the Greeks of Greece.[614]

In *Farewell Anatolia*, the elders of Kırkıca wanted the young people to be conscripted into the Greek army to fight against the Turks and liberate the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia. However, Manolis is confused when he hears that "Greek

[610] Böke, *Tanıklıklar*, 82.
[611] Ibid., 92-93-128.
[612] Ibid., 127.
[613] Ibid., 136.
[614] Ibid., 137.

citizens of Asia Minor" are expected to join the Greek army. He does not want to join the Greek army as he declares to his fellow villagers, "I reasoned, our region had not been annexed by Greece. We were still Ottoman citizens. How could they conscript us?"[615] Obviously, Manolis is not willing to join the Greek army at first. The reason could be his bitter experiences in the labor battalions. As Manolis hesitates to take action, the village elders, the priest, and the village headman get angry at him and tell: "You are a smart lad, you are. Too bad you pretend to be a patriot. Since when have you been so proud to be an Ottoman citizen?"[616] Manolis and his fellow villagers do not have any choice other than to fight for the *Megali Idea* as they are forced to do so by the village elders. It is not their free-will but a compulsory duty they are expected to fulfill. Moreover, if they do not report to Hacısülük station the next morning, they would face stiff penalties.

The next day four hundred men from Kırkıca gather at Hacısülük station to go to Smyrna. In front of the "Soldier's House", somebody gives a patriotic speech. Manolis remarks: "We were moved to tears. Our minds were made up: our patriotic duty meant that we were to take up arms, and lay them down only when we marched into Constantinople."[617] However, Manolis also confesses that "conquering the City never interested me; what we had already taken was plenty for me."[618] He is not very willing to go and fight for the *Megali Idea* because he knows what fighting brings: bloodshed and misery. Panayota Katırcı, from Çirkince, also informed Yalçın how people reacted to the landing of the Greek army in Smyrna. She reported that the villagers of Çirkince were amazed by the coming of the Greek army, and people were conscripted into the Greek army. Moreover rich villagers of Çirkince collected seven thousand pieces of gold to help the Greek army financially.[619] Her father, Nicholas Kazakoglou, joined the Greek army as we mentioned above.

Oral testimonies project both sides of the coin: first the attitude of the Ottoman Greeks to the Greek army's landing, and then the result of that event evaluated by the refugees. Mirsini Kapsali stated that Asia Minor Greeks of Balıkesir

[615] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 187.
[616] Ibid., 188.
[617] Ibid.
[618] Ibid.
[619] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 147.

felt happy when they learnt that the Greek army had already landed in Smyrna in 1919. Turks felt insecure and hid themselves as an initial reaction. Ottoman Greeks welcomed the Greek army with Greek flags and escorted the army to the barracks. Kapsali continued: "We started to boast and humiliate the Turks. We told them that first we would get water from the fountain and then they will. Whereas we have had no conflicts between Turks, and none of them have harmed us."[620] Muammer Öztürk and Ahmet Bican, interviewed by Pelin Böke, also reported the same attitudes of the Ottoman Greeks during the Greek occupation of İzmir.[621] Some refugees even blamed the Ottoman Greeks for what they had done during the Balkan Wars. Vasilias Kuçomitos, from Ayvalık, confessed that they paid for what they had done before. During the Balkan Wars, they supported the Greeks by sending them gold coins hidden in bottles of olive oil. According to Kuçomitos, Turks took revenge for the Balkan Wars in the Greco-Turkish War.[622] Evripidu Lafazani also stated that they paid for joining the Greek army and supporting them at their best."[623] These oral testimonies are interesting as they reflect how the refugees interpreted the chain of events during the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Catastrophe. While some refugees blamed the Great Powers, some blamed the Greeks. Köroğlu remarks that

> During the Balkan War, the Greek fleet managed to dominate the Aegean Sea, preventing the Turkish fleet from providing logistical support to its army and thus causing the loss of Salonika. In those years the most powerful ship of the Greek fleet was a battleship called Averof, which had been donated to the Greek government by Averof, a rich Greek born in Ottoman lands.[624]

When Manolis meets Nikita Drosakis in 1921, Greeks had been in Asia Minor for almost three years, and Drosakis had already fought in the Salt Desert in Anatolia. He was an experienced soldier who was well aware of the politics going on between Venizelos, King Constantine, and the Great Powers. What strikes Manolis about Drosakis is "his unorthodox opinions and his clearheaded outlook."[625]

[620] KAAM, *Göç*, 98.
[621] Böke, *Tanıklıklar*, 95- 109.
[622] KAAM, *Göç*, 49.
[623] Ibid., 55.
[624] Köroğlu, *Ottoman Propaganda*, 50.
[625] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 202.

Drosakis has a critical mind, and his ideas appear to be unconventional to Manolis who tries to justify the *Megali Idea* according to his own understanding and knowledge. Drosakis thinks that Greece will lose the battle, and Turks will be victorious at the end and as he says, "We are dancing right over the edge of the cliff, and no one wants to admit it."[626]

Drosakis educates himself during the war and studies the Asia Minor campaign through reading the foreign papers. Manolis is puzzled because he does not think that the situation is going worse each day. Drosakis talks about his past experiences at the battlefield to inform and educate Manolis:

> What do you think? Everything's just wonderful, eh? I've been through Salt Desert and the Sakarya, Axiotis, so I've got first hand info. Understand? We're going to pay for those brilliant victories of ours, last spring and summer- Afyon Karahisar, Eskisehir, Kütahya… Back home, they're completely out of touch: it's all church bells, flags, speeches, editorials in the papers. The government? Instead of jumping at the chance to find a way out, or consolidate the front, it orders us to march full speed ahead for Ankara! And how are we supposed to get there? Who'll back us up?[627]

The Greek army was divided into two camps; one party supported Venizelos, and the other supported the King who was against the campaign.[628] On 25 October 1920 King Alexander was bitten by a monkey and died.[629] Three weeks later on 15 November 1920 a general election was held between Venizelos and King Constantine in which Venizelos lost the election. King Constantine returned to his throne and continued the war which had already been started by Venizelos.[630] Kontogiorgi states that, "These events alienated the Allies, who remembered his disloyal attitude during the war, and gave warning in a note that his restoration would have serious political and financial consequences."[631] The Great Powers did not support the Greek army after the defeat of Venizelos in the elections of 1920.

[626] Ibid., 203.
[627] Ibid., 204.
[628] Böke, *Tanıklıklar*, 51.
[629] Goldstein, "The British Official Mind," 187; de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 484; Ertul, *Kimlik*, 128.
[630] Ibid.
[631] Kontogiorgi, *Population Exchange*, 53.

Another factor that contributed to the losing of the campaign was the dispute between the Greek soldiers because they were homesick and did not want to fight. Manolis says that, "Some began to talk of desertion, others of wounding themselves. There were rumors an entire brigade had revolted. All winter long we went without proper shelter, decent clothing, or food."[632]

Drosakis knows that Venizelos was asked to invade Asia Minor by the Great Powers for their own good and that is why they were sent to Asia Minor. Toynbee analyzes why Greece was backed by Great Britain to invade Asia Minor:

> If Greece makes these claims good through British backing, she will have to follow Great Britain's lead. She is a maritime Power, a labyrinth of peninsulas and islands, and the territories that she covets in Anatolia are overseas. In short, if Turkey can be dominated by the sea-power of Great Britain, and so the British Government can still carry out their war-aims in the Near and Middle East without spending British money and lives.[633]

Drosakis, who is an educated young man, knows that they are not actually liberating Asia Minor Greeks. According to Manolis, Venizelos was right in his actions as he shouted at Drosakis advocating the policy of Venizelos: "Greece should be the winner; Turkey is lying there in ruins, and he shouldn't jump at the chance? He shouldn't try to save us, after centuries of slavery? This land is the breadbasket and the glory of our race and it's ours, all ours, from way way back!"[634] Manolis considers that Asia Minor Greeks have been slaves for centuries and need to be liberated. Drosakis smiles and answers: "Liberate us, but don't destroy us."[635] Moreover, both Greeks and Asia Minor Greeks were killed for the beautiful visions of a Byzantine Empire.

Manolis resists learning the facts about the Asia Minor campaign, and believes that he is a soldier, not a politician, general, or a journalist to question the politics of Greece: "That's none of my business. Let someone else figure it out, the politicians, the generals, the journalists… I'm nothing but a soldier from Anatolia.

[632] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 224.
[633] Toynbee, *The Western Question*, 74.
[634] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 207.
[635] Ibid.

My job is to close my eyes and ears, fight, and keep moving ahead…"[636] Drosakis, who is determined to inform Manolis that it is the business of people to criticize and analyze the politics of the state, loses his temper and says,

> the people who can't be bothered to think things through, the ones who just shrug their shoulders, are criminals. But you're guilty of something worse, Axiotis. You think it's the generals and the politicians who write history. Go ahead, close your eyes; you are nothing but a wheel rolling blindly toward the edge of the cliff. But you're not a wheel; you're the people. You've got to understand the way things happen, and change them. I'm ready to fight with everything I've got. Death doesn't scare me; I don't even stop to think how I'm losing the best years of my life in the mountains of Turkey. What scares me is that I'll be guilty of something worse, something that hurts my people and my country.[637]

Manolis does not understand Drosakis and blames him for lack of patriotism for Greece. However, Drosakis is an intellectual who can identify the difference between the country and the state.[638] For Drosakis, the state is guilty of cooperating with the imperialist powers, and that is what he criticizes. Drosakis, who is from Crete, likes Greece and the Greek people; however, he does not like the government that acts in favor of the Great Powers. Manolis, who does not believe Drosakis and does not want to hear the real facts, prefers to hang around with the soldiers who are nationalists like himself.[639]

Drosakis, who is determined to inform Manolis, draws the whole picture in the Near East in order to convince Manolis that Greece is not doing the right thing:

> What do you think Manolis? When the Entente made sure its interests in the Middle East were protected and stopped the breakup of the Ottoman Empire, from that moment on our little affair in Asia Minor was like a dead child in Greece's womb…Foreign capital is only concerned about its interest. You expect heart from it, or justice? The people who serve it are sitting there in their offices in London or Paris or wherever else with the maps spread out in front of them. Wherever it serves their purpose they remember self-determination, peoples' right to freedom and

[636] Ibid., 225.
[637] Ibid., 226.
[638] Ibid., 226.
[639] Ibid., 225-226.

> independence. And when it doesn't serve their interests, they pick up a read pencil and draw a line through countries and peoples. The unfortunate thing is that, this very minute, the red pencil is right above our heads. Whatever they could get out of Greece they did, and cheap at that. We are the squeezed lemon; now Kemal's got the juice.[640]

Greeks and Turks clashed in Asia Minor because the Great Powers advocated freedom and self-determination—but for their own interest in the Near East. Drosakis realizes that they are not fighting for the freedom of Asia Minor Greeks, but for the freedom of the Turks since Turkish nationalism became stronger with the landing of the Greek army in Anatolia.[641] Muslim Turks became aware of Turkish nationalism to liberate their country from the invaders.

Finally, Manolis understands Drosakis, and thinks of his family and his village with tears in his eyes.[642] The Greek army was defeated by the Turkish army, and the *Megali Idea* was buried in Asia Minor without giving birth to "Greater Greece." In our view, Drosakis is the intellectual and ideological voice of Sotiriou. Furthermore, Drosakis manages to inform Manolis and transform him from a nationalist into a socialist. Drosakis is wounded severely at the end of the Asia Minor campaign as the Turkish soldiers manage to defeat the Greek army. Manolis leaves him to the Red Cross and goes to Smyrna. We do not know whether he survives or dies because Sotiriou does not inform us. Manolis arrives in Smyrna, which "was the warm and welcoming capital of hellenism, a city that smelled of jasmine yearned for freedom."[643] However, now the city is almost dead due to the war. People are terrified to be killed and try to run away from Smyrna as soon as possible since the Turkish army is heading for the city from the interior parts of the country. Manolis, standing in front of a barbershop, realizes that he is out of shape; his uniform is torn and blood-stained. His mother would be horrified if she saw Manolis in such bad shape. The barber invites him into the shop and starts shaving Manolis. Tassos Kasabalis, the barber, is an old man who is unaware of the defeat and thinks that General Trikoupis was preparing a defense against the Turks with the help of the

[640] Ibid., 238.
[641] Ibid., 224-225.
[642] Ibid., 238-239.
[643] Ibid., 256.

British. Manolis tries to persuade him that they are already defeated and that the Great Powers are digging their graves by sending the Greeks to Asia Minor.[644]

Tassos Kasabalis does not want to believe Manolis, and says that his wife begged him that morning not to open the shop, but find a boat to take them to an island which would be safer. Tassos never pays attention to his wife and believes that nothing will happen and everybody should open their shops as they do every day. Tassos talks about his expectations and disappointments:

> I may look like an old wreck, but I've seen a lot of life, eaten it with a spoon, and now I'm down to the last crumbs. But our liberty here in Asia Minor, why it's like a little kid just learning to walk; we haven't even had time to light candles on the birthday cake. She can't die; we won't be able to stand the pain of burying her. Better we should all be beneath the dark earth…[645]

Tassos cries for the dead child in the womb of Greece, and says that he donated his family savings to a military hospital during the war.[646] Tassos symbolizes nationalist Ottoman Greeks who were hopeful about the victory of the Greek army and donated their savings to the Greek army.

Finally, Manolis meets his mother, sister, and brother in Smyrna. While they are discussing whether to leave Smyrna that day or not, the Turkish army enters the city with a victory parade announcing that people should continue their daily life, and nobody will be harmed.[647] However, in a couple of seconds, people start to run away since a flame starts to rise from the Armenian quarter of Smyrna. The atrocities between the Greeks and Turks start all over again and Asia Minor Greeks throw themselves into the Aegean as they are trying to escape. Manolis is wondering where their protectors are? He blames the Great Powers for doing nothing to rescue people: "They had set up the motion picture cameras on their ships and filmed us as we were slaughtered and eradicated. On board their warship brass bands played marches and merry songs, to keep the howls of agony and pleas for mercy from reaching the ears

[644] Ibid., 259.
[645] Ibid., 261.
[646] Ibid.
[647] Ibid., 272.

of their crews."[648]

Panayotis Marselis, from Smyrna, narrated a similar story about how the Great Powers treated the Greeks when they were trying to survive from the Smyrna Fire:

> People, who were stuck between the fire and the soldiers, had nowhere to run away. They jumped into the sea, and some of them were killed by the Turks. The survivors swam to the ships of the Great Powers that supported the Greeks. However, the crews threw the ones who managed to get on the ships. Some of them died as they were thrown to the sea, and some survived. English, French, and Italian people were having fun at cafeterias while the Greeks were suffering.[649]

This unfortunate event was narrated by many refugees who witnessed the Smyrna Fire and managed to survive. What the survivors of the Smyrna Fire said was true. In Smyrna, as Kasaba notes, Greeks "were squeezed between the city, which was on fire and being taken over by Turkish nationalist forces, and the sea, where ships of the Allied Powers were anchored but refused to take the refugees on board."[650] The Great Powers initially did not want to rescue the Greeks. They just helped their own nationals. However, the Italians "accepted on board anyone who could reach their ships and the French accepted anyone who said he was French — so long as he could say it in French. Eventually, though, the British and Americans came to the aid of refugees without regard to nationality."[651]

With the Smyrna Fire of 1922, Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire were cleansed from Smyrna as well as from Asia Minor. The Smyrna Fire marked the end of multiculturalism under Ottoman rule. Asia Minor was Islamized and the Balkans and Greece were Christianized. The same ethnic-cleansing had taken place in Salonika in 1917. Although it was said after the fire that Salonika needed such a destructive fire to get rid of the 'filth of so many centuries' as well as the narrow streets of poor city-planning, Peter Mackridge claims that, "We can read the 'filth of so many centuries' as referring not only the lack of properly organized street-

[648] Ibid., 275.
[649] KAAM, *Göç*, 30.
[650] Kasaba, *A Moveable Empire*, 131.
[651] Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace*, 546.

cleaning in Salonika, but to the physical, moral, and cultural traces of Ottoman rule, which included those inhabitants who were not Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians."[652] The fire attacked the old city inhabited mostly by the Turks and the Jews of Salonika. Mark Mazower states that "The strong wind, the shortage of water, the difficulty posed to fire-fighters by the narrow roads had all contributed to the scale of the devastation. 9.500 buildings were destroyed and over 70,000 people had lost their homes."[653] The Ottoman heritage of the city was destroyed.[654] Both Smyrna and Salonika, multicultural cities of the Aegean, were destroyed due to excessive nationalist sentiments of that era.

Manolis manages to survive and arrive in Samos Island which had already been filled with thousands of refugees. He watches Asia Minor from Samos with a profound grief: "We abandoned our children and parents and brothers, left our dead unburied, the living without a roof over their heads. Haunted dreams. There. Over there, until just yesterday, it had been our home."[655] He feels the grief of leaving his motherland and longs for the old days which he spent with his friend Şevket. He sighs deeply and says: "Ah Şevket! We have turned into monsters. We have plunged knives into our hearts, destroyed them; and for what?"[656] Manolis feels sorry for his bitter past experiences and atrocities between Greeks and Turks. He remembers Kör Mehmet whom he killed in the war and says: "Guerrilla fighter of Kör Mehmet, give my regards to the earth that gave us birth! *Selam söyle Anadolu'ya*. Farewell Anatolia! Hold it not against us that we drenched you with blood. *Kahr olsun sebep olanlar*. A curse on the guilty ones![657] The novel ends with the curses of Manolis Axiotis. Sotiriou concludes her novel at the end of Greco-Turkish War as Manolis migrates to Samos Island before The Treaty of Lausanne is signed.

---

[652] Peter Mackridge, "Cultivating New Lands: The Consolidation of Territorial Gains in Greek Macedonia through Literature, 1912- 1940," in *Our Selves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity since 1912*, ed. Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis, 175-186 (UK: Berg, 1997), 175.
[653] Mark Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts: Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430-1950* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 2004), 320.
[654] Mehmet Ali Gökaçtı, *Nüfus Mübadelesi: Kayıp Bir Kuşağın Hikâyesi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003), 83.
[655] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 297.
[656] Ibid., 298.
[657] Ibid.

Farewell Anatolia has parallels with Sotiriou's life story because she migrated to Greece before the Lausanne Convention. When she arrived in Piraeus with her aunt, the Greek army had already been defeated in Smyrna a day before.[658] Sotiriou did not tell us why she migrated to Greece with her aunt rather than with her family in *Anıların Tadı* (Taste of the Memoirs). Luckily, her autobiographical novel, *The Dead Await,* clarifies the reason. Aliki Magi, Sotiriou's fictional character of herself, narrates how her father could not predict the Catastrophe to take any precautions against harm: Aliki's father was in a successful soap business and led a luxurious life with his family. He was a nationalist and was pretty sure that the Greek army would defeat the Turkish army sooner or later. While his relatives were getting their money out of the country and warning him to do the same for the sake of his family, he did nothing to save his property. Aliki's family got poorer each day, and she was sent to her aunt to be raised and supported. When bad news started to come from the front during the war, Aliki and her aunt immediately fled to Greece. Her family arrived in Greece after the Catastrophe.

The characters of *Birds Without Wings* also blame the Great Powers. Iskander the Potter blames the Great Powers as well as the Greeks and the Turks for the death of Philothei:

> İbrahim blamed himself, and if I had been one of her brothers or one of her other relatives, I would have come back from exile and killed him. The peculiar thing is, however, that nothing would have happened to Philothei at all, if other things had not been happening in the great world. So it is my opinion that the blame belongs more widely, not only to İbrahim but to all of us who lived in this place, as well as to those in other parts who were bloodthirsty and ambitious…Suddenly we heard of people called 'Germans', and people called 'French', and of a place called Britain that had governed half the world without us knowing of it, but it was never explained to us why they had chosen to come and bring us hardship, starvation, bloodshed and lamentation, why they played with us and martyred our tranquility.[659]

[658] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.
[659] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 3-4.

Vretu Meneksepulu sounds like Iskander the Potter:

> We did not know Greece then. We had the photos of the Russian Tsar at our homes and churches who sent us bells and icons. We heard the name of Greece for the first time in the Balkan Wars. We knew Russia, Bulgaria and Romania before. We heard of America after the constitution in 1908. During the Balkan Wars, some young Ottoman Greeks fled to America in order not to join the army. Generally, the educated ones in Istanbul fled to America.[660]

Asia Minor Greeks of small towns and villages were unaware of the Greek Kingdom and the Great Powers. Through wars and conflicts, they got to know more about the countries that the Ottoman Empire was in conflict with. Georgio P. Theodorou blamed the British Prime Minister David Lloyd George, Venizelos, King Constantine, and whoever else created the Asia Minor Catastrophe as he was drowning in the Aegean during the fire in Smyrna.[661] Drosoula also says, "Why does God give us a garden, and put a snake in it?"[662]

Asia Minor refugees also blamed the Great Powers in *Emanet Çeyiz* as they recollected their past memories of the Catastrophe. Vasili Vasilyadis said, "We were brothers with Turks. Curse on the guilty ones who made us enemies!"[663] Tanasis Bakırcıoğlu claimed that "Wicked people were the cause of the disaster. Britain provoked Greece to occupy Turkey. We were happy in our country. Otherwise, we would not have experienced all of these."[664] Another refugee, Father Yorgo said: "We were happy in our country. What was our fault? We did not send anybody to the Greek army; people in İzmir helped the Greek army. In 1918-19 England provoked Greece to attack Turkey. Then they withdrew and we suffered in between."[665] Haralambos Kubroğlu, from Niğde/Cappadocia, noted that both Orthodox Christians and Turks cried together as they were deported, and cursed the guilty ones.[666] Hirschon states that blaming the Great Powers was a politically informed explanation

[660] KAAM, *Göç*, 167.
[661] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 509.
[662] Ibid., 24.
[663] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 104.
[664] Ibid., 120.
[665] Ibid., 130.
[666] KAAM, *Göç*, 202.

since she conducted her field study in Kokkinia, a left-wing locality.[667]

3.3. Saying farewell to Philothei

Sotiriou fictionalizes the Greco-Turkish War in *Farewell Anatolia*; whereas de Bernières prefers to narrate the Greco-Turkish War through the life story of Atatürk with historical facts. He does not fictionalize the battle and informs the reader through solid history rather than fiction. However, the Gallipoli front of World War I is fictionalized through the adventures of Abdul (Karatavuk) due to the author's grandfather, Arthur Kenneth Smithells, who was severely wounded at Gallipoli. He wanted to narrate Gallipoli from the Turkish point of view.[668] When Greeks invade Asia Minor for "Greater Greece" and start fighting with Turks, Eskibahçe is occupied by the Italians because according to The Treaty of Sèvres, "Anatolia was carved up into zones of economic influence, France receiving Cilicia, Italy Adalia and the southwest."[669] "The Allied intention is to use one Ally, Greece, to frustrate another Ally, the Italians."[670] Furthermore as the author mentions, "The Italians decide to frustrate the Greeks, and land troops in Antalya."[671] Italian soldiers "had been sent to Eskibahçe on the grounds that it looked like an important town on the map."[672] Due to Italian occupation, which was peaceful, the town never becomes a battle field, and the Ottoman Greeks and Turks do not fight against each other in the novel. According to Bilge Umar, Italians were friendly toward the Turks. They fed the poor people in Antalya and opened a pharmacy in Bodrum to heal the sick and the poor.[673]

While Manolis changes throughout *Farewell Anatolia*, de Bernières does not develop his nationalist character, Leonidas. When the population exchange is announced, he starts to sweat and tremble with the reality of leaving his homeland.

---

[667] Hirschon, "'We got on well with the Turks'," 331.
[668] http://www.waterstones.com/waterstonesweb/pages/content/1025/
[669] Michael Llewellyn-Smith, "Venizelos' Diplomacy, 1910-23: From Balkan Alliance to Greek Turkish Settlement," in *Eleftherios Venizelos: The Trials of Statesmanship*, ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides, 133-192 (U.K: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 164.
[670] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 452.
[671] Ibid., 449.
[672] Ibid., 439.
[673] Bilge Umar, *İzmir'de Yunanlıların Son Günleri* (Ankara: Bilgi, 1974), 47.

The Asia Minor Catastrophe is not a personal but a political defeat. He shows his first reaction against the population exchange and gives a speech to the villagers to persuade them to stay behind:

> Since ancient times, we have lived here. This is our home. In their greatest days our ancestors built the magnificent things that you see fallen about you in ruins. We had the greatest civilization in the history of the world. They tell you that you are being taken to Greece, but this was Greece. This must be Greece again. It is Greece. We are Greeks and this is our home in Greece. We cannot leave. In this place, it is the Turks who are foreigners. They arrived long after we did. You must all go back to your house. We must all refuse to go, this is our home. This is Greece. This is the land of the Patriarch. And the love of God.[674]

The Asia Minor Catastrophe was a real defeat for Leonidas, who was still dreaming the "Greater Greece". "It was also a political and ideological one. He saw his dreams evaporating."[675]

Although de Bernières does not develop Leonidas, he develops his naïve character, İbrahim the Mad, throughout his novel. Before the conflict between the Greeks and the Turks, İbrahim was a naïve boy and "there was a smile at the corners of his lips from the moment of his birth."[676] However, fighting in two battles and facing all kinds of savagery made İbrahim mad and took his smiles away. "İbrahim and Karatavuk, two unfortunate nobodies in these great imperial games,"[677] are no longer the same people after the war. Before the war, İbrahim used to be called İbrahim the Goatherd. When İbrahim returns home, he does not behave normally and people start to call him Ibrahim the Mad. Moreover his parents agree with the parents of Philothei to postpone the wedding till İbrahim recovers psychologically. Philothei is well aware of Ibrahim's changing attitude toward her:

> And now he has returned. He has fought in a place called Mesopotamia, a desert place of scorpions and stones, and he has been in Syria, and he has been in the armies of Mustafa Kemal in the fight against the Old Greeks, and this has concerned me, because perhaps he wouldn't want me because my father is a

[674] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 529-530.
[675] Ibid., 529.
[676] Ibid., 2.
[677] Ibid., 481.

> Christian, and now there is bitterness against Christians because of the Old Greeks.[678]

Philothei is right in her suspicion of İbrahim and her future marriage that might not happen at all. Iskander confirms Philothei as he explains the situation: "I think that back in those days many of us were maddened by hatred because of the war with the Greeks, and in all honesty I include myself, but İbrahim was the one among us whose mind was disengaged by love."[679]

The death of Philothei is an unfortunate event on the eve of deportation. Her death also symbolizes the destruction of Eskibahçe with the exchange of populations. While Gerasimos, Drosoula and their son Mandras are preparing their boat to sail, Drosoula realizes that Philothei and Ibrahim the Mad are discussing something on the rocks. When the time comes for them to leave Eskibahçe, Philothei cannot decide what to do. She narrates her psychology: "The worst thing for me was that I was torn in half because I was betrothed to Ibrahim, and he was far away in the rocks with the goats and Kopek, his dog. I was a Christian, but if I married him I would be a Muslim. I didn't know what to do."[680] She is torn between her family and Ibrahim. While her mother is preparing to depart, she runs to the rocks to see Ibrahim. Drosoula witnesses the quarrel between Ibrahim and Philothei on the rocks. She cannot hear what they say to each other but can clearly see the fall of Philothei over the cliff.[681] Philothei dies and Drosoula curses Ibrahim and blames him for the death of Philothei.[682] With this accident, İbrahim loses his mind and he is called İbrahim the Mad in the village.

İbrahim knows that the death of Philothei is an accident and confesses that instead of fighting against the Greeks, he could have deserted from the army and come home to marry Philothei. However, he chose to fight when he learned of the landing of the Greek army in Smyrna.[683] He remembers how the Turkish soldiers fought against the Armenians and the French soldiers in Cilicia, and the Sakarya

[678] Ibid., 523.
[679] Ibid., 3.
[680] Ibid., 542.
[681] Ibid., 555.
[682] Ibid., 556.
[683] Ibid., 562.

battle of the Greco-Turkish War in the western part of the country. Turks fought against the invaders to liberate their country and İbrahim witnessed many unfortunate incidents as well as atrocities between the invaders and the Turks. For the death of Philothei, İbrahim has an excuse:

> The excuse is that when we were advancing towards the sea and driving the Greek army before us, we found that they were destroying everything and leaving behind them nothing but a smoking desert, and from the survivors who had not managed to flee to the Italian sector we heard terrible stories about what the Greeks did to our people. There was town after town, village after village, laid waste and devastated, everything looted and stolen, the farmland destroyed. I saw many sights.[684]

İbrahim's bitter experiences in war lead him to take revenge. He witnessed Turkish women raped by the Greek soldiers and he was involved in the same shameful act against a Greek woman for revenge. He felt so ashamed that he did not marry Philothei after returning home: "it was because she was a woman, and after my experience I couldn't perceive her in the same way as when I was pure."[685] İbrahim lost his purity and naïve nature on the battlefield. Furthermore, he "has been profoundly disquieted to realize that it was not, after all, enough to be a Muslim, but he feels a new strength in the idea that now he is above all things a Turk."[686]

The rise of nationalist sentiments among the Greeks and the Turks was the cause of the atrocity. Ottoman Greeks and Turks started to identify themselves with their national identities that they were unaware of before World War I and the Greco-Turkish War. There were no atrocities between the inhabitants of the town before because people were not aware of other nations and nationalities. Iskander narrates how this awareness was formed:

> In those days we came to hear of many other countries that had never figured in our lives before. It was a rapid education, and many of us are still confused. We knew that our Christians were sometimes called 'Greeks', although we often called them 'dogs' or 'infidels', but in a manner that was a formality, or said with a smile, just as were their deprecatory terms for us. They would call us 'Turks' in order to insult us, at the time when we called

[684] Ibid., 563.
[685] Ibid., 565.
[686] Ibid., 436.

> ourselves 'Ottomans' or 'Osmanlis'. Later on it turned out that we really are 'Turks', and we became proud of it, as one does of new boots that are uncomfortable at first, but then settle into the feet and look exceedingly smart. Be that as it may, one day we discovered that there actually existed a country called 'Greece' that wanted to own this place, and do away with us, and take away our land. We knew of Russians before, because of other wars, but who were these Italians? Who were these other Frankish people? Suddenly we heard of people called 'Germans', and people called 'French', and of a place called Britain. That had governed half the world without us knowing of it, but it was never explained to us why they had chosen to come and bring us hardship, starvation, bloodshed and lamentation, why they played with us and martyred our tranquility.[687]

Iskander has a long description of the political and social atmosphere of the Ottoman Greeks and Turks. First of all, they were Osmanlis, not Turks or Greeks. With the rise of nationalism, Orthodox Christians identified themselves Greeks, Muslims identified themselves as Turkish, and this process began the disintegration of the empire. Although Leonidas did not succeed in reviving nationalist sentiments among the folk of Eskibahçe, both Turks and Ottoman Greeks inevitably gained their national consciousness due to the political atmosphere of the era.

Iskander says, "Nowadays, instead of saying, 'We are Osmanlis,' or 'We are Ottomans,' people were saying, 'Yes, we are Turks.' How strange that the world should change because of words, and words change because of the world."[688] Rüstem Bey, the agha of Eskibahçe, welcomed Lieutenant Gofredo Granitola and asked him: "Are you Greek?" He did not get an answer and then he "pointed to himself and said, 'Ottoman', and then changed this to 'Turk'."[689] The Muslims of Anatolia also start to identify themselves as Turks, not Ottomans anymore. After the Lausanne Convention, Sergeant Osman delivers the bad news to the villagers of Eskibahçe. He was ordered to take the Christians to Telmessos, and then they would be transported to Greece. People started panicking because they were worried about their houses, their family members who were sick or not at home for a while at that time. They were asked to leave their homes the following day without proper

[687] Ibid., 4.
[688] Ibid., 318-319.
[689] Ibid., 444-445.

preparation, and Sergeant Osman said: "Listen, all of you, in your new home you will get compensation to the exact value of everything you have lost. There will be an issue of certificates."[690]

Another tragedy was the location of Greece because the folk of Eskibahçe did not know where Greece was. Sergeant Osman answers their question: "Over the sea. It's not far. Don't worry. You will be looked after by the Greeks and the Franks. They will find you new homes, as good as your old ones."[691] Then another villager asks: "Are the Greeks Ottoman like us?" Sergeant Osman replies: "No, from now on you are Greeks, not Ottomans. And we are not Ottomans any more either, we are Turks."[692] His explanation of the new nation-state identities clarified the purpose of the Lausanne Convention. When the committee comes to Eskibahçe to value the properties, Asia Minor Greeks remark that they do not speak Greek, and are not Greeks, but Ottomans. However, the committee says, "There's no such thing as Ottoman any more. If you're a Muslim you're a Turk. If you're Christian and you are not Armenian, and you're from round here, you're Greek."[693] All Muslims became Turks regardless of their ethnic origin, and all Orthodox Christians of Anatolia became Greeks, regardless of their ethnic origins. Papa Eftim and his community, the Karamanlis, declared their ethnic origin as Turks; however, their affiliation with Orthodox Christianity made them Greeks, not Turks.

The deportation of Asia Minor Greeks was inevitable and they were not asked whether they wanted to leave Eskibahçe or not. With the announcement of the deportation, Polyxeni runs to the cemetery and takes her mother's bones from her grave. This is an interesting and unpredictable action. Following Polyxeni, "Some people ran to the cemetery and flung themselves headlong upon the newer graves, speaking into the earth, "I'll come back for you, I promise, I'll come back."[694] Father Kristoforos, the priest of the town, takes the icon of the Virgin Panagia Glykophilousa from the Church of St. Nicholas.[695] Filiz Çalışlar Yenişehirlioğlu

[690] Ibid., 527.
[691] Ibid.
[692] Ibid.
[693] Ibid., 542.
[694] Ibid., 533.
[695] Ibid., 536.

remarks that those icons, taken from the homeland, were a means of "cultural identity." That is why, at that time, it was not forbidden to take them out of the country because the icons did belong to the people, not to the states. Now those icons are considered as cultural heritages, and it is forbidden to take them out of the country.[696] Sofia Devletoğlu, from Kayseri, told the researchers of CAMS that they first heard of the population exchange from the Greek Muslims, who were deported from Greece. Greek Muslims told the Christians that they would go to their new country, Greece. Their first reaction was running to their churches and gathering the gold and money of the church. Then they ran to the cemeteries and took out the bones of their relatives.[697]

Philothei's dead body was not lucky to be buried properly. Like many Asia Minor Greeks, her body was put into the Aegean Sea by Gerasimos and Drosoula who were sailing to Cephalonia.[698] In order not to be arrested for killing Philothei, Drosoula and Gerasimos made a hard decision and threw her dead body into the sea with prayers, and Drosoula said,

> Saying farewell to Philothei and watching her slowly sinking out of sight in the blue water was like saying goodbye to Anatolia and to the life that I would have had there, and these farewells always leave you empty. I wonder where Philothei washed up. My clothes had her bloodstains on them until I was able to obtain new ones.[699]

Drosoula confronted three major and traumatic tragedies on the same day. She lost her motherland, her family, and her best friend. She sailed with her husband and son to an unknown country without any friend or relative to help her to share her grief.

When the people of Eskibahçe were preparing to leave, something extraordinary happened in Rüstem Bey's house. His mistress Leyla Hanım was writing a letter to him explaining that she was not Circassian but a Greek named Ioanna and was born in Ithaca. When she was a little girl, she was abducted by bad

[696] Filiz Çalışlar Yenişehirlioğlu, "Mübadele ve Kültürel Miras," (The Exchange and the Cultural Heritage), in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 421-446 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 441-442.
[697] KAAM, *Göç*, 197.
[698] de Bernieres, *Birds Without Wings*, 566.
[699] Ibid.

men, first traded in Sicily, then Cyprus, and finally in İstanbul.[700] She was sold to Rüstem Bey in İstanbul as a Muslim Circassian. However, Ioanna always longed for her mother country, and wanted to die in Greece. Ioanna writes in her letter: "I am longing to hear Greeks call me my real name, to speak my own language, and to hear the sweet melody of it in my ears. I was disappointed when I arrived here and found out that the Greeks did not speak Greek. But now they will have to learn it."[701] With the population exchange, Ioanna gets prepared to leave Asia Minor with the folk of Eskibahçe. People were surprised to see Leyla Hanım leaving the town with them because they all knew her as a Circassian. Ioanna joined the group and left Asia Minor. Rüstem Bey got the letter which was written in Greek; however, he never managed to read it because he did not know the Greek language. Moreover there was nobody left in the town who knew Greek. Leyla and her letter remained a mystery to Rüstem Bey.

The adventure of Ioanna from Ithaca to Asia Minor symbolizes the life of Odysseus who sailed from Ithaca to Asia Minor to fight in the Trojan War. After the Trojan victory, Odysseus sails back home to Ithaca. Odysseus is a legend whose adventures were told by Homer. de Bernières created his character Ioanna for artistic purposes. In Greece, Ithaca is a metaphor because going to Ithaca means going home. The adventure of Ioanna is a reference to the legend of Odysseus.[702] Gerasimos is the other character of the novel whose life resembles the life of Odysseus. Gerasimos, who has never been to Greece, says that "it's the only place in Greece I've ever heard of. My grandfather, who was shipwrecked and was washed ashore here, was from Cephalonia, and his name was Gerasimos Drapanikitos, and I was named after him. He met my grandmother and never went home."[703] For that reason, Gerasimos decides to go to Cephalonia, his ancestral home after a long and hard sail by a small fishing boat from Turkey. Gerasimos continues fishing in Cephalonia and is called Odysseus by his fellow fishermen. He also wears his turban while fishing.[704] Wearing his turban shows that Gerasimos does not abandoned the

[700] Ibid., 546.
[701] Ibid.
[702] Louis de Bernières.
[703] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 552.
[704] Ibid., 571.

traditional outfit of the Ottoman culture as he is the product of that culture.

The departure of Asia Minor Greeks from their motherland is very touching. People leave their homeland forever with lamentations and tears. The scenery is narrated by Ayşe, the wife of Abdulhamid Hojda:

> At Telmessos some Christians kissed the earth, and some Christians took a leaf or a flower or even an insect or a feather or a handful of the earth because they wanted something from their native land, and when the time came for the ship to leave the quay, there was much hugging and weeping, and promises were made, and the little boys who could swim swam out after the ship for a little way, and the women who had mirrors took them out of their sashes and they held them up to the sun so that the little flashes could sparkle on the ship until it was out of the sight, and that way the sunlight of their native land followed the exiles even when they left it. And there were people who were saying, 'A curse on all those who are responsible for this, we curse them and we curse them and we curse them,' but I never did find out who was responsible except that it was probably the Franks.[705]

The folk of Eskibahçe curses the guilty ones like Manolis Axiotis of *Farewell Anatolia*. The ship takes the refugees to Crete. After the departure of Asia Minor Greeks, some Cretan Muslims arrive in Eskibahçe. Ayşe states that, "these Cretan Muslims are rather like the Christians that we lost, so that we wonder why it was necessary to exchange them."[706] Cretan Muslims settle in Eskibahçe, and some of them only speak Greek as their mother tongue. Ayşe's daughter, Hasseki, marries one of those Cretan men who are devoted Muslims.

After the departure of Orthodox Christians from Eskibahçe, Mehmetçik (Nico) returns home. He cannot cope with the troubles he faces in labor battalions, deserts and becomes an outlaw. He goes to his family house and encounters a stranger who does not speak Turkish. He wonders where his family is and meets Karatavuk whom he has not seen for seven years. Karatavuk tells him the story, and Mehmetçik says, "Obviously, I knew that all the Greeks had been taken away. I saw the columns. But I didn't think my own family was included, I didn't know we

[705] Ibid., 559.
[706] Ibid., 560.

counted."[707] Interestingly, Nico does not acquire any nationalist emotions in all those years and he does not consider himself Greek despite the war. It was a shocking experience for him to realize that his family and he were Greeks, not Ottomans any more. As we remember, he wanted to fight in World War I since he regarded himself an Ottoman. The war did not destroy the friendship of Karatavuk and Mehmetçik. While two friends are talking, the Cretan Muslim, who resides in Mehmetçik's house, goes to the gendarme, and informs them about the stranger who knocked on his door the night before. People start panicking and getting ready to attack the stranger. Nobody knew that Mehmetçik was the Red Wolf, the bandit, because his family never told the truth to anybody in the town. Mehmetçik was wearing a red shirt that suited his nickname, Red Wolf. Iskander the Potter also joins the group to hunt the bandit.

Karatavuk and Mehmetçik recognize the group getting close to them. Karatavuk offers Mehmetçik to exchange their shirts so that Karatavuk can deceive the group and save Mehmetçik's life. Mehmetçik hesitates for a while however, Karatavuk insists and all of a sudden he is shot by Iskander, his own father. Meanwhile Mehmetçik manages to run away. Iskander shoots his own son in his right arm, and Karatavuk, who has started making pottery like his father, loses his right arm, and which ends his carreer as a potter.[708] Karatavuk saved the life of his childhood friend: fighting in the Gallipoli Battle and the Greco-Turkish War could not infuse hatred into Karatavuk; the author does not destroy the friendship between those boys. After this unfortunate accident, Karatavuk becomes the town's letter-writer and trains himself to write with his left hand. Moreover he moves to the house of Leonidas with his own family. He uses the papers and the ink of Leonidas and thinks of the old days.[709] Leonidas taught Mehmetçik to read and to write. Then Mehmetçik taught Karatavuk to read and write. Karatavuk becomes the literate man of the town. Mehmetçik and Karatavuk contributed to each other's lives in this way.

Turkey became the land of Turks, and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk built a new country and changed the alphabet from Arabic to Roman letters. Karatavuk learns the

[707] Ibid., 582.
[708] Ibid., 588.
[709] Ibid., 615.

new alphabet and becomes the letter-writer of the town. Of course, the younger generation was incapable of reading the old books written in Arabic letters.[710] Abdul gets Karatavuk as his surname and he becomes Abdul Karatavuk Efendi, and 'Efendi' brings him great honor because he can read and write.[711] Abdul writes a letter to his dear friend, Mehmetçik, saying that he misses him very much after all those years, and now he is an old man with grandchildren.[712] He concludes his letter as follows:

> For me the stars are growing dim, and everything has almost gone, and I wonder if you have come to the same conclusion as I have. It is often useless to plan for things, even when you know exactly what you are doing. The present is confounded by the future, the future is confounded by the future beyond it, and the memories bubble up in disorder, and the heart is unpredictable. You and I once fancied ourselves as birds, and we were very happy even when we flapped our wings and fell down and bruised ourselves, but the truth is that we were birds without wings. You were a robin and I was a blackbird, and there were some who were eagles, or vultures, or pretty goldfinches, but none of us had wings. For birds with wings nothing changes; they fly where they will and they know nothing about borders and their quarrels are very small. But we are always confined to the earth, no matter how much we climb to the high places and flap our arms. Because we cannot fly, we are condemned to do things that do not agree with us. Because we have no wings we are pushed into struggles and abominations that we did not seek, and then, after all that, the years go by, the mountains are leveled, the valleys rise, the rivers are blocked by sand and the cliffs fall into the sea.[713]

Abdul summarizes life through the lives of the birds and human beings. It was the metaphor of the novel that man is a bird without wings. Asia Minor Greeks migrated to Greece without wings, and settled there since human beings are confined to the earth.

A new imam comes to Eskibahçe from Konya after the Christians were deported. They break down the locked doors of the abandoned houses, empty the wine bottles stored in the houses of the Christians. Then they go to the church and

[710] Ibid., 616.
[711] Ibid., 617.
[712] Ibid., 620.
[713] Ibid., 621.

destroy the frescos of the saints on the wall of the church. They also damage the cemetery of the Christians.[714] The same destructive attitudes are also done in Greece, too. Mosques are demolished and Muslim cemeteries are desecrated.[715] It was done for the nation building process both in Turkey and Greece. With the population exchange, two so-called homogeneous societies were established on each side of the Aegean. Cultural and religious monuments were not tolerated and were destroyed as part of erasing the history of the "Other." The monuments of the Greeks and Turks in both countries became the target of nationalist ideologies.[716] People destroyed those monuments of a common cultural heritage to take revenge against the "Other." Eskibahçe was also destroyed by nationalism as de Bernières describes the village after the population exchange:

> Not many years ago a bishop came from Rhodes, and an imam came from Fethiye, and in the broken carapace of the Church of Aghios Nikolaos, they prayed together for the rebirth of the place and its community, where, side by side, there used to live Christians who spoke only Turkish, but wrote it in the Greek script, and Muslims who also speak only Turkish, and also wrote it in the Greek script. Neither God, for reasons best known to himself, nor the Turkish government, for cogent reasons of expense, have answered the prayers of the bishop and the imam, and the town of Eskibahçe, whose Greek name in the Byzantine age was 'Paleoperiboli', slumbers on in death, without an epitaph, and with no one to remember it.[717]

Eskibahçe's multi-ethnic atmosphere was destroyed by the population exchange. Beautiful visions of friendship, respect, and love were buried there after a couple of years fighting and hatred.

Nikandros Kepesis, who was the former resident of Livisi/Kayaköy, was interviewed by Barbaros Tanc in 1999 in Greece. He was born on 2 February 1914 in Livisi, the only son of Eirinis and Minas Hatziarguris and he left Asia Minor in 1922. Tanc writes that

[714] Ibid., 593.
[715] Ibid., 594.
[716] Nikos Agriantonis, "Greece and Turkey. The Protection of Our Heritage: Problem without Problems," in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 277-283 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 281.
[717] de Bernières. *Birds Without Wings*, 29.

> When Kepesis describes his life in Livisi, he emphasizes the importance of family and the religious community. He also indicates the harmonious relationship between Christians and Muslims. In this regard, there are similarities between Kepesis's perspectives and those of the Greek novelist Mrs Dido Sotiriou in *The Dead Wait*: both agree that at least until the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913, there was a good relationship between Muslims and orthodox Christians in the Ottoman empire.[718]

He also remembered celebrating feasts of Christians and Bayrams of Muslims together in Kayaköy. On the eve of World War I, life became harder, and his father fled first to Egypt, then to Piraeus and ended up in the United States in order not to be taken to the labor battalions. He and his mother were sent to Denizli with other Christians. After their return from Denizli to Livisi, they realized that the male population of the town had already been sent to the labor battalions. During the deportation, some villagers converted to Islam in order not leave their homeland. The rest left the town with nothing.

A local Muslim Livisian described the event to Tanc: "They left here with only food in their stomachs and clothes on their backs."[719] Ottoman Greeks (200 families) were taken to Tzia (Kea) — an island near the Turkish coast. They wanted to settle in the same area and "they were very creative in turning barren area to a place where they could settle. They called their place Nea-Makri, after the harbor town near Livisi, now called Fethiye in Turkey."[720] After seventy-five years, Kepesis visited Livisi, and felt very sorry after seeing their house in bad condition, and as he visited the church, he heard the voice of his mother and his cousin. He recollected how his mother and grandmother accepted the idea of leaving their motherland: "it was the will of God and nobody can go against it."[721]

Some Asia Minor Greeks left the keys of their houses to their Turkish neighbors with a great hope of returning. Therefore, they entrusted their houses to Iskander the Potter: "Please, efendi, look after my things until I get back, and take this key to my house, and lock it when we have gone, and look after it until we come

[718] Tanc, "Where local trumps national," 279.
[719] Ibid., 280. For the departure of the Ottoman Greeks see Hilmi Uran's *Hatıralarım* (My Memoirs). Uran was the governor of Çeşme/İzmir in 1920s.
[720] Ibid., 281.
[721] Ibid., 283.

back."[722] Ayşe is entrusted with a trunk by Polyxeni before the exchange. Ayşe promises to keep the trunk forever: "I would always keep the trunk she left in my care that has all the things from her dowry in it, I will keep it until I die and after I die I will give it into the care of my eldest daughter, and like that it will be safe for all the time."[723] de Bernières told me that, Ayşe Nine, the last person who remembered the departure of the Christians, was also entrusted some goods by her neighbors.[724] This was common among the Christians and the Muslims who were victims of the exchange. People were keeping the keys of the houses that were falling down.[725] While the trousseau entrusted by Polyxeni to Ayşe is a minor theme or detail in *Birds Without Wings*, it is the central theme in *Emanet Çeyiz*. It is a symbol that shows the hope of the uprooted people to return to their homeland and their faithful neighbors who promised to keep their belongings until they return.

[722] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 601.
[723] Ibid., 559.
[724] Louis de Bernières.
[725] Ibid.

CHAPTER 4

IMPERIAL IDENTITIES OF *MIKRASIÁTES*

4.1. *Mikrasiátes*: The Last Ottomans

After the Asia Minor Catastrophe, Asia Minor Greeks were neither the protected *millets* of the Ottoman Empire nor the minorities of the Turkish Republic. With the Lausanne Convention, which approved the displacement of minorities from Greece and Turkey, Asia Minor Greeks became the refugees of the Greek state that claimed to be the mother country of the Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor, even though most of them did not speak Greek and had never been to Greece at all. The integration of the refugees into Greek society could not accomplished completely because they were the last Ottomans on Greek soil, and they had imperial identities that differentiated them from the local Greeks who had had national identities for almost a century. The attitudes of the local Greeks and the nationalist policy of the Greek state also had a negative impact on the refugees and their integration. It is crucial to define what I mean by imperial identity. Research has shown that Asia Minor refugees identified themselves as *Mikrasiátes*, meaning Asia Minor people, when they encountered the locals. *Mikrasiátes* was the legacy of the *Millet-i Rum* that was perpetuated in Greece after the Lausanne Convention. The *Millet-i Rum* used to have imperial identities, an Ottoman legacy, which became their social, cultural, and political identity against the locals.

Imperial identities of the Asia Minor Greeks were kept alive through their refugee identity. The *Millet-i Rum* was transformed into *Mikrasiátes* by the refugees who did not want to forget their culture and past. In the first part of this chapter we will discuss why and how refugees differentiated themselves from the locals. The second part of the chapter will analyze the lives of the Asia Minor Greeks in Anatolia that shaped their imperial identity. The last part will discuss the reaction of the refugees to the nationalist policy of the Greek state as the *Millet-i Rum* and whether they perceived Greece as their motherland or not. This chapter will analyze the imperial identities of Asia Minor refugees in the selected literary texts: *Farewell Anatolia, Birds Without Wings* and *Emanet Çeyiz.*

Sotiriou's novel, *Farewell Anatolia*, ends with the Smyrna Fire, so the author does not fictionalize the encounter of the refugees and the locals in Greece. Therefore we have no idea of their lives as well as their imperial identity in Greece. On the other hand, we have oral testimony of Sotiriou in *Anıların Tadı* (Taste of the Memoirs) in which she explained the reaction of the local Greeks toward the refugees just after the Catastrophe. Sotiriou arrived at the port of Piraeus with her aunt when she was a little girl. The Smyrna Fire occurred the day before their arrival in Greece. Sotiriou and her aunt observed the local Greeks gathering at the port, desperately waiting for their sons who were conscripted into the Greek army for the Asia Minor campaign. Sotiriou observed, "Greek mothers, who sent their sons to Asia Minor to occupy the western coast, were at the port, waiting for their sons' arrivals in Greece. They were staring at us with hatred as if we, Asia Minor Greeks, killed their sons. Besides, we were "Turkish seeds" for the local Greeks."[726] Obviously, even before the arrival of the refugees in Greece, there was a tension between the refugees and the locals because the locals blamed the refugees for the loss of their sons and relatives in the Asia Minor campaign. Sotiriou's real life experience is crucial to understand how the trauma of the disaster affected the relations of the refugees and the locals in Greece.

Birds Without Wings has flashbacks of Drosoula, who narrates life in Greece after the deportation. Drosoula is an important character who recalls the lives of the Christians both in Eskibahçe and Cephalonia. de Bernières conveys to his readers how Asia Minor Greeks will be treated in Greece even before the deportation. While Asia Minor Greeks are heading to Telmessos to leave the country, Ioanna joins the group leaving Asia Minor. The following quotation is remarkable for enlightening us about the atmosphere of that moment when Ioanna reveals her real identity and how other people react. Father Kristoforos, the priest of the village, is surprised to see Leyla Hanım among them and wants to know why she is joining with them when there is no reason for a Circassian to leave:

> Leyla Hanım did not even look up at him. 'Eimai pio Ellinida apo olous sas,' she said tartly. 'Genithika stin Ithaki kai esis den isaste para mia ageli apo bastardi Tourki.'

[726] Sotiriou, *Anıların Tadı*.

> Father Kristoforos's Greek extended only to the snippets of the old ecclesiastical variety that he had learned by rote for the purposes of his ministry, and he was taken aback by this unexpected reply that he barely understood. He had spoken to her in his native Turkish, and now asked of those at the fire, 'What did she say? What's she saying?'
>
> Sitting near the flames, Daskalos Leonidas had been momentarily awakened from his mute dejection by hearing his own tongue spoken, and he stirred and looked up wearily at Father Kristoforos. 'I'll translate for you,' he said. 'Leyla Hanım said, "I am more Greek thank any of you. I was born in Ithaca, and you are nothing but a pack of mongrel Turks."'
>
> 'She said that?' asked Father Kristoforos incredulously. 'Christ have mercy!'
>
> 'From now on,' said Leyla Hanım, reverting to Turkish, 'my name is Ioanna, and you will speak to me with respect.'[727]

Ioanna's humiliation of Asia Minor Greeks is an important signal of how they will be treated in Greece by the locals. For Ioanna, Asia Minor Greeks are Turks, not true Greeks like herself; she is more Greek than the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia. With the deportation of Asia Minor Greeks to Greece, a question arose among the locals who did not want the refugees. That question was whether the refugees were "pure" Greeks or not. This will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

The problems of the refugees were not limited to ethnicity but also the country itself since they had never been to Greece. Gerasimos decides to go to Cephalonia, an island of Greece that is familiar only by its name. It was his grandfather's homeland but not his homeland. He has never been to Cephalonia. His motherland is Asia Minor. Therefore, Cephalonia appears to be the best place to migrate although they do not know where exactly the island is. Gerasimos explains the location of the island to Drosoula: "In the west. Somewhere. We'll ask after it, and when we get there we will find the family of Drapanikitos. Then we won't be nobodies in a land of strangers."[728] Gerasimos knows that they are going to the land of strangers. Going to his grandfather's homeland and finding his relatives are the only solutions that will make Gerasimos and Drosoula less anxious and disoriented.

[727] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 548-549.
[728] Ibid., 553.

Drosoula, who is exiled in Cephalonia, remembers how she was treated in Greece when she first arrived in a new and foreign country:

> When I came here I didn't even speak Greek, didn't you know that? I still dream in Turkish sometimes. I came here because the Christians had to leave, and they thought all the Christians like me were Greeks, because the people who run the world never did and never will have any idea how complicated it really is, so if you call me a Turk you might think you're insulting me, but it's half true, and I am not ashamed. People used to call me 'Turk' when I first came here, and they didn't mean it kindly either, and they pushed in front of me and shoved me aside, and they muttered things under their breath when I passed by.[729]

When the local Greeks first encountered the Asia Minor Greeks, they did not recognize them as "Greeks" but Turks since they were coming from Turkey, the land of the Turks. Moreover, Asia Minor Greeks spoke Turkish as their mother tongue, which complicated the issue for the locals who were approaching the issue of language and ethnicity in terms of nationalist affiliations. The confusion led to culture shock on both sides. Mavrogordatos gives us a precise explanation of the culture shock:

> As one should expect, the conceptions and forms that Orthodox Christianity, the Greek language, and "Greekness" itself had assumed within the refugee cultural heritage were, or at least appeared to be, so different from those of the natives that both sides experienced what can only be described as a *traumatic cultural shock*.[730]

Perhaps both refugees and the locals were assumed to unite within the cultural heritage that they thought was alike, but their culture was different.

Under these circumstances the longing of the refugees for Asia Minor never alleviated but got stronger each day. They lost their past, their culture, their homeland with a traumatic destruction. Drosoula narrates what she has lost in Anatolia: "I lost my family, my town, my language and my earth. Perhaps it's only possible to be happy, as I am here in this foreign land that someone decided was my

[729] Ibid., 20.
[730] Mavrogordatos, *Stillborn Republic,* 193.

home, if one forgets not only the evil things, but also the very perfect ones."[731] Drosoula thinks that she is in exile in a foreign land that somebody else has decided for her. She discovers two kinds of people:

> Those who are thoughtless, and those who have hearts. The thoughtless ones call you a filthy Turk, and spit at you, and tell you to go to the devil, and say 'Piss off back to Turkey', and the heartful ones give you coins and bread, and offer you work, and make a fuss of your little boy, and offer you clothes they have finished with, because they pity your rags.[732]

Refugees left their properties in Asia Minor and arrived in Greece in poverty. They became extremely poor due to the deportation. While some locals were thoughtful, some were extremely discriminatory toward the refugees. Nikos Marantzidis notes that Venizelos and his supporters wanted to alleviate the sorrows of the refugees and make the local Greeks sensitive toward the problems of the refugees. However, the conflict between the refugees and the locals continued for a long time.[733]

The Drapanikitos family, relatives of Gerasimos' grandfather, did not welcome Gerasimos and Drosoula because they were filthy "Turks." They heard about Gerasimos, the grandfather, before, "but apparently he had been a black sheep anyway."[734] However, Gerasimos and Drosoula took the surname Drapanikitos despite the negative treatment that they received from the Drapanikitas family. Gerasimos earned his living by fishing and his nickname was Odysseus because he managed to sail by a small boat from Turkey to Cephalonia. It was not easy at all, but dangerous and risky. Moreover he was wearing a turban when he was out at sea, instead of a hat. The turban represented their Ottoman and Anatolian culture. "Did I ever tell that after all this time I sometimes still dream in Turkish?"[735] was the last remark of Drosoula who longed for Asia Minor.

---

[731] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 24.
[732] Ibid., 568.
[733] Nikos Marantzidis, "Yunanistan'da Türkçe Konuşan Pontuslu Mülteciler: Entegrasyon Sorunu," (Turkish Speaking Pontian Refugees in Greece: Integration Problem), in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 97-109 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 102.
[734] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 571.
[735] Ibid., 571.

Asia Minor refugees were discriminated against by the natives due to their mother tongue and their mother country. The oral testimonies of the refugees in *Emanet Çeyiz* are informative about the humiliation of the refugees by the locals with the word *tourkosporoi* (seeds of Turks). The local Greeks did not want the refugees in Greece. Vasili Karabaş said that they were despised as the "seeds of Turks" and the locals refused to marry the refugees.[736] Hirschon notes that "Even in 1972 it was clear that marriages were preferably contracted from within the 'refugee' population. People in Kokkinia often used the common Greek proverb, 'Shoes from your homeland, even if they are mended'."[737] The refugees and the locals were totally different in terms of culture, customs and manners, so marriages were avoided between the two for a long time. Refugees lived in the refugee settlements and married among themselves. Marantzidis notes that the Turkish-speaking refugees, who married among themselves, were alienated and their different identities became more apparent.[738]

Asia Minor refugees were not welcomed by the locals although they were both Orthodox Christians and were assumed "Greeks". The integration of the refugees into the Greek society did not happen smoothly as it had been expected by the nationalist politicians and diplomats who initiated the population exchange. The first problem of the refugees in Greek society was their ethnic origin and "Greekness." Mavrogordatos notes that:

> On the level of perceptions, the "Greekness" itself of the refugees was questioned, or even denied, despite their own claims to be the purest Greeks. The same distinctive cultural patterns which served to cement the refugee ethnic identity also served to cast doubt on their national identity. The ethnic slurs commonly hurled at them, such as "Turkish seed" (*tourkosporoi*, "Turkish born" (*tourkogennemenoi* and *tourkomerites*), and "baptized in yogurt" (*giaourtovaftismenoi*), forcefully reflect this basic native perception. Among other native stereotypes, suffice it to note those concerning the "loose" sexual mores of the refugees (woman in particular), again in fairly classical syndrome.[739]

[736] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 82.
[737] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 111.
[738] Marantzidis, "Yunanistan'da Türkçe Konuşan Pontuslu Mülteciler," 104.
[739] Mavrogordatos, *Stillborn Republic*, 194.

Angela Katrini remarked that the local Greeks did not want the refugees because they feared losing their farmlands. Furthermore, they let loose their dogs to frighten the refugees.[740] Karakasidou explains that the locals "resented the settlement of refugees in their communities, or initially regarded the refugees as somehow less Greek than themselves. Others considered them as total "Others" who had come to take away the lands they now claimed as theirs."[741] Dimitra Giannuli stresses that "Metropolitan Greeks perceived the newcomers as a serious economic threat since the refugees would inevitably compete with them for the limited resources of the country."[742] As we will remember from the oral testimonies of the refugees in Chapter 2, homeless and hopeless refugees worked very hard to survive in Greece. Furthermore, they were exploited by their employers who knew that those people needed food and shelter desperately.

The refugees and the natives had different perspectives on Turks. For the refugees, Turks were not the enemy, but former neighbors and friends; but for the locals, however, Turks were the national enemy. That was another reason that they could not get on well. Hirschon observes that among the refugees,

> a highly differentiated picture emerges from the frequent references to Turks/Muslims. *Mikrasiátes* of this generation were aware of them as human beings with all the faults and virtues which they themselves had. Notably, in their narratives there is a realistic representation of events and characters, rather than the images based on stereotypical 'imaginings', which are routinized outside of real-life experience.[743]

While refugees remembered Turks with good memories and intentions since they had long years of co-existence together in Asia Minor, the local Greeks perceived the Turks as the "Other", the enemy due to the Greek Revolution and the Greco-Turkish War. Eleni Manailoglou stated that they got on well with the Turks in Asia Minor;

[740] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 142.
[741] Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat*, 147.
[742] Dimitra Giannuli, "Greeks or "Strangers at Home": The Experiences of Ottoman Greek Refugees during Their Exodus to Greece, 1922-1923," *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* Vol.13, No.2 (October 1995): 279.
[743] Hirschon, "Knowledge of Diversity," 72.

however they were afraid to praise their Turkish neighbors before the locals who humiliated them as the "seeds of Turks."[744]

Pappas remarks that for the local Greeks, "the refugees represented an Anatolian corruption of Greekness, a Turkofied version of themselves, polluted by Turkish language, Levantine mercantilism, and oriental customs, characteristics many thought they had shed long before when they secured independence from their Ottoman overlords."[745] Local Greeks were approaching the issue of ethnicity from a nationalist outlook, and their criterion of Greekness was the Greek language as explained by Mackridge:

> For most Greeks today, being Greek is chiefly defined by speaking the Greek language, being a member of the Orthodox Church, and living in lands that were inhabited by Greek ancestors. Beyond this, Greeks feel that their Church membership connects them particularly to the Byzantine Empire, while their language connects them to Classical Hellas as well as Byzantium.[746]

This definition of Greekness does not match with the Turkish-speaking Asia Minor refugees. They were members of the Orthodox Church; however, their language and culture were different. Moreover, their ancestors were not in Greece but in Turkey. They were literally sent into exile. As Edward Said explains, exile "is produced by human beings for other human beings; and that, like death but without the death's ultimate mercy, it has torn millions of people from the nourishment of tradition, family, and geography."[747]

There were other factors that prevented the refugees to integrate into Greek society fully. Refugees left their belongings and fortunes in Asia Minor, lived under desperate conditions, and were deprived of basic needs for their survival. The poor assistance of the Greek state always kept their refugee identities alive. Furthermore, the invasion of Greece by the Germans and the Italians during World War II, and then the Civil War, worsened the conditions and lives of the refugees as Vasili

[744] KAAM, *Göç*, 215.
[745] Pappas, "Concepts of Greekness," 353.
[746] Peter Mackridge, *Language and National Identity in Greece 1766–1976* (U.S.A: Oxford University Press, 2009), 9.
[747] Edward Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (U.S.A: Harvard University Press), 174.

Karabaş explained in *Emanet Çeyiz.*[748] Drosoula thinks that the local Greeks treated the refugees badly during the Civil War: "In all the hundred years of occupation the Turks never did anything to us that was half as bad as what we Greeks did to each other in the civil war."[749] According to Louis de Bernières, the Greek Civil War was the outcome of the population exchange. If the population exchange had not taken place in 1923, the civil war wouldn't have happened in Greece.[750] de Bernieres' evaluation of the Greek Civil War clarifies our argument that two culturally distinct groups were forced to live together in Greece.

The refugees were unfortunate because their lives were wasted in wars and conflicts. Hirschon, who observed the lives of the refugees in the 1970s, states that, "For that period the immense scale of the disruption was unique, so great that, even in the 1970s, the Greek Red Cross broadcast daily messages for relatives seeking those with whom contact had been lost fifty years before."[751] The population exchange was such a tragedy that fifty years could not heal it when Hirschon was doing her research. She notes that "Even in 1983 there was no central sewerage system in Kokkinia. Every winter many basement rooms (where aged couples resided) flooded in storms, causing drowning in the worst incidents."[752] The trauma of deportation from their homeland always haunted them in Greece and affected their adaptation to Greek society along with their poor living conditions.

The hope of returning to Asia Minor has always been very central to their refugee identity. Refugees always hoped to go back to Turkey and expected to be forgiven by Atatürk and allowed to return to their previous lives in Asia Minor. That is another reason for the transplanted people of Asia Minor not adapting to Greek society as fully as they were expected to. Tanasis Bakırcıoğlu regretted migrating to Greece since he disliked the country as well as the locals. He regretted that he did not convert to Islam and change his name to Mehmet in order to stay in his hometown, Burdur.[753] This personal regret of Tanasis clarifies the desperate lives of the refugees

[748] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 82.
[749] de Bernieres, *Birds Without Wings*, 20.
[750] Louis de Bernières.
[751] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 1-2.
[752] Ibid., 3.
[753] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 116.

in Greece to such an extent that some even regretted not having converted and stayed in Asia Minor. Since the population exchange was based on religious affiliation, the only way for a Christian to stay in Asia Minor was to convert to Islam. This is a remarkable confession that claims that the mother country might have more impact on the lives of the human beings than their religion. At the moment of decision between the motherland and the religion, one may choose the motherland as many Asia Minor Greeks did in the 1920s during the exchange of populations.

Pentzopoulos asserts that the representatives of the Refugee Settlement Commission were frequently asked by the refugees when they would be able to go back to their home country in which they had been the masters of their lives.[754] Furthermore, refugees believed that the Turkish government would eventually correct their mistake and request the refugees to return to their home country. Asia Minor was a "Paradise Lost" for the homesick refugees, in which they used to live peacefully. It is human to have strong feelings and attachment to one's homeland because it is where one is born and nurtured. Losing one's homeland forever is traumatic. World War II and the Civil War also made the refugees lives harder. Greece could not provide a prosperous life due to the political and social conflicts. Liisa H. Malkki states "Forced population movements have extraordinarily diverse historical and political causes and involve people who, while all displaced, find themselves in qualitatively different situations and predicaments."[755] Asia Minor refugees, who found themselves in different situations, regarded their mother country as a paradise since they had been happy there; whereas in Greece, their sufferings were endless.

Renee Hirschon's invaluable book, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, is an anthropological monograph on the refugee identities of Asia Minor Greeks settled in Kokkinia, a refugee settlement near Piraeus. Hirschon undertook her research in 1972 when Asia Minor Greeks (*Mikrasiátes*) had been refugees in Greece for 50 years and were still trying to adapt to the new society. She observed their culture, beliefs, customs, and identities as well as their relations with the local Greeks. Their

[754] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 206.
[755] Liisa H. Malkki, "Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things," *Annual Review of Anthropology* (1995. 24): 496.

past memories of Asia Minor, their relations with Turks, and their shared memories and cultures with Turks were analyzed by Hirschon, who admired the refugees and was astonished to observe their strong belief in Orthodox Christianity, which was a means of survival for them in Greece. Her interpretation and analysis of refugee identities of Asia Minor Greeks and their cultural and traditional values are impressive.

My first question to Renèe Hirschon in our interview was whether it was her choice to do fieldwork in Kokkinia with the Asia Minor refugees. She noted that it was not a conscious choice. Her interests were on the relationship between cultural values and how space was used, and how people organized their lives in a particular locality. Hirschon said that Kokkinia "was a very good area to study because the housing that existed there had a standard pattern which was given to them in 1928 in that locality and I was just studying them 50 years later and so, it was a good laboratory to see what the changes had been in the way people lived in their houses and around the locality."[756] Hirschon and her research associate, Thakurdesai, were surprised to see that every woman had her own kitchen in that limited area of space. "It appears that the kitchen is seen primarily as a cooking area, and cooking activities are not conceived as communal. Thus a kitchen, even though of minimal size, is the independent realm of each married woman."[757] This was a turning point for Hirschon to realize that the refugees had a different cultural background from the local Greeks despite the same language and religion.

After that awareness of the refugees' different cultural background, Hirschon decided to do doctoral research on Asia Minor refugees because as she stayed there, she soon realized that those people were saying something to her about themselves which was very important and she could not ignore their view of the world because she believes that the most important thing for an anthropologist is to understand what the people are saying. Instead of imposing a research agenda on those people, Hirschon became aware of how important it was that they had been displaced from

[756] Renèe Hirschon, interview by author, Oxford, August 2, 2012.
[757] Renèe Hirschon and Thakurdesai, "Society, Culture and Spatial Organization: An Athens Community," *Ekistics*, Vol. 30, No. 178 (1970):194. See also Hirschon, "Essential Objects and the Sacred: Interior and Exterior Space in an Urban Greek Locality" and "Housing and Cultural Priorities: the Asia Minor Refugees of 1922" (with S. Thakurdesai).

their homeland and they were still using the term "refugee" fifty years afterwards. What was most striking for Hirschon was that although in a country where the local Greeks and the refugees have the same religion and the same language, refugees identified themselves differently. She tried to understand why they were different and what the distinctions were between the locals and the refugees.

According to Hirschon's research, Asia Minor refugees had a distinct sense of identity different from the local Greeks. Hirschon observes that "The inhabitants of Kokkinia had a clearly developed sense of identity, separate from that of metropolitan Greek society."[758] They either referred to themselves as "refugees" or "Asia Minor people" to distinguish themselves from the locals. Hirschon asserts that the refugees had various names for the locals such as 'local' or 'Vlachs', meaning shepherds, 'old Greeks' or simply Greeks. Moreover, even the second and the third generation of the refugees who were born in Greece referred to themselves as 'refugees' or 'Asia Minor people'.[759] A representative declared to the Pan-Refugee Congress: "We will never cease being aware that we are refugees and will never stop transmitting [this sentiment] to our children and to the children of our children."[760] Refugees with their own will and intention preferred to remain as refugees in Greece. As we have discussed earlier, they were also forced to remain refugees. A strong sense of common culture inherited from Anatolia connected the refugees together in Greece. Furthermore, Hirschon has an interesting analysis of the refugees with whom she lived: "I have come to realize that these elderly people, with whom I enjoyed such good company, were among the last of the Ottomans, a fact, which I did not fully appreciate at that time or my field research might have taken a more specific focus."[761] Hirschon realized much later that she lived among the last Ottomans. Those last Ottomans had imperial identities to differentiate themselves from the locals.

In our interview, I asked Renèe Hirschon if she had known that the refugees were the last Ottomans during her fieldwork, how she would direct her research and

[758] Hirchon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 4.
[759] Ibid.
[760] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 205.
[761] Hirschon, "Knowledge of Diversity," 66.

how this awareness would affect her research. She told me that the refugees never used the word Ottoman, but she understood their cosmopolitan worldview through their daily conversations although most of them were illiterate. They had a very broad view of the world and they were respectful toward other cultures. Furthermore, they did not stereotype other ethnic groups. Here I should add that the refugees were not the product of a nationalist ideology. For that reason, they did not know how to stereotype other people. They constantly said to Renée Hirschon that they had a better civilization in Asia Minor compared to Greece. They felt superior as they perceived themselves more sophisticated and cosmopolitan. Renée Hirschon told me that if she had been aware of the refugees being the last Ottomans, she would have paid more attention to what language they spoke because the Greek language they spoke contained many Turkish words. In her neighborhood there were also Turkish-speaking refugees. However, she could not communicate with them much. She regretted not recording their daily speech into a voice recorder which would inform us about the spoken Ottoman Turkish of 1970s Greece.

Refugees were aware of different ethnic identities and languages as well as the cultures and customs of those ethnic groups with whom they had lived. Hirschon claims that, "the world view of these former inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire was founded in a wider, more inclusive notion of 'common humanity', and differed in this respect from that of the local Greek population, both from the time of their arrival and later, as the decades passed."[762] Hirschon observed the daily lives of the refugees and realized that their speech

> contained frequent references to the customs and character of other groups–Europeans, Armenians, Jews and Muslims. The *Mikrasiátes'* view of the world was essentially cosmopolitan, expressing a sense of familiarity and ease with the ways of others. Conversations with the older people in Kokkinia, in which they recounted events from their lives in the homeland, displayed this sense of acceptance that the ways of others were different but nonetheless could be respected. It was also the basis for differentiating themselves from the limited horizons and knowledge of the local Greeks.[763]

[762] Ibid., 65.
[763] Ibid., 67.

The wider worldview of the refugees distanced them from the locals although they shared the same religion and language that were supposed to unite the refugees and the locals. Tanc asserts that "their cultural identities are strongly related to their past of who they were."[764] Culture is one of the most important criteria of determining who you are. What differentiated the refugees from the locals was their cultural background that was nurtured in Asia Minor.

Refugees, with their different cultural and political background, were the last Ottomans with Ottoman identities which were their political and social identity as well. Ottoman identity is first mentioned in *Birds Without Wings* by the father of Leonidas who opposes the *Megali Idea* as he tries to persuade Leonidas that they should not mess up their lives in Asia Minor for the sake of "Greater Greece": "We are all Ottomans now. Times have changed."[765] The father of Leonidas is aware of his political and social identity, as a subject of the Ottoman Empire, and he is happy with that because he enjoys more privileges in Asia Minor compared to the Greeks in Athens. Another character who emphasizes his Ottoman identity is Nico. When World War I broke out, Nico, a Christian boy, wants to fight against the enemies of the Sultan and regards himself an Ottoman citizen. When he is told that it was a holy war against the Christians, he ignores that and says, "I am an Ottoman."[766] Nico, with all his naiveté, wants to fulfill his duty to the Sultan as a citizen of the empire. Serving in the army was one of the duties of Ottoman citizens, and many Ottoman Greeks fought in the Balkan Wars and World War I either at the front or in the labor battalions. Both characters regard themselves as Ottomans due to the imperial rule of the Ottoman Empire.

Refugees and the locals could not manage to cooperate well as they were expected to by the policy makers because refugees had imperial identities while the locals had Greek national identities. Alice James states that "The Greeks that became independent from the Ottoman Empire looked to Western Europe for their frame of reference and to the classical past for inspiration. But the Greeks that remained a part of the Ottoman Empire looked to Byzantium. Constantinople was the center of their

[764] Tanc, "Where Local Trumps National," 281.
[765] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 259.
[766] Ibid., 293.

social and religious world."[767] The refugees and the locals had different points of reference and past experiences. Refugees were used to constitute a self-governing entity in the Ottoman Empire: "For nearly half a millennium, the Ottomans ruled an empire as diverse as any in history. Remarkably, this multi-ethnic and multi-religious society worked. Muslims, Christians, and Jews worshipped and studied side by side, enriching their distinct cultures."[768] Refugees had a long past with the diverse ethnic groups of Asia Minor; whereas locals used to live in a homogeneous country.

Refugees did not regard the Turks as the enemy but as friends and neighbors with whom they used to have good relations. On the other hand, the locals fought against the Turks and the Ottoman Empire for their independence in the nineteenth century. After independence, Greeks and Turks clashed in Asia Minor during 1919-1922. The locals fought against the Turks twice while most Asia Minor Greeks were not part of those conflicts. Thus the locals had a strong sense of nationalism. The refugees, however, were not much influenced by nationalism. Pentzopoulos states that

> When Asia Minor Greeks migrated to Greece, Greece was a Kingdom with a strong sense of nationalism that had already constructed a homogeneous society and gathered all Hellenes in Greece. On the other hand, Asia Minor refugees, coming from a multi-ethnic and multi-lingual society, did not have any sense of loyalty to the King because they had been autonomous in Asia Minor under the Ottoman rule and they did not struggle for independence as the local Greeks did.[769]

These totally different backgrounds of the refugees and the locals prevented them from cooperating and integrating smoothly into the Greek state. The locals were the citizens of a nation-state and as Anderson notes, "the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings."[770] There was no comradeship between the locals and the refugees. In the eyes of the refugees, nationalist Greeks led the

[767] Alice James, "The Mirror of Their Past: Greek Refugee Photographs and Memories of Anatolia," *Visual Anthropology Review*. V. 16, No. 2 (Fall-Winter 2000-2001): 27.
[768] Braude and Lewis, introduction to *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, 1.
[769] Pentzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange*, 175.
[770] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 7.

Asia Minor campaign and displaced Asia Minor Greeks from their homeland due to their irredentist ideologies. For the locals, their sons and relatives were killed in Asia Minor for the liberation of Asia Minor Greeks. Both groups had excuses not to cooperate and get on well.

According to the refugees, Asia Minor and Greece were different, even topographically; while Asia Minor was fertile, Greece was "nothing but gravel and swamp"[771] said Mihalis, brother of Manolis who deserted from the Ottoman army during the Balkan Wars and went to Greece. Furthermore, the local Greeks were ignorant mountain people. They were not the residents of big cities like the ones in Asia Minor. Leonidas' father describes Athens thus: "It's a shitty little village, that's what! A shitty little provincial village with some ruins and no theatre worth going to, and the people with no education and no culture, and the houses with all the paint peeled off, and they can't even speak Greek properly!"[772] The father of Leonidas lives in Smyrna, a metropolis with all kinds of cultural and artistic openings and a multi-ethnic city open to the world. Hirschon notes that, "Asia Minor towns were centers of contact, exchange, and variety, and by implication they represented the 'open' world."[773] Therefore, local Greeks, who used to live in the mountains, were the members of a closed society which was isolated, and were perceived negatively by the refugees. Actually, refugees were not ignorant of Greece's geography, and they knew that not all local Greeks lived in the mountains.[774] It was a way of differentiating themselves from the locals, emphasizing their Asia Minor origin. James claims that "Once the refugees recovered from their most desperate situation, they were disappointed with the lack of sophistication of small provincial towns such as Chios city, and even of Athens and Thessaloniki."[775]

Refugees were not happy with the habits and manners of the locals either. Compared to their sophisticated life-style and the cosmopolitan cities of Asia Minor they had resided in before, Greece and the locals appeared to be simple and ignorant.

[771] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 66.
[772] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 259.
[773] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 34.
[774] Ibid., 33.
[775] Alice James, "Memories of Anatolia: Generating Greek Refugee Identity," *Balkanologie*, Vol. V, No.1-2 (Dec. 2001):236.

One elderly refugee told Hirschon, "Before we came here what were they? We opened their eyes. They didn't know how to eat or dress. They used to eat salt fish and wild vegetables. It was we who taught them everything."[776] Vasili Karabaş also mentioned that Greece was a poor country before; however with the contribution of the refugees, Greece managed to develop and become prosperous after World War II and the Civil War.[777] It took a long time to recover but finally the refugees made a difference with their arrival in Greece. Tanc states that, "By thus casting themselves as cultured and educated and their "hosts" as isolated and backward, the Asia Minor Greeks constructed social boundaries. Integral in this process was the idea of their lost homelands, and the collective memory of the Ottoman past."[778]

Apart from the political, social and cultural differences of the refugees from the locals, the refugees were also physically different. Giannuli claims that, "Variations in physical appearance, dialects, educational and occupational skills, and life style, as well as practices and rituals of their Orthodox faith, provided a colorful diversity among the refugees themselves while at the same time setting them apart from native Greeks."[779] Refugees were not homogenous at all. They were very heterogeneous as they had different dialects and cultures in Asia Minor. Mavrogordatos remarks that,

> Distinctive patterns of speech, including peculiar dialects such as the Pontic (not to speak of the Turkish-speaking, or bilingual refugees), manners, customs, and even surnames (often ending in the Turkish suffix oglu) served both to single out the refugee and to cement his ethnic identity, while communication with the natives and "their" state was impeded. Whether cosmopolitan (such as the bourgeoisie of Smyrna) or parochial (such as the peasants of inner Anatolia) in outlook, the refugees found themselves deeply alienated from the suffocating and narrow parochialism of the Greek state and its society.[780]

[776] Hirchon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 31.
[777] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 82.
[778] Tanc, "Where local trumps national," 282.
[779] Giannuli, "Greeks or "Strangers at Home"," 277- 278.
[780] Mavrogordatos, *Stillborn Republic*, 193.

Refugees both alienated themselves and were alienated by the locals due to their heterogeneous cultures and customs. They were not homogeneous as they were coming from an empire of multiple identities, languages, and cultures.

Refugees not only distinguished their identities from the local Greeks, but also preferred to have separate spaces of their own. We have already read several oral testimonies of the refugees who looked for a place that resembled their hometown in Asia Minor. They travelled from one place to another to find somewhere that could remind them of their hometown. Giannuli points that

> The migration and settlement patterns differed for urban as opposed to rural refugees. The former gravitated to urban centers, usually in small groups; the latter tended to organize themselves into large groups composed of members from the former communities in Turkey, and moved from place to place looking for terrain and other conditions similar to what they had left.[781]

Resemblance was important for their orientation in Greece. The refugee settlements, the towns or cities, were named after their hometown such as Nea Smyrne, Nea Philadelphia, Nea Kios, Nea Ionia. Those refugee settlements provided the refugees their own space together as a community who shared the Catastrophe, a common trauma that united the refugees in Greece.

Refugees always longed for their hometown and expected to be back because their attachment to their hometown was very intense. Yi-Fu Tuan, who coined the term *topophilia* (one's love of place), states that, "Hometown is an intimate place. It may be plain, lacking in architectural distinction and historical glamor, yet we resent an outsider's criticism of it."[782] Because humans have a strong sense of connection to their hometowns, "The response may be tactile, a delight in the feel of air, water, earth. More permanent and less easy to express are feelings that one has towards a place because it is home, the locus of memories, and the means of gaining a livelihood."[783] Vassilis Colonas notes that Asia Minor Greeks not only lost their homeland but also "the architectural expressions of identity and purpose that had

[781] Giannuli, "Greeks or "Strangers at Home"," 279.
[782] Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), 144-145.
[783] Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), 93.

been built into their communities that had made them meaningful homes."[784] The refugees, with the loss of their meaningful homes in Asia Minor, tried to keep themselves connected to their old homeland through the new homes, churches, and settings that resembled Anatolia. These are means of survival in a foreign land, and orientation through the lost homeland.

4.2. Imperial Lives of the *Mikrasiátes*

The imperial lives of the Ottomans can illuminate us for the imperial identities of Asia Minor Greeks as well as their cultural background in Asia Minor. Asia Minor Greeks were regarded as the privileged *millet* of the empire due to their being the heirs of the Byzantine Empire (Eastern Roman Empire) that fell in 1453 with the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmet II. Actually, the Byzantine Empire did not fall until the Asia Minor Catastrophe, because "The first to come under the Ottoman rule were the Greeks. The initial relation between these two people was not simply one of conqueror and conquered. Turk and Greek had developed a common culture of the frontier over the centuries of their conflict."[785] According to İsmail Tokalak's findings, *Bizans-Osmanlı Sentezi* (The Synthesis of the Byzantine and the Ottoman), classical Ottoman state system was based on the Byzantine state system because Sultan Mehmet II knew how to benefit from the administrators of the Byzantine Empire.[786] The influence of the Byzantine Empire on the Ottoman Empire was not limited to administration. There were many factors that created the synthesis and a cosmopolitan society in the empire: interfaith marriages, conversion of local Orthodox Christian population to Islam and living together with Turks, and recruiting Christians for the army, the Janissaries, and the administration instead of Turks.[787] The laws that Sultan Mehmet II passed were not completely based on Sharia, but they were fairly secular because it was not possible to rule a multi-ethnic

[784] Vassilis, Colonas, "Housing and Architectural Expression of Asia Minor Greeks Before and After 1923," in *Crossing the Aegean*: *An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, ed. Renèe Hirschon, 163-178 (U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004), 163.
[785] Braude and Lewis, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, 10.
[786] İsmail Tokalak, *Bizans-Osmanlı Sentezi* (İstanbul: Güleyboy, 2006), 243. See also Dimitri Kitsikis, *Türk-Yunan İmparatorluğu* (Turkish-Greek Empire).
[787] Ibid., 201.

empire through sharia law alone. The Sultan was the lawgiver and there was no other institution to constrain his power and will.[788] Therefore, Greeks and Turks conquered each other in terms of religion, culture, and language during five centuries of co-existence in Asia Minor. As de Bernières writes, "Istanbul was still the latest living incarnation of Constantinople and Byzantium, whereby names and rulers had changed, but customs, institutions and habits had not."[789]

Asia Minor Greeks always had imperial identities due to their long term existence first under the Byzantine Empire and then the Ottoman Empire from 1299 to 1922. Empires are multicultural, multilingual, and multiethnic. They are also inclusive and tolerant toward different ethnic groups since this is the nature of an empire. The Ottoman Empire was not a completely new state for the subjects of the defeated Byzantine Empire since the Ottoman Sultans regarded themselves as the heirs of the Roman Empire. Salih Özbaran asserts that the Ottoman sultans "styled themselves as Kaysar (Ceasar), Basileus (King – the primary title used by the Byzantine Emperors), *Padisah-ı Konstantiniye* (Emperors of Constantinople), and as *Padisah-ı Rum* (Emperors of the Romans), all titles that clearly underline a belief in their role as inheritors of universal power."[790] This is a continuum of the Eastern Roman Empire through the Ottoman Empire in which Asia Minor Greeks used to co-exist with other ethnic groups for centuries. The Ottoman contribution to the imperial heritage of the Byzantine Empire was the Turkic traditions and Islamic practices.[791] The empire was organized according to the traditions of the Byzantine Empire, Islam, and Turkish culture.

With the conversions and interfaith marriages, the empire became more diverse and dynamic, leading Asia Minor Greeks and Turks to construct a common culture for a harmonious life under the reign of the Ottomans. The imperial society, tradition, and culture in Asia Minor continued and the imperial identities of Asia Minor Greeks shifted from Roman to Ottoman. Kwame Anthony Appiah claims that "identities are multiple and overlapping and context-sensitive, and some are

[788] Ibid., 250.
[789] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 167.
[790] Salih Özbaran, *Bir Osmanlı Kimliği* (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2004), 36.
[791] Barkey, *Empire of Difference*, 69.

relatively trivial or transient."[792] The identity of the Asia Minor Greeks shifted from Roman to Ottoman, from the ruling flock to the protected *Millet-i Rum*. However, the imperial identity, formed through interactions between different ethnic groups, and cultures, remained as the most powerful and inclusive identity of the Ottoman subjects as well as Asia Minor Greeks. Because the Byzantine Empire was multi-ethnic and multi-lingual— like the Ottoman Empire, the imperial identity of Ottoman subjects continued without an interruption. We can define imperial identity as Ottoman identity because Asia Minor Greeks were the subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Hirschon remarks that, "Identity is not a given: it is a process and has a dynamic character. To form one's identity and to maintain it is a process of ongoing definition, of changing perceptions, of redefinitions, and revisions. It is therefore essentially dynamic and is subject to context and circumstance."[793]

Since the Ottoman subjects were ruled through their religious identification, religion had always been the center of their lives. The *millets* of the empire were represented by their religious leaders who were also responsible for the civil and social lives of their charges. The religious leader was the representative of the *millet* before the Ottoman administration. Therefore, the *millets* of the empire had a strong sense of religious identification. Hirschon observes that religion "set a framework for everyday life in which ritual and spiritual dimension penetrated all other spheres. The absence of separation between the 'sacred' or 'spiritual' and the 'mundane' or 'secular' is still characteristic of much contemporary Greek life and was a pronounced feature of life in Asia Minor communities."[794] As it is understood from Hirschon's observation, Asia Minor Greeks perceived life in terms of religion and they were not familiar with national affiliations. The refugees were surprised to know that Hirschon was not an Orthodox Christian although she knew the Greek language.[795] For the refugees, only Orthodox Christians could speak Greek. They could not distinguish contemporary national and linguistic affiliations.[796] This mentality aligned with the notion that all Muslims are Turks; converting to Islam

[792] Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Ethics of Identity* (U.S.A: Princeton University Press, 2005), 100.
[793] Hirschon, "History's Long Shadow," 83.
[794] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 19.
[795] Ibid.
[796] Ibid.

makes the convert a Turk. This notion stems from the *millet* system which grouped each nation through their religious affiliations.

The Ottoman Empire ruled different faiths and cultures for centuries and this led to religious syncretism among the subjects of the empire who were Muslims, Christians, and Jews. F.W. Hasluck's extraordinary research and observations in Asia Minor were compiled in two volumes titled *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans.* Hasluck observed how the transference of the urban and rural sanctuaries during the Ottomans affected the lives, behaviors, and beliefs of the Christians and the Muslims. After the conversion of Saint Sophia Cathedral into a mosque by the Sultan Mehmet II in 1453, Saint Sophia became a holy place of worship for Muslims, as it was previously for Greeks.[797] According to Hasluck's findings, Christians and Muslims frequented common shrines in Anatolia.[798] They constituted a cosmopolitan society. Bernard Lewis remarks that "In the popular religion of both Greek Christians and Turkish Muslims, there are countless common saints, common festivals, and common holy places, which each group interpreted in its own way."[799] Maurice Godelier notes that "human beings, in contrast to other social animals do not just live in society, they produce society in order to live."[800]

Sotiriou narrates a society that is produced by Greeks and Turks in Asia Minor. She depicts a peaceful life of Asia Minor Greeks in Anatolia, the paradise of both Greeks and Turks. Manolis says: "Could it have been the natural warmth of Anatolia, or perhaps the fertile soil?...Whatever the reason, we were always singing. We'd start the day with a song, and we would walk along with a song, in good times and in bad."[801] Orthodox Christians were happy in Kırkıca, and were free in their religious beliefs and rituals. Manolis narrates that they used to celebrate the feasts of saints in Kırkıca with great joy and happiness. Saint Demetrius' day, Saint John's days, Holy Trinity, Christmas, New Year's Day, Epiphany, Carnival, and Easter are celebrated by the folk of Kırkıca as Manolis remarks, "Could there have been a feast

[797] F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2000), 62.
[798] Ibid., 96- 118.
[799] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 42.
[800] Maurice Godelier, *The Mental and The Material* (London: Verso, 1986), 1.
[801] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 18.

day we'd let pass without festivities?"[802] Orthodox Christians of Anatolia used to celebrate the saints' days with their Turkish neighbors and friends.[803] They used to exchange the special food of their feasts with their neighbors, and those gatherings contributed to their friendship and mutual respect and understanding.

de Bernières depicts a very harmonious life in Eskibahçe as Iskander the Potter, an Ottoman Muslim, remembered visiting his Christian neighbors, Charitos and Polyxeni, when their daughter Philothei was born. He noted: "Philothei's family was a Christian one, but at that time we were very much mixed up and, apart from the rantings of a few hotheads whose bellies were filled with raki and the Devil, we lived together in sufficient harmony."[804] The harmonious life in Asia Minor was emphasized several times by the refugees in *Emanet Çeyiz* such as Tanasis Bakırcıoğlu who remarked that they were like brothers with the Turks.[805] Hirschon states that "there are many accounts of the uprooted refugees themselves whose first hand recollections are recorded in archival or oral history sources, and can be starkly juxtaposed and summarized in a frequently repeated phrase: 'We got on well with the Turks'."[806] *Emanet Çeyiz* and *Göç: Rumların Anadolu'dan Mecburi Ayrılışı (1919-1923)* have several oral testimonies of the refugees about their good relations with the Turks. The Greeks and the Turks were not enemies in Anatolia, but neighbors and friends who had good and bad days together as part of their daily lives.

Greeks and Turks managed to create a common culture in Asia Minor in which mixed marriages enriched the diversity of Ottoman society. Interchange marriages between men and women of different religious affiliations was not prohibited in Eskibahçe. Philothei's father, Charitos, says, "She will be a Christian Muslim"[807] because Philothei

> knows that when he returns, she will have to become a Muslim, but this prospect has little meaning for her, as she will still be able to leave little offerings in front of the icon of the Panagia Glykophilousa, and it has always been the pattern for a woman to

[802] Ibid.
[803] Ibid., 22.
[804] de Bernieres, *Birds Without Wings*, 10.
[805] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 113.
[806] Hirschon, "'We got on well with the Turks'," 325.
[807] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 240.

> take her husband's faith, and there have been certain Muslim and Christian families in Eskibahçe that have customarily intermarried since memory began.[808]

Christians and Muslims intermarried and mixed their religions and Anatolian cultures. In Eskibahçe, "In one way or another, if one traced it back far enough, there was no one in that town who was not in some way a relation of everybody else."[809] However, in *Farewell Anatolia*, marrying a Muslim is not allowed at all because it is regarded as sinful. "The worst will happen; there's no greater sin than for a Christian to turn Turk."[810] Manolis had a love affair with a Muslim girl, Adviye; however, he did not want to marry her due to their different religious affiliations. Manolis was afraid to turn Turk by marrying Adviye.[811] While Asia Minor Greeks of Eskibahçe integrated with Turks through mixed marriages, the Ottoman Greeks of Kırkıca avoided it because the people of Kırkıca had already gained a Greek national consciousness. However, love-affairs between Christians and Muslims are unavoidable in the novel because it is part of life.

Farewell Anatolia has an interesting example when Şevket brings some gifts to Manolis to thank him for his father's recovery, and requests Manolis to light a candle: "Light a candle for me. Perhaps our Gods become friends like you and me."[812] Şevket's request from Manolis indicates how religious syncretism occurred in Asia Minor. Another example is from *Birds Without Wings*: Ayşe, wife of Abdulhamid Hodja, asks Polyxeni to light a candle for her: "I want you to ask your Virgin Mary Panagia to do me a favor. Look, here's the money. Buy a candle and burn it for me, and kiss the icon, and beg the Panagia."[813] Hirschon remarks that "The Panayia is the figure with whom the women most closely identify, embodying the ideal values of womanhood and providing, as it were, a redeeming archetype to

[808] Ibid.,450.
[809] Ibid., 32.
[810] Ibid. 31-32.
[811] Ibid., 126.
[812] Sotiriyu, *Benden Selam Söyle Anadolu'ya*, 28.
[813] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 123.

counteract that of Eve, the image of unregenerate womanhood."[814] There are several examples in *Birds Without Wings* of religious syncretism among the villagers of Eskibahçe. For example "A mixed party of Muslims and Christians took their first step towards Ephesus, making pilgrimage together to the house of the Virgin Mary."[815]

When Polyxeni was pregnant with Philothei, she "had drunk from a bowl engraved with verses from the Koran, and in which further verses had been dipped for extra assurance, and had slept with a cross on her belly for at least a week."[816] Philothei is a very beautiful baby, and "The women are hanging Bibles and Koran and blue beads and cloves of garlic all over the place"[817] to get rid of the evil eye on the baby. Lydia, the wife of Father Kristoforos, was barren and "she had even gone to Ayşe, wife of Abdulhamid Hodja, and begged her for some tiny slips of paper upon which Abdulhamid daily wrote of the Koran for the sick to eat. There were special verses, in which children were mentioned."[818] de Bernières notes that,

> It wasn't like that in the big cities, like Smyrna, where there were separate quarters, Armenian quarters, Jewish quarters, et cetera, but in the more remote, little places over the centuries, people's cultural identities got awfully blurred. These were the kind of people who as you say, if you were a Christian and you were ill, you could swallow a little line from the Koran as your medicine.[819]

Obviously, there were no sharp differences between Christianity and Islam for the ordinary folk of Anatolia. People used to have faith for both religions depending on their needs.

Not only religions clashed in Anatolia, but also pagan beliefs and superstitions. Charitos, father of Philothei, asks Iskander the Potter to tie a rag on the red pine to take away the Satan from his beautiful daughter: "Please set my mind at

[814] Renèe Hirschon, "Women, the Aged and Religious Activity: Oppositions and Complementarity in an Urban Greek Locality," *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Johns Hopkins (Baltimore: 1983): 117.
[815] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 172.
[816] Ibid., 7.
[817] Ibid.
[818] Ibid., 65.
[819] Birnbaum, "Louis de Bernières."

rest; go and tie a rag on the red pine, and wish my child an easy life."[820] Amots Dafni asserts that "The custom of tying rags (as well as other objects such as threads, beads, hairs, chains, locks, and other personal belongings) on sacred trees exists in almost every known human culture beyond the borders of religions, geography and time."[821] Dafni identified several reasons for tying rags on trees. The most popular ones are the wishes for a good harvest, overcoming a problem, and curing diseases.[822] According to İsmet Zeki Eyüboğlu those kinds of superstitions are fed from three sources: paganism, monotheistic religions, and everyday lives.[823] They are very effective in the lives of the folk, and the folk of Anatolia have hundreds of superstitions borrowed from shamanism. Polyxeni also requested Ayşe to tie a rag to the tekke of their Muslim saint on her behalf. Ayşe explained to her that anybody could do that and she even saw a Jew tying a rag to the tekke of a Muslim saint.[824] "The lower branches were copiously hung with rags that represented the wishes of an entire town over many years."[825]

Abdülkadir İnan, in *Eski Türk Dini Tarihi* (The History of Old Turkish Religion), remarks that tying rags on trees is a shamanistic practice of Turks from Central Asia to the Mediterranean that has no relation to Islam.[826] He claims that it was a pagan belief that Turks brought to Anatolia from Central Asia. Furthermore, shamanism has not disappeared yet because it is still alive in Islam.[827] Muslims still practice shamanism whether consciously or unconsciously on a daily basis. Serving food for the dead is a shamanistic practice, and now Muslims follow the same tradition through making *helva* (a desert) to serve to people who visit them for condolence.[828] Tokalak notes that Greeks and Armenians also have the same tradition.[829] Obviously, the peoples of Anatolia have borrowed many customs and

[820] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 11.
[821] Amots Dafni, "Why Are Rags Tied to the Sacred Trees of the Holy Land?" *Economic Botany*, Vol.56, No. 4, (Winter, 2002): 315.
[822] Ibid., 325.
[823] İsmet Zeki Eyüboğlu, *Anadolu İnançları* (İstanbul: Koza, 1974), 23.
[824] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 123.
[825] Ibid., 15.
[826] Abdülkadir İnan, *Eski Türk Dini Tarihi* (İstanbul: Devlet Yayınları, 1976), 203.
[827] Ibid., 15.
[828] Ibid., 153- 154.
[829] Tokalak, *Bizans-Osmanlı Sentezi*, 564.

traditions from each other for strategic or practical reasons. This is how cultures and civilizations interact and flourish.

Manolis describes what their Turkish neighbors from other villages used to do after the celebrations of saints' festivals: "Some of them even secretly knelt down before the silver-embossed icon of Saint George and hung votive offerings to heal them of illness or disease and give them strength on their long journey."[830] Hasluck notes that both Christians and Muslims frequented the same shrines in Anatolia when they were desperately trying to overcome a trouble or a disease. He asserts that, "In the face of a common disaster, such as a prolonged drought or an epidemic, Christians and Muslims will combine in supplication and even share the same procession."[831] It was part of their lives, and not extraordinary or weird for the people of Asia Minor because religion was the center of their lives. Anatolia has many shrines that have hosted many people of different faiths. Hasluck remarks that, "Scarlatos Byzantios, writing in the fifties, says frankly that in in his own time, Christians, and frequently even priests, when ill, invited *emirs* and dervishes to 'read over' them, while Turks frequented Christian priests for the same purpose."[832] S. Photine in Smyrna was frequented by the Turks because of the holy well in the church that cures the eye-diseases.[833] The Virgin of Sümela in Trebizond (Trabzon in modern Turkey) was frequented by everyone because "The picture painted by S. Luke has special virtue against locusts and is visited by the surrounding population, irrespective of religion, for relief from all kinds of misfortune."[834] Imam Baghevi in Konya was frequented by Muslims and Christians for healing purposes, and the Mosque of Eyyub in Istanbul has been a holy shrine for the believers of both religions.[835] Haji Bektash Tekke near Kırşehir and Mevlevi Tekke in Konya (Cappadocia region) were respected and frequented by both Muslims and Christians.[836]

[830] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 23.
[831] Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, 96.
[832] Ibid., 105.
[833] Ibid., 98.
[834] Ibid.
[835] Ibid., 108.
[836] Ibid., 109-110.

The close contact with other faiths contributed to the cosmopolitanism of Ottoman society as well as the religious syncretism. Angeli Mavridis notes that Turks joined their feasts with great respect to their priest and the Virgin Mary.[837] In Islam, Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, and all prophets mentioned in the Holy Quran are respected and regarded as sacred. Therefore, Muslims, Christians, and Jews are people of the Book and they are the protected subjects as in the case of the *millet* system. Philothei states that "Jesus Son of Mary and Mary herself are also theirs as well as ours."[838] Christians and Muslims shared their religious and cultural practices without conflicts or contradictions. The religious leaders of Eskibahçe, Father Kristofos and Abdulhamid Hodja, respect each other, and used to have long discussions on theology that "always ended with one or other of them saying, 'Well, after all, we are both peoples of the book'."[839] There used to be mutual respect among the people of the book. de Bernières remarks that, "under the Ottoman regime tolerance was compulsory. They had no toleration of intolerance because everyone was sat on more or less fairly and equally heavily; there wasn't much trouble between the ethnicities and the religions."[840]

Cultural borrowings between Christians and Muslims were common such as the surnames of Asia Minor Greeks with the "Hacı/Hatzi" prefix. Silvia Hacımihalidu, Antonias Hacistefanu, and Vasilis Hacıathanasoglou are some examples that we encounter in *Göç* by CAMS.[841] Hirschon remarks that "Among Anatolian Christians, the aspiration was to visit Jerusalem, to worship at the Holy Places, and to be 'baptized' in the river Jordan. On their return they would prefix Hatzi/-enna to their name."[842] They borrowed it from their Muslim neighbors who also have had "Hacı/Hatzi" prefix to their surnames after their pilgrimage to Mecca. Since Asia Minor Greeks speak Turkish as their mother tongue, the "Hacı/Hatzi" prefix was very common. Hirschon explains that

> The fact that religious elements are borrowed does not shake the central commitments of the believer, and the process of syncretism

[837] KAAM, *Göç*, 162.
[838] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 251.
[839] Ibid., 38
[840] Birnbaum, "Louis de Bernières."
[841] KAAM, *Göç*, 79-127-257.
[842] Hirschon, "'We got on well with Turks'," 335.

> is integral to the development of all religious systems in contact with each other. The salient point is that the co-existence of different faiths may lead to the growth of mutual respect, and to the recognition that grace may be attained in different ways through a variety of practices.[843]

Mutual respect was established between the Orthodox Christians and Muslims through borrowings that also stemmed from conversion and interfaith marriages. Another interesting religious borrowing is mentioned by Doumanis: "Throughout Anatolia and the Balkans, many Greek Orthodox communities adopted *kurban* as an important initiation rite, despite the protestations of the Church—the Hellenized term was 'kourbania'."[844]

Michael Carrithers writes that "As a species we display great intensity of mutual concern and tremendous dependency on each other. The fact that we are social animals is not just an adventitious, accidental feature of our nature, but lies at the very core of what it is to be human. We simply could not live, could not continue our existence as humans, without sociality."[845] Cultural borrowings, mutual respect, and good relationships project the sociality of Asia Minor Greeks with their Turkish neighbors. Because religion had a special status among the subjects of the Ottomans, people were respectful toward other faiths. This is how dynamic and multiple identities were formed. People could easily shift from one identity to another according to the social and political atmosphere of the period. Therefore, Ottoman subjects had multiple and dynamic identities rather than a single static one.

[843] Ibid., 336.
[844] Doumanis, *Before the Nation*, 122.
[845] Michael Carrithers, *Why Humans Have Cultures: Explaining Anthropology and Social Diversity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 1.

4.3. *Mikrasiátes:* The Legacy of the *Millet-i Rum*

As we have already discussed, Asia Minor refugees and the locals did not unite peacefully in Greece due to their different sense of identities. *Mikrasiátes*, the Asia Minor people, preferred to live as the *Millet-i Rum*, a distinct group, within the Greek nation. We may say that *Mikrasiátes* constituted a nation with the Greek nation. The experiment that Appiah assesses in *The Ethics of Identity* is remarkable since it projects how the members of a group behave when they confront another group. Here are the details of the experiment:

> In the summer of 1953, a team of researchers assembled two groups of eleven-year-old boys at adjoining but separate campsites in the Sans Bois Mountains, part of Oklahoma's Robbers Cave State Park. The boys were drawn from the Oklahoma City area and, though previously unacquainted, came from a fairly homogeneous background—they were Protestant, white, middle-class. All this was by careful design.[846]

The researchers were trying to find out how each group would react when they learn that they were not alone in the forest. A couple of days later, after each group settled in their own camp, researchers informed them that they were not alone; there was another group camping next to them. This was a turning point for both groups as there was a rival group next door. Competition started to emerge between the boys of each group, and they learnt to curse each other. Appiah notes that, "Soon—and this was perhaps the study's most dramatic finding—tempers flared and a violent enmity developed between the two groups, the Rattlers and the Eagles (as they came to dub themselves)."[847] This experiment shows that it is inevitable not to have conflicts between two different neighbor communities.

The groups were not initially named the Rattlers and the Eagles when they first camped in the forest. Perhaps they did not even have a group spirit before they learned the existence of the other group nearby. When they met the other group, they searched for identification. This experiment is a good example to show what the refugees and the natives did and felt when they first encountered. Each group tried to demonstrate that their group was superior, knowledgeable, and cultured while the

[846] Appiah, *The Ethics of Identity*, 62.
[847] Ibid., 62.

other was just the opposite. As Karina V. Korostelina remarks, "Individuals perceive themselves as members of a group and identify themselves with it in order to distinguish between their groups (ingroups) and outgroups."[848] Refugees had imperial identities, which differentiated them from the locals. They did not refer to themselves as *Mikrasiátes* (Asia Minor people) back in their homeland. With their arrival in Greece, they named themselves *Mikrasiátes*. Charles Taylor claims that "our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others."[849] The local Greeks usually recognized the refugees as the "Turks" and humiliated them as the "seeds of the Turks." Misrecognition of the refugees by the locals was a kind of oppression that forced Asia Minor Greeks to be always identified as refugees.

Asia Minor refugees clearly set their boundaries and differentiated themselves from the local Greeks both physically, culturally, sociologically, linguistically, and politically. Refugee settlements separated them physically from the locals. Their imperial identity as well as refugee identity that they adopted in Greece separated them from the locals culturally, sociological, and politically. The first generation Turkish-speaking refugees also separated themselves from the locals linguistically. Clearly there were two different culturally distinct groups that were forced to live together in Greece: *Mikrasiátes* and the local Greeks. Asia Minor refugees had previously constituted a nation in the Ottoman Empire as they were the *Millet-i Rum*. In a way, that tradition continued in Greece. The *Millet-i Rum* was transformed into *Mikrasiátes* with a new dimension attached to it which was the refugee identity. As Malkki indicates, "identity is always mobile and processual, partly self-construction, partly categorization by others, partly a condition, a status, a label, a weapon, a shield, a fund of memories."[850] Asia Minor refugees were no longer the *Millet-i Rum* but the citizens of the Greek state. However, their tradition, life-style and habits did not change with the population exchange, but continued within a different path.

[848] Karina V. Korostelina, *Social Identity and Conflict: Structures, Dynamics, and Implications* (U.S.A: Macmillan, 2007), 23-24.
[849] Charles Taylor, *Multiculturalism* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 25.
[850] Liisa H. Malkki, "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees," *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. (Feb., 1992):37.

The refugees were not *Mikrasiátes* (Asia Minor people) when they lived in Asia Minor. They were Orthodox Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. It was after their forced migration that they identified themselves as *Mikrasiátes*, a collective and social identity that they shared with all displaced peoples of Asia Minor. Tanc remarks that "People form a new kind of identity on the basis of loss of home and they build close relationships with people who have had similar losses."[851] This explains how refugees formed their identities on the basis of their bitter past experiences. The trauma of losing their homeland united the refugees in Greece around their refugee identity. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann claim that "Societies have histories in the course of which specific identities emerge; these histories are, however, made by men with specific identities."[852]

Although refugees and the locals share the same religion, Orthodox Christianity, and language, their cultural, social, and political identities were totally different. While refugees were coming from a cosmopolitan society with multicultural and multiple identities, locals were confined to monochromatic identities, which is the national identity. Clark asserts that "The children of the population exchange grew up in a world where cultural identities were rich, complex and ambivalent. They were forced to adapt to one where national affiliation was simpler and more strictly enforced, and there was a high price for questioning this simplicity."[853] Social, cultural, and political life in a multicultural state is rich and complex, while in a nation-state it is simple, static, and restrictive. That is the very first reason how communities are imagined and constructed: one nation in one state that claims to have existed since time immemorial without interruption or mixing with other ethnic groups. As Smith asserts, "the total population of the state share a single ethnic culture."[854] Diversity and multiculturalism are to be eliminated since they are threats to the perpetuation of the nation-states. As Özkırımlı indicates,

[851] Tanc, "Where Local Trumps National," 281.
[852] Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (U.S.A: Anchor Books, 1989), 173.
[853] Clark, *Twice A Stranger*, 5.
[854] Smith, *National Identity*, 15.

"Nationalist rhetoric presents the nation as a unified, homogeneous, seamless whole, without reference to its internal diversity."[855]

If we compare the interactions of Asia Minor Greeks and the locals with their states, Ottoman Empire and the Greek state, we will realize that Asia Minor Greeks were not ruled directly by the Ottoman state; they were ruled by the Patriarch who was positioned between them and the state. They were the members of the *Millet-i Rum*, and enjoying full autonomy, whereas local Greeks were directly ruled by the Greek state. Refugees were the Ottoman subjects, the last Ottomans, while the locals were citizens of the Greek nation. The mission of a nation state is to indoctrinate its citizens to fit the definition of a nation. Different ethnic groups are not tolerated, but eliminated or denied because a nation is composed of one ethnic group. Citizens are forced to imagine a mythical past that ties the society together. However, an empire cannot claim to have a mythical past because empires are complex and multi-ethnic. Under these circumstances national identity and imperial identity oppose each other, and share nothing in common.

What separated the refugees from the locals was their different past experiences and cultures. Some refugees resisted adopting national identities and Greek surnames. The Greek officers changed the surnames of the refugees as indicated in *Son of Refugees*. An officer of the Ministry of Internal Affairs changed Yianni's surname from Selinos to Selinidis when Yianni asked assistance to unite his family in Greece.[856] Yianni did not pay much attention then as he was a teenager and was trying to find his family. He was desperately seeking help. However, adult refugees refused to have Greek surnames. Sophia Minoğlu's father refused to change his Turkish surname when he was asked to change.[857] Vasili Karabaş declared that he was born Karabaş and would die Karabaş. He refused to change his Turkish surname as well because his mother tongue was Turkish and changing the surname was regarded as a betrayal of his background and culture. Refugees did not want to forget their roots and imperial identities because as Michael Lambek claims, "identity is not composed of a fixed set of memories but lies in the dialectical, ceaseless activity of

[855] Özkırımlı, *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism*, 168.
[856] Selinidis, *Son of Refugees*, 112.
[857] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 319.

remembering and forgetting."[858] For the refugees, remembering was the most important activity for survival in Greece, and refusal of Greek surnames was actually an active resistance to assimilation. They did not want to forget their past, and their mother tongue was a link to their ancestral home.

The nationalist policy makers thought that the refugees would integrate into the society easily as they shared the same language and religion. Charles B. Eddy claimed that "The refugees were immigrants, it is true, but they were Greek immigrants coming to Greece, not aliens thrown on a foreign shore."[859] This explains the role and impact of the nationalist elite over the masses as it was mentioned by Otto Bauer.[860] According to the Greek nationalists, the displacement of Asia Minor Greeks was repatriation, and the homeland was Greece, not Turkey. Aktar and Demirözü state that, nationalist Greek historiography ignored the cultural differences of the refugees, claiming that Asia Minor Greeks brought Hellenism from Ancient Anatolia to Greece.[861] Furthermore, the Asia Minor Catastrophe helped them to form a national identity in mainland Greece, which approved that Greek national identity had always been in Anatolia since time immemorial.[862] Therefore, Greece was not a foreign country but the ancestral home of the refugees. This reminds us of jus sanguinis, which defines citizenship not through birth place but through blood.[863] Athanasia Anagnostopoulou explains that the refugees were regarded as the heroes/heroines of the Catastrophe, the national tragedy of Greece. Furthermore, refugees were settled in Greece with a secret mission: to form a nation state with national identities.[864] Through the presence of refugees, the Greek state tried to prove that Asia Minor had always been Hellene. Official Greek historiography starts with the Smyrna Fire of 1922 and the refugees are the witness of that important event.[865]

---

[858] Paul Antze and Michael Lambek, *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory* (New York: Routledge, 1996), xxix.
[859] Charles B. Eddy, *Greece and the Greek Refugees* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1931), 14.
[860] Bauer, "The Nation," 56.
[861] Ayhan Aktar and Damla Demirözü, "Yunan Tarihyazımında Mübadele ve Göç," *Kebikeç: İnsan Bilimleri için Kaynak Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 22 (2006): 87.
[862] Ibid.
[863] Encyclopedia Britannica Online, s. v. "citizenship," accessed January 24, 2012, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/118828/citizenship
[864] Anagnostopoulou, "Mültecilerin Sosyal ve Kültürel Asimilasyonu," 75-76.
[865] Ibid., 77.

On the other hand, for the refugees the homeland was not Greece, but Turkey. Their memories challenged the nationalist discourse and program. Eftihia Vourita states that, "The main lesson from the Asia Minor refugee resettlement was that the availability of resources, itself mitigated by the newcomers' expectations and decision to remember as well as forget where they came from, is the critical factor in successful integration."[866] Asia Minor refugees preferred to remember their homeland instead of forgetting it since Orthodox Christianity puts a great emphasis on memory, because "The Eastern Church emphasizes the authority of tradition as a tenet, and memory itself is institutionalized."[867] Celebrating the saints' days is a good example of understanding what memory means for Orthodox Christians. When Father Yorgo was asked how come he was so fluent in Turkish in Greece after 70 years of displacement, he answered proudly: "Turkish is the language of my home country, I will not forget it."[868] This sentence reveals two important facts: refugees considered Turkey as their homeland; and forgetting the language of the homeland was not acceptable.

As Toynbee claimed, "Nationality is a question of sentiment, not of language or race."[869] Giorgios Mavrommatis states that the refugees who migrated from the interior of Asia Minor did not have nationalist sentiments.[870] Smith stated that "nations must have a measure of common culture and a civic ideology, a set of common understandings and aspirations, sentiments and ideas that bind the population together in their homeland."[871] According to Smith's assumption of nationalism, nations should share the same culture, ideology, and homeland. However, in this case the refugees and the locals did not share the same culture and ideology as well as the homeland. According to Bauer's assumption that emphasizes

[866] Eftihia Vourita, "Population Transfers and Resettlement Policies in Inter-war Europe: The Case of Asia Minor Refugees in Macedonia from an International and National Perspective," in *Our Selves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity since 1912*, ed. Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis, 111-133 (UK: Berg, 1997), 123.
[867] Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, 16.
[868] Yalçın, *Emanet Çeyiz*, 131.
[869] Tonybee, *The Western Question*, 121.
[870] Giorgios Mavrommatis, "Yunanistan'da Hristiyan Göçmenler ve Müslüman Azınlıklar: Eğitimin Milli Homojenleşmedeki Rolü," (Christian Refugees and Minority Muslims in Greece: The Questions of National Homogenisation and the Role of Education), in *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, comp. Müfide Pekin, 357-364 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005), 358.
[871] Smith, *National Identity*, 11.

national character, the refugees had different national characters compared to the locals because Ottoman society was different from Greek society. For that reason, it is controversial to claim that refugees and locals constituted a nation with different cultural backgrounds and sentiments. As Malkki notes, "state and territory are not sufficient to make a nation, and that citizenship does not amount to a true nativeness."[872] As we will remember, the refugees were not homogeneous at all: They were very heterogeneous as they had different dialects and cultures in Asia Minor. Karakasidou states that, "It would, however, be equally mistaken to depict the refugees as a "pure" race of people descendant from ancient Greeks who had colonized the Aegean coast in antiquity or as pure-blood descended of the Byzantines."[873] Refugees were the locals of Anatolia under six centuries of Ottoman rule, and it is a nationalist sentiment to regard all of them Greek.

To strengthen our argument that the victims of Lausanne had different identities and were aware of their differences from the locals, I interviewed Müfide Pekin whose maternal grandmother was from Crete. Pekin is from Smyrna and her grandmother migrated from Crete with the Lausanne Convention. Her mother was a little girl then and learned the Turkish language at school. Her grandmother used to speak Greek and never learnt Turkish.[874] The first generation of the exchangees could not learn the language of the new country. It was the same with the Asia Minor refugees as well. Pekin told me that her grandmother was proud of being Cretan and considered herself European. The grandmother always emphasized that they were exchangees, not *göçmen* or *muhacir* (immigrants), because the exchangees left their properties behind. Those properties were a means of identifying themselves in the new country. Obviously, the Muslim exchangees also differentiated themselves from the local Turks because their identities were also different from the locals. Pekin's grandmother was Cretan Muslim Turk who was different from the Muslim Turks of Turkey. She also held *mübadil* (exchangee) identity together with her other identities originated from Crete. Her mother tongue was Greek and her motherland was

[872] Malkki, "National Geographic," 36.
[873] Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat*, 149.
[874] Müfide Pekin, interview by author, İstanbul, October 2, 2012.

Crete.[875] Pekin's father was a local Turk of Smyrna, and Pekin realized that her mother and father had totally different cultures and habits.

I also interviewed a *Rum* in order to understand how they identify themselves because they were not subject to the population exchange. Tanaş Çimbis was born in İstanbul and served in the Turkish army in 1971-72 in Gaziantep.[876] Due to the political oppression of the Turkish Republic toward non-Muslim minorities, he migrated to Crete. I asked him how he identified himself and he answered that he was a *Rum*, not a Greek or a Turk. As Charles Maier claims, "We define ourselves at least partly in terms of where we are from."[877] That is why Tanaş Çimbis defined his identity through his birthplace. Asia Minor refugees also define their identity through their homeland because the homeland is the place where one is born, not the place that someone decides for you. Tanaş Çimbis is not the only *Rum* who rejects Greek or Turkish identity for *Rum* identity. According to İlay Romain Örs, the refusal of the Greek and Turkish identity by the *Rum* of İstanbul is actually a reaction against the nationalist discourse of the two neighbor countries.[878] Greeks and Turks were forced to be one thing or another without reference to diversity and multiculturalism, which was a rooted culture and part of life in the Ottoman society.

After the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the newly emerging nation-states imposed monochromatic identities to their citizens who used to live in cosmopolitan cities, towns or villages with their imperial identities. The transition from imperial identity to national identity was a painful process because diverse cultures and identities were oppressed and finally eliminated for a homogeneous identity, culture, and population. Doumanis claims that, "Nationalism did ultimately succeed in destroying intercommunality, but by preserving memories of intercommunality the refugees showed a determination to deny nationalism a complete victory."[879] It is a

[875] For the history of Ottoman Crete, see A. Nükhet Adıyeke, "The Appearance of Muslim Identity and Relations between Muslim and Orthodox Communities in Crete under Ottoman Rule."
[876] Tanaş Çimbis, interview by author, İstanbul, October 2, 2012.
[877] Charles S. Maier, "'Being there': Place, Territory, and Identity," in *Identities, Affiliations, and Allegiances*, ed. Seyla Benhabib, Ian Shapiro, and Danilo Petranovi´c, 67-84 (U.K: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 67.
[878] İlay Romain Örs, "Beyond the Greek and Turkish Dichotomy: The *Rum* Polites of Istanbul and Athens," in *When Greeks Think About Turks: The view from Anthropology*, ed. Dimitrio Theodossopoulos, 79- 94 (London & New York: Routledge, 2007), 82.
[879] Doumanis, *Before the Nation*, 58.

utopian project to fit every single person into the nation state and its mythical past. Asia Minor refugees were the subjects of a multi-ethnic empire without a mythical past as in the case of a nation state. Greece and Turkey, with their local population and their refugees, tried to create new nation-states through erasing the legacies of the Ottoman Empire. However, the imperial identities of Asia Minor refugees indicated that identities could be the strongest legacy of a state that would take perhaps a century or more to transform. Every nation state is multi-cultural and it is a utopian project to have homogeneous populations because "most of the new states built on the ruins of the old empires, were quite as multinational as the 'prisons of nations' they replaced."[880]

Interestingly, not only the Asia Minor refugees preserved the Ottoman *millet* system in Greece, but also the local Greeks whose daily lives are shaped by Orthodox Christianity. Hirschon, in her article "Dismantling the *Millet*," clearly defines the role of religion for modern Greeks who define themselves as religious. Since Greek Independence in 1829, the Greek state has been trying to become secular, referring to Western ideals and thought. However, as Hirschon states, "religious practices are an integral and central element in what is characterized as 'Greek culture'."[881] Church is still powerful over the Greeks, thus Greek culture cannot be separated from Orthodox Christianity. Even the atheists cannot identify themselves apart from Orthodox Christianity because to be Greek is to be an Orthodox Christian.[882] Obviously, the Ottoman legacy of the *millet* system is a rooted phenomenon in Greece, and religion is still a vital reference of identification for modern Greeks despite the efforts of secularization initiated by the Greek state.

[880] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, 133.
[881] Renèe Hirschon, "Dismantling the *Millet*: Religion and National Identity in Contemporary Greece," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, ed. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızıkyürek & Umut Özkırımlı, 61- 75 (U.K: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 66.
[882] Ibid., 67.

CONCLUSION

"Conflicts between civilizations are terrible, because civilizations are the most real and fundamental forms of human society"[883] said Arnold Toynbee, who lived in one of the most painful centuries of humanity. Toynbee, who witnessed World War I and the Greco-Turkish War, referred to the Western and the Eastern civilizations that clashed in the twentieth century with the rise of nationalism. Nationalism is one of the products of the modern world which can be defined as a grand social engineering project of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. The Ottoman Empire, one of the great empires of the world, disintegrated due to the rise of nationalism that flourished in the West and spread to the East with great impact as well as controversy. Asia Minor, the heartland of the Ottoman Empire, had always been ethnically, linguistically, and religiously diverse, with no national hero of its own. The nationalist policy makers of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic, Enver Pasha, the leader of the Young Turks, and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, were born and educated in the Balkans. They were not originally from Asia Minor. They faced the hardship of nationalism in the Balkans, and decided to consolidate Muslim Turks in Asia Minor with no room left for the Christian minorities of the Ottoman Empire. As Justin McCarthy stated, Asia Minor was the only possible future home of the harassed Muslims of the Balkans, Crimea, and the Caucasus who were forced to migrate to Asia Minor starting in the nineteenth century. Those immigrants, who were transplanted from their homes due to the rise of nationalism, for their own survival embraced nationalism in their new home, Asia Minor, for their own survival and took their revenge on their former Christian oppressors.

The clash of the Greeks and the Turks was inevitable since Greek Independence in 1829, the Balkan Wars in 1911-12, and then World War I between 1914 and 1918, infused feelings of nationalism on all subjects of the Ottoman Empire from the Balkans to the Middle East. The Ottoman Empire, after losing its lands in the Balkans and the Middle East, was confined to Asia Minor, which would later give birth to the Turkish Republic. Nationalism became the most popular policy

[883] Toynbee, *The Western Question*, 36.

of the independent peoples of the empire. Furthermore, “greater” nation-states were dreamt of such as the “Greater Greece” by the Greek Kingdom. Greece wanted to gather all Greeks under its authority and territory with its grand dream the *Megali Idea*. The western coast of Asia Minor was part of this dream because the Orthodox Christians had been living there for centuries with their Muslim, Armenian, and Jewish neighbors. Orthodox Christians were perceived as “slaves” by the Greek Kingdom and there was only one option: to liberate those Christians from the Ottoman yoke by annexing the western coast of Asia Minor and establishing a nation-state that controls the Aegean Sea as well as the Mediterranean. With the support of the British, the Greek army invaded Asia Minor. This was a turning point for the future of Christians and Muslims as well as Greece and Turkey: nothing would be the same after that.

Asia Minor, one of the earliest Christian lands, gradually Islamized with the deportation of the Orthodox Christians. The Balkans had been Christianized since the nineteenth century and the Islamization of Asia Minor was completed with the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the Lausanne Convention. Peoples of the Balkans and Asia Minor, Christians and Muslims, suffered all those years for their own “imagined communities.” The question we should ask now is who wanted to have those “imagined communities”? One of the goals of this research is to find an answer to that question. As we have searched for an answer, we have come to realize that it was not the peoples of the Balkans and Asia Minor who were enthusiastic to have nation-states, but rather it was the educated elites of both communities who were greatly influenced by Western enlightenment and nationalism. The literary texts that we analyzed as well as the oral testimonies of the victims demonstrate that the peoples of Asia Minor preferred to live beyond nationalist confines of their era. It was not their desire to live within the limited scope of a nation-state, because they used to live in an empire that provided a wider perspective and outlook of the world, including close contact with various ethnic groups. They were not monolingual as the citizens of a nation-state who are kept isolated from the whole world and restricted to live in a country with one ethnic group, language, and religion. A nation-state creates

a limited space and limited horizons for its citizens, and it destroys the local cultures and indigenous languages of minorities.

The legacy of the *Millet-i Rum* continued in Greece through the lives of the refugees. The imperial identities of the refugees were cosmopolitan and different from the identities of the local Greeks. The children of the Lausanne Convention were sent into exile, and even the second and third generations experienced that exile through the narration of their elders. Tamara Chalabi, who questions the notion of exile, has a remarkable comment: "Does exile ever really end? Rather than being a physical separation from a place, I believe that it is essentially a state of mind. It grows and evolves, taking on a life of its own. To have an inheritance of exile is a never-ending journey between myth and reality."[884] For the refugees and their children, exile was a never-ending journey, and Asia Minor was the homeland with a mythical past. Refugees were determined to maintain their refugee identities in Greece and pass it on to their children and grandchildren. It was their legacy, inherited from Asia Minor. As Said says, "Exile is predicated on the existence of, love for, and bond with, one's native place; what is true of all exiles is not that home and love of home are lost, but that loss is inherent in the very existence of both."[885]

Dido Sotiriou, who devoted her life to establish bridge between modern Greeks and Turks, believed that, "The same earth nurtured our two peoples."[886] Asia Minor nurtured both Greeks and Turks for several centuries during which they created a common cultural heritage with ancestral ties. Greeks and Turks, Louis de Bernières told me in our interview, are cousins who have close relations regardless of the hatred they developed for each other over the past century. Furthermore, de Bernières told me that he had Greek friends who used to say: "My best friend is a Turk but Turks are barbarians."[887] de Bernières was surprised to hear that sentence from his Greek friends, and he believes that this does not make sense.[888] This phrase is an outcome of nationalism between modern Greeks and Turks who can manage to have friendship despite being affected by nationalism. This also shows that it was

[884] Chalabi, *Late for Tea at the Deer Palace*, 388.
[885] Said, *Reflections on Exile*, 185.
[886] Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia*, 61.
[887] Louis de Bernières.
[888] Ibid.

both easy and difficult to overcome the impact of nationalism between Greeks and Turks because personal friendship and interactions are not independent of nationalist ideologies.

At the end of our interview with Renèe Hirschon about the social and cultural lives of the Asia Minor refugees, we both realized that minor differences separate the people of the Aegean rather than huge differences.[889] I also realized that nationalism distanced Turkish people from the other neighbor countries such as Georgia. During my stay in Oxford, I met the Archbishop of Georgia, Malkhaz Sungulashvili, and his wife, Ala Kavtaradze, with whom we had discussions on our cultural heritages. We realized that our cultures and traditions were almost the same, and that helped us to communicate very well. The Archbishop told me that during the communist Soviet regime in Georgia, they used to think that Turkey was a far away country, but after the collapse of the Soviet Union, he understood that Turkey was far mentally, not geographically or culturally.[890] This remarkable confession shows that our neighbor societies are all mentally indoctrinated to perceive their neighbors as the "Other" although they share the same culture.

On analyzing the imperial identities of Asia Minor Greeks, we have realized that Orthodox Christians and Muslims of Anatolia created a common culture based on the Anatolian culture, paganism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. One should know the history of religions in Asia Minor as well as the ancient civilizations of Anatolia for a better understanding of the common cultural heritage of Greeks and Turks, and the ethnic and national conflicts that arose between them in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Modern Greeks and Turks are the children and grandchildren of those refugees whose wounds seem to be incurable. "Since those times of whirlwind the world has learned over and over again that the wounds of the ancestors make the children bleed. I do not know if anyone will ever be forgiven, or if the harm that was done will ever be undone"[891] says de Bernières.

The legacy of Asia Minor is still preserved in Greece by the refugees. The exchange of populations will always remain the most tragic event of both Greek and

[889] Renèe Hirschon.
[890] Malkhaz Sungulashvili, interview by author, Oxford, September 8, 2012.
[891] de Bernières, *Birds Without Wings*, 6.

Turkish historiography because Greeks and Turks fought against each other and were killed for the sake of controlling Asia Minor with strong nationalist ideologies. Greeks and Turks destroyed their own peaceful lives, and the survivors of the war were displaced from their homeland by the Lausanne Convention against their will. The testimonies of Asia Minor refugees create an opportunity for future generations of Greeks and Turks to "act as extended families, harboring the deepest feuds and the deepest bonds"[892], to make peace and be aware of their common heritage despite the nationalist ideologies that homogenized Greece and Turkey. Greeks and Turks are neighbor nations "shaped by intimate rivalries fed by the blood and tears of ancestors keen on tying the hands of the living."[893]

[892] Othon Anastasakis, Kalypso Nicolaidis, and Kerem Öktem, eds., introduction to *In the Long Shadow of Europe: Greeks and Turks in the Era of Postnationalism* (Netherlands: Brill, 2009).
[893] Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adıyeke, Nükhet. "Osmanlı Egemenliği Altında Girit'te Müslüman Kimliğin Oluşumu ve Müslüman Cemaati ile Ortodoks Cemaati Arasındaki İlişkiler." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 365-375. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.

Aghatabay, Cahide Zengin. *Mübadelenin Mazlum Misafirleri: Mübadele ve Kamuoyu 1923-1930*. İstanbul: Bengi Yayın, 2007.

Agriantonis, Nikos. "'İyi' ve 'Kötü' Tarihi Eserler." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 277-283. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.

Aladağ, Ertuğrul. *Sekene: Türkleşmiş Rumlar/Dönmeler*. İstanbul: Belge, 1997.

———. *Andonia: Küçük Asya'dan Göç*. İstanbul: Belge, 1995.

Alexandris, Alexis. *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974*. Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 1992.

———."The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910-1912): A Contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography." In *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, edited by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 45-76. U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999.

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf, trans. *The Meaning of the Holy Quran*. U.S.A: Amana, 2004.

Ali, Sabahattin. "Çirkince." In *Sırça Köşk*. İstanbul: YKY, 2011.

Ali, Tariq. "Remembering Edward Said." *New Left Review* 24, November-December 2003. Accessed March 12, 2013. http://newleftreview.org/II/24/tariq-ali-remembering-edward-said

Akgönül, Samim. *Türkiye Rumları: Ulus-Devlet Çağından Küreselleşme Çağına Bir Azınlığın Yok Oluş Süreci*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2007.

Aktar, Ayhan. Homogenizing the Nation, Turkifying the Economy: The Turkish Experience of Population Exchange Reconsidered." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 79-97. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.

———. "Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi'nin İlk Yılı: Eylül 1922-Eylül 1923." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 41-74. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.

———.*Türk Milliyetçiliği, Gayrimüslimler ve Ekonomik Dönüşüm*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2006.

———. and Damla Demirözü. "Yunan Tarihyazımında Mübadele ve Göç." *Kebikeç: İnsan Bilimleri için Kaynak Araştırmaları Dergisi*. Vol. 22, 2006:85-98.

Anagnostopoulou, Athanasia. "Mültecilerin Sosyal ve Kültürel Asimilasyonu." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 75-81. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.

Anastasakis, Othon, Kalypso Nicolaidis, and Kerem Öktem, eds. *In the Long Shadow of Europe: Greeks and Turks in the Era of Postnationalism*. Netherlands: Brill, 2009.

Andreadis, Yorgo. *Gizli Din Taşıyanlar*. Translated by Atilla Tuygan. İstanbul: Belge, 1999.

———. *Tamama: Pontus'un Yitik Kızı*. Translated by Ragıp Zarakolu. İstanbul: Belge, 2012.

———.*Temel Garip*. Translated by Sema Sandalcı. İstanbul: Belge, 1998.

Andrews, Peter A. *Ethnic Groups in the Republic of Turkey*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 1989.
Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*: *Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 2006.
Antze, Paul and Michael Lambek. *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
Anzerlioğlu, Yonca. *Karamanlı Ortodoks Türkler*. Ankara: Phoenix, 2003.
Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *The Ethics of Identity*. U.S.A: Princeton University Press, 2005.
Arı, Kemal. *Büyük Mübadele: Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç, 1923-1925*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2010.
———. *Türk Ticaret-i Bahriyesi: Mübadele Gemileri*. İzmir: Deniz Ticaret Odası İzmir Şubesi Yayınları, 2008.
———. "Tarih Bilimi Açısından Mübadele." In *Tarihi, Hukuki, Toplumsal Boyutları ile Mübadele*, edited by İstanbul Barosu Yayın Kurulu, 16-35. İstanbul: İstanbul Barosu Yayınları, 2012.
Balta, Evangelia. *Beyond The Language Frontier: Studies on the Karamanlis and the Karamanlidika Printing*. İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2010.
Barkey, Karen. *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. U.S.A: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory*. U.K: Manchester University Press, 2009.
Bauer, Otto. "The Nation." In *Mapping the Nation*, edited by Gopal Balakrishnan, 39-77. U.S.A: Verso, 2012.
Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of the Knowledge*. U.S.A: Anchor Books, 1989.
Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. London: Hurst&Company, 1998.
Bernières, Louis De. *Birds Without Wings*. London: Vintage Books, 2005.
———. *Captain Corelli's Mandolin*. London: Vintage Books, 1994.
Belli, Mihri. *Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi*. Translated by Müfide Pekin. İstanbul: Belge, 2004.
Birnbaum, Robert. "Louis de Bernières." *The Morning News*, January 24, 2005. Accessed March 30, 2012. http://www.themorningnews.org/article/birnbaum-v.-louis-de-bernires.
Bornat, Joanna. "Oral history as a Social Movement: Reminiscence and Older People." In *Oral History Reader*, edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, 189-206. New York: Routledge, 1998.
Böke, Pelin. *İzmir 1919-1922/Tanıklıklar*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2006.
Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. U.S.A: St. Martin's, Press, 1998.
Braude, Benjamin, and Bernard Lewis, eds. Introduction to *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, V. 1-2. U.K: Holmes&Meier, 1982.
Breuilly, John. "Bringing History Back into Nationalism." In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, edited by Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızıkyürek & Umut Özkırımlı, 1-17. U.K: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Brewer, David. *Greece, the Hidden Centuries: Turkish Rule from the Fall of Constantinople to Greek Independence*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2010.
Calhoun, Craig. *Nationalism*. U.S.A: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Carrithers, Michael. *Why Humans Have Cultures: Explaining Anthropology and Social Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
Chalabi, Tamara. *Late for Tea at the Deer Palace: The Lost Dreams of my Iraqi Family*. U.K: HarperCollins, 2010.
Chandler, Richard. *Travels in Asia Minor*. London, 1776.
Chater, Melville. "History's Greatest Trek." *National Geographic*, (Nov, 1925): 533-540.
Clark. Bruce. *Twice A Stranger: How Mass Expulsion Forged Modern Greece and Turkey*. London: Granta, 2007.
Clogg, Richard. "A Millet Within a Millet: The Karamanlides." In *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, edited by Dimitri Goncidas and Charles Issawi, 115-143. USA: Darwin Press, 1999.
Colonas, Vassilis. "Housing and Architectural Expression of Asia Minor Greeks before and after 1923." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 163-178. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember*. U.K: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
Çelebi, Sai Mustafa. *Yapılar Kitabı Tezkiretü'l-Bünyan ve Tezkiretü'l-Ebniye (Mimar Sinan'ın Anıları)*. İstanbul: Koç Kültür Sanat, 2002.
Dafni, Amots. "Why Are Rags Tied to the Sacred Trees of the Holy Land?" *Economic Botany*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Winter, 2002): 315-327.
Davison, Roderic H. "The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire." In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, Vol. 1, 319-339. U.K: Holmes & Meier, 1982.
Doulis, Thomas. *Disaster and Fiction: Modern Greek Fiction and the Asia Minor Disaster of 1922*. U.S.A: University of California Press, 1977.
Doumanis, Nicholas. *Before the Nation: Muslim-Christian Coexistence and its Destruction in Late Ottoman Anatolia*. U.K: Oxford University Press, 2013.
Durak, Atilla. *Ebru: Reflections of Cultural Diversity in Turkey*. İstanbul: Metis, 2007.
Eddy, Charles B. *Greece and the Greek Refugees*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1931.
Efiloğlu, Ahmet. *Osmanlı Rumları: Göç ve Tehcir 1912-1918*. İstanbul: Bayrak, 2011.
Eksertzoglou, Haris. *Osmanlı'da Cemiyetler ve Rum Cemaati*. Translated by Foti and Stefo Benlisoy. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.
Eliot, Charles. *Turkey in Europe*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.
Emgili, Fahriye. "İhtidâ (Conversion to Islam) as an Effort to be Exempt from the Exchange of Populations." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*.
Encyclopedia Britannica Online, s.v. "citizenship," accessed January 24, 2012, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/118828/citizenship
Englund, Peter. "The Bedazzled Gaze: On Perspective and Paradoxes in Witness Literature." In *Witness Literature*, edited by Horace Engdahl, 45-56. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2002.
Erdem, Nilüfer. "Yunan Osmanlılığının En Önemli Temsilcilerinden Suliotis-Nikolayidis'in Kaleminden 'İstanbul Örgütü' ve II. Meşrutiyet Dönemindeki Etkinlikleri." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Yakın Dönem Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Sayı 12 (Haziran 2007):89-105.

Ertul, Nurten. *Kimlik: Osmanlı Topraklarında 700 Yıllık Yaşam ve Köklerimiz*. İstanbul: Nesa, 2006.
Eryılmaz, Bilal. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Gayrimüslim Tebaanın Yönetimi*. İstanbul: Risale Yayın, 1996.
Eyüboğlu, İsmet Zeki. *Anadolu İnançları*. İstanbul: Koza, 1974.
Featherstone, Kevin et al. *The Last Ottomans: The Muslim Minority of Greece 1940-1949*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Frangakis-Syrett, Elena. "The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir in the Second Half of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries." In *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, edited by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 17-44. U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999.
Freely, John. *Children of Achilles: The Greeks in Asia Minor since the Days of Troy*. U.K: I. B. Tauris, 2010.
Fromkin, David. *A Peace to End All Peace*: *Creating the Modern Middle East 1914-1922*. U.K: Penguin, 1991.
Gauntlett, Stathis. "Between Orientalism and Occidentalism: The Contribution of Asia Minor Refugees to Greek Popular Song, and its Reception." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 247-260. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. U.S.A: Cornell University Press, 2008.
Giannuli, Dimitra. "Greeks or "Strangers at Home": The Experiences of Ottoman Greek Refugees during Their Exodus to Greece, 1922-1923." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, V. 13, No. 2 (October 1995): 271-287.
Godelier, Maurice. *The Mental and The Material*. London: Verso, 1986.
Goldstein, Erik. "The British Official Mind and the Lausanne Conference 1922-1923." *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 14:2 (2003): 185-206.
Gökaçtı, Mehmet Ali. *Nüfus Mübadelesi: Kayıp Bir Kuşağın Hikayesi*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2003.
Greenblatt, Stephen. *Learning to Curse*. U.K: Routledge, 2007.
———.*Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. U.S.A: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
Güvenç, Sefer, ed. *Common Cultural Heritage: Developing local Awareness Concerning the Architectural Heritage Left from the Exchange of Populations in Turkey and Greece*. İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2005.
———. "80. Yılında Mübadele: Genel Değerlendirme." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 447-452. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
Haley, Charles D. "The Desperate Ottoman: Enver Paşa and the German Empire-I." *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.30, No. 1 (January 1994): 1-51.
Hasluck, F.W. *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*. İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2000.
Heraclides, Alexis. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the Aegean: Imagined Enemies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Hionidou, Violetta. *Famine and Death in Occupied Greece, 1941-1944*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Hirschon, Renèe. “Dismantling the *Millet*: Religion and National Identity in Contemporary Greece.” In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey,* edited by Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızıkyürek & Umut Özkırımlı, 61-75. U.K: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

———. *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2009.

———.“History’s Long Shadow: The Lausanne Treaty and Contemporary Greco-Turkish Relations.” In *The Long Shadow of Europe: Greeks and Turks in the Era of Post-nationalism*, edited by O. Anastasakis, K. Nicolaidis & K. Öktem, 73-94. Netherlands: Brill, 2009.

———.“Knowledge of Diversity: Towards a More Differentiated Set of 'Greek' Perception of 'Turks'.” In *When Greeks Think About Turks: The view from Anthropology*, edited by Dimitrio Theodossopoulos, 61-78. London & New York: Routledge, 2007.

——— .“The Consequences of the Lausanne Convention: An Overview.” In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 13-20. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.

———.“'Unmixing Peoples' in the Aegean Region.” In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 3-12. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.

———. “‘We got on well with the Turks': Christian-Muslim Relations in the late Ottoman Period.” In *Archaeology, Anthropology and Heritage: the Work of F. W. Hasluck (1878-1920)*, edited by David Shankland, 325-343. V. II. İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2004.

———.“Essential Objects and the Sacred: Interior and Exterior Space in an Urban Greek Locality.” In *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps*, edited by Ardener S., 72-88. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

———.“Under One Roof: Marriage, the Dowry and Family Life in Piraeus, Greece.” In *Urban Life in Mediterranean Europe*, edited by Kenny M and Kertzer D., 299-323. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983.

———.“Women, the Aged and Religious Activity: Oppositions and Complementarity in an Urban Greek Locality.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Johns Hopkins (Baltimore: 1983): 113-129.

——— and Thakurdesai. “Housing and Cultural Priorities: the Asia Minor Refugees of 1922.” *Disasters*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1979: 247-50.

——— and Thakurdesai. “Society, Culture and Spatial Organization: An Athens Community.” *Ekistics*, Vol. 30, No. 178 (1970): 187-196.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. U.K: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Hohendahl, Peter Uwe. “A Return to History? The New Historicism and Its Agenda.” *New German Critique*, No. 55 (Winter, 1992): 87-104.

Horvath, Bela. *Anadolu 1913*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996.

Iğsız, Aslı. “Documenting the Past and Publicizing Personal Stories: Sensescapes and the 1923 Greco-Turkish Population Exchange in Contemporary Turkey.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (October 2008): 451-487.

İçduygu, Ahmet et al. “The Politics of Population in a Nation-Building Process: Emigration of Non-Muslims from Turkey.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31:2 (2008): 358-389.
İnalcık, Halil. *Essays in Ottoman History*. İstanbul: Eren, 1998.
———. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600*. Translated by Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973.
İnan, Abdülkadir. *Eski Türk Dini Tarihi*. İstanbul: Devlet Yayınları, 1976.
Issawi, Charles. Introduction to *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, edited by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 1-16. U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999.
James, Alice. “The Mirror of Their Past: Greek Refugee Photographs and Memories of Anatolia.” *Visual Anthropology Review*. Vol. 16, No. 2 (Fall-Winter 2000-2001): 25-42.
———. “Memories of Anatolia: Generating Greek Refugee Identity.” *Balkanologie*, Vol. V, No.1-2 (Dec. 2001): 229-238.
Kadare, İsmail. *The Palace of Dreams*. Arcade Publishing, 1998.
Kalfoğlu, Ioannis. *Küçük Asya Kıtasının Tarihi Coğrafyası*. Çeviren: Özge Özgür. Edirne: Albatros, 2013.
Kappatos, Sophia. *The Promised Journey: Pontus-Kefalonia*. Greece: The Foundation of Hellenic World, 2011.
Karakasidou, Anastasia. *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*. U.S.A: Chicago University Press, 1997.
———.“Politicizing Culture: Negating Ethnic Identity in Greek Macedonia.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (May 1993):1-28.
Karakoyunlu, Yılmaz. *Mor Kaftanlı Selanik*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2012.
Karpat, Kemal. “*Millets* and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era.” In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, 141-171, V.1. U.K: Holmes&Meier, 1982.
———.*Osmanlı’dan Günümüze Kimlik ve İdeoloji*. İstanbul: Timaş, 2009.
———.*Osmanlı’dan Günümüze Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler*. İstanbul: Timaş, 2010.
Karra, Anthi. “From *Polypathis* to *Temaşa-i Dünya*, from the Safe Port of Translation to the Open Sea of Creation.” In *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies*, edited by Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler, 201-218. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
Kasaba, Reşat. *A Moveable Empire: Ottoman Nomads, Migrants&Refugees*. U.S.A: University of Washington Press, 2009.
———.“Economic Foundations of a Civil Society: Greeks in the Trade of Western Anatolia, 1840-1876.” In *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, edited by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 77-88. U.S.A: Darwin Press, 1999.
Katsikas, Stefanos. “*Millets* in Nation-States: The Case of Greek and Bulgarian Muslims, 1912-1923.” *Nationalities Papers*, 37: 2 (Routledge, 2009):177-201.
Kayademir, Müşerref. *Yanya-Ioannina Yemek ve Mezeleri*. İstanbul: Epigon Yayınları, 2003.
Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*. U.K: Blackwell, 1998.
Kemal, Yaşar. *Fırat Suyu Kan Akıyor Baksana: Bir Ada Hikayesi 1*. İstanbul: YKY, 1998.

———. *Karıncanın Su İçtiği: Bir Ada Hikayesi 2*. İstanbul: YKY, 2002.
———. *Tanyeri Horozları: Bir Ada Hikayesi 3*. İstanbul: Adam Yayıncılık, 2002.
———. *Çıplak Deniz, Çıplak Ada: Bir Ada Hikayesi 4*. İstanbul: YKY, 2012.
Kenanoğlu, M. Macit. *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek*. İstanbul: Klasik, 2007.
Keyder, Çağlar. "The Consequences of the Exchange of Populations for Turkey." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 39-53. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
Kitromilides, Paschalis M. "Küçük Asya Araştırmaları Merkezi ve Küçük Asya'da Yunan Kültürel Geleneği." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 27-37. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
Kitsikis, Dimitri. *Türk-Yunan İmparatorluğu: Arabölge Gerçeği Işığında Osmanlı Tarihine Bakış* (Turkish-Greek Empire). İstanbul: İletişim, 1996.
Koliopoulos, John S., and Thanos M. Veremis. *Modern Greece: A History since 1821*. U.K: Wiley- Blackwell Publishing, 2010.
Korkmazgil, Sevda. "Fethiye'de Bir Aşk Hikâyesi Anlatıcısı: Louis de Bernières." *Yolculuk* No. 89 (Nov. 2011): 62-65.
Kontogiorgi, Elisabeth. *Population Exchange in Greek Macedonia: The Forced Settlement of Refugees 1922-1930*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
Korostelina, Karina V. *Social Identity and Conflict: Structures, Dynamics, and Implications*. U.S.A: Macmillan, 2007.
Koufopoulou, Sophia. "Muslim Cretans in Turkey: The Reformulation of Ethnic Identity in an Aegean Community." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 209-221. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
Kourtovik, Demosthenes. "Anadolu'nun Sonelere İlham Kaynağı Olmaktan Çıktığı Zamanlar: Küçük Asya Felaketi'nin Yunan Edebiyatındaki Yankıları." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 205-219. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
Köker, Tolga. "Lessons in Refugeehood: The Experience of Forced Migrants in Turkey." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 193- 209. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
Köroğlu, Erol. *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity: Literature in Turkey during World War I*. London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007.
Küçük Asya Araştırmaları Merkezi. *Göç: Rumların Anadolu'dan Mecburi Ayrılışı (1919-1923)*, compiled by Hercules Millas, translated by Damla Demirözü. İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.
Ladas, Stephen P. *The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey*. New York: Macmillan, 1932.
Lane, Richard J. *Fifty Key Literary Theorists*. U.K: Routledge, 2006.
Layoun, Mary N. *Wedded to the Land*. London: Duke University Press, 2001.
Lentricchia, Frank. "Foucault's Legacy: A New Historicism?" In *The New Historicism*, edited by Aram Veeser, 231- 242. U.S.A: Routledge, 1989.
Leontis, Artemis. *Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the Homeland*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. 1961. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
———. *The Multiple Identities of the Middle East*. New York: Schocken Books, 1998.
Lewis, Geoffrey. *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*. U.K: Oxford University Press, 1999.
Llewellyn-Smith, Michael. *Ionian Vision: Greece in Asia Minor 1919-1922*. India: Hurst& Company, 2009.
———."Venizelos' Diplomacy, 1910–23: From Balkan Alliance to Greek–Turkish Settlement." In *Eleftherios Venizelos: The Trials of Statesmanship*, edited by Paschalis M. Kitromilides, 133-192. U.K: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
Lowenthal, David. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. U.K: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
Macar, Elçin. "Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı." In *Geleceğin Sesi: Türk-Yunan Yurttaş Diyaloğu*, compiled by Taciser Ulaş Belge, 89-94. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004.
———. "Mübadele Araştırmalarında Yeni Bir Kaynak: Dorothy Harrox Sutton Arşivi." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 83-96. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
Mackridge, Peter. "Cultivating New Lands: The Consolidation of Territorial Gains in Greek Macedonia through Literature, 1912-1940." In *Our Selves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity since 1912*, edited by Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis, 175-186. U.K: Berg, 1997.
———.*Language and National Identity in Greece 1766–1976*. U.S: Oxford University Press, 2009.
———."The Myth of Asia Minor in Greek Fiction." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 235-246. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
Maier, Charles S. "'Being there': Place, Territory, and Identity." In *Identities, Affiliations, and Allegiances*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, Ian Shapiro, and Danilo Petranovi´c, 67-84. U.K: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Malkki, Liisa H. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees." *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. (Feb., 1992): 24-44.
———. "Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, No. 24 (1995): 495-523.
Marantzidis, Nikos. "Yunanistan'da Türkçe Konuşan Pontuslu Mülteciler: Entegrasyon Sorunu." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 97-109. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
Mavrogordatos, George Th. *Stillborn Republic: Social Coalitions and Party Strategies in Greece, 1922-1936*. U.S.A: University of California Press, 1983.
Mavrommatis, Giorgios. "Yunanistan'da Hristiyan Göçmenler ve Müslüman Azınlıklar: Eğitimin Milli Homojenleşmedeki Rolü." In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 357-364. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.

Mazower, Mark. *Salonica, City of Ghosts: Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430-1950*. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 2004.
McCarthy, Justin. *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. New Jersey: The Darwin Press, 2004.
Michael, Michalis N. "History, Myth and Nationalism: The Retrospective Force of National Roles within a Myth-Constructed Past." In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, edited by Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızıkyürek & Umut Özkırımlı, 149-159. U.K: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Mignon, Laurent. *Elifbâlar Sevdası*. Ankara: Hece Yayınları, 2003.
Millas, Hercules. "Constructing Memories of "Multiculturalism" and Identities in Turkish Novels." In *Turkish Literature and Cultural Memory*, edited by Catharina Dufft, 79-105. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.
———.*Geçmişten Bugüne Yunanlılar: Dil, Din ve Kimlikleri*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004.
———."Perceptions of Conflict: Greeks and Turks in Each Other's Mirrors." In *The Long Shadow of Europe, Greeks and Turks in the Era of Postnationalism*, edited by O. Anastasakis, K. Nicolaidis & K. Öktem, 95-114. Netherlands: Brill, 2009.
———."The Exchange of Populations in Turkish Literature: The Undertone of Texts." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 221-235. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
———."*Tourkokratia*: History and the Image of Turks in Greek Literature." In *When Greeks Think About Turks: The view from Anthropology*, edited by Dimitrio Theodossopoulos, 47-60. London & New York: Routledge, 2007.
———.*Türk Romanı ve "Öteki": Ulusal Kimlikte Yunan İmajı*. İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2000.
———.*Yunan Ulusunun Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2006.
———.*The Imagined 'Other' as National Identity: Greeks & Turks*. Ankara: Civil Society Development Programme.
———.*Türk Yunan İlişkilerine Bir Önsöz*: *Tencere Dibin Kara*. İstanbul: Kavram, 1995.
Misailidis, Evangelinos. *Seyreyle Dünyayı (Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-u Cefakeş)*. Transliterated by Robert Anhegger and Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: Cem, 1986.
Milton, Giles. *Paradise Lost: Smyrna 1922*. U.K: Hodder & Stoughton, 2009.
Morgenthau, Henry. *I was sent to Athens*. U.S.A: Doubleday, Doran&Company, 1929.
Müller, Herta. "When We Don't Speak, We Become Unbearable, and When We do, We Make Fools of Ourselves. Can Literature Bear Witness?" In *Witness Literature*, edited by Horace Engdahl, 15-32. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2002.
Nakracas, Georgios. *Anadolu ve Rum Göçmenlerin Kökeni*. İstanbul: Belge, 2003.
Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Islamic Life and Thought*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
Okay Erman and Thomas Balkhenhol, directors. *Anıların Tadı: Küçük Asyalı Dido Sotiriou*. A Documentary produced by GİSAM: 1990, 60'. http://odtutv.metu.edu.tr/index.php?form=arsiv&kod=8.
Oran, Baskın. "The Story of Those Who Stayed." In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renèe Hirschon, 97-115. U.K: Berghahn Books, 2004.
Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: Timaş, 2011.

Öktem, Kerem. *Angry Nation: Turkey since 1989*. London: Zed Books, 2011.
———.“The Nation’s Imprint: Demographic Engineering and the Change of Toponymes in Republican Turkey.” *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, (11/2008).
Örs, İlay Romain. “Beyond the Greek and Turkish Dichotomy: The *Rum Polites* of Istanbul and Athens.” In *When Greeks Think About Turks: The view from Anthropology*, edited by Dimitrio Theodossopoulos, 79-94. London & New York: Routledge, 2007.
Özbaran, Salih. *Bir Osmanlı Kimliği: 14.-17. Yüzyıllarda Rum/Rumi Aidiyet ve İmgeleri*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2004.
Özdem, Oğuz. *Biz Vatanımıza Hasret Öldük Yavrularım*. Derleyen: İsmail Oral. Ankara: Yurt Kitap, 2007.
Özkırımlı, Umut. *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement*. U.S.A: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
———.and Spyros A. Sofos. *Tormented by History: Nationalism in Greece and Turkey*. U.K: Hurst & Company, 2008.
Özsoy, İskender. *Mübadelenin Öksüz Çocukları.* İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 2007.
Pallis, Alexander. *Greece's Anatolian Venture, and After: A Survey of the Diplomatic and Political Aspects of the Greek Expedition to Asia Minor (1915-1922)*. London: Methuen, 1937.
Papailias, Penelope. *Genres of Recollection: Archival Poetics and Modern Greece*. U.S.A: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
Pappas, Nicholas G. “Concepts of Greekness: The Recorded Music of Anatolian Greeks after 1922.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (October 1999): 353-373.
Pekin, Müfide, ed. *Belleklerdeki Güzellik Girit Maniler, Atasözleri, Deyimler, Tekerlemeler* . İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2007.
——— and Sefer Güvenç, comp. *Belleklerdeki Güzellik: Mübadele Türküleri*. İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2007.
———. ed. *Mübadele Öyküleri*. İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2009.
——— and Çimen Turan, eds. *Mübadele Bibliyografyası*. İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2002.
———.comp. *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
———. and Konstantinos Tsitselikis, comp. *Meriç’in İki Yakası*. İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2009.
———.ed. *Mübadil Kentler: Türkiye*. İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2013.
———.ed. *Mübadil Kentler: Yunanistan*. İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı, 2012.
Pentzopoulos, Dimitri. *The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and Its Impact on Greece*. London: Hurston & Company, 2002.
Permanent Bureau of the Turkish Congress at Lausanne. *Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna (May to July 1919).* BiblioBazaar, 2009.
Portelli, Alessandro. “What makes oral history different.” In *Oral History Reader*, edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, 63-75. New York: Routledge, 1998.
Ramsay, William Mitchell. *The Intermixture of Races in Asia Minor; Some of Its Causes and Effects*. U.S.A: General Books, 2010.

Rodas, Mihail. *Almanya Türkiye'deki Rumları Nasıl Mahvetti*. İstanbul: Belge, 2011.
Roshwald, Aviel. *Ethnic Nationalism and the Fall of Empires: Central Europe, Russia and the Middle East, 1914–1923*. London: Routledge, 2001.
Said, Edward. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. U.S.A: Harvard University Press, 2001.
Salamone, Stephen D. *In the Shadow of the Holy Mountain: the Genesis of a Rural Greek Community and its Refugee Heritage*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1987.
Selinidis, Captain K.I. *Son of Refugees: Immigrant to the United States*. U.S.A: Xlibris, 2008.
Sells, Michael A. *The Bridge Betrayed: Religion and Genocide in Bosnia*. U.S.A: University of California Press, 1996.
Sethi, Anita. "Interview: Louis de Bernières." *Granta*, August 4, 2009. Accessed March 30, 2012. http://www.granta.com/Online-Only/Louis-de-Bernieres.
Sotiriou, Dido. *Farewell Anatolia*. Translated by Fred. A. Reed. Greece: Kedros, 1991.
———.*Ölüler Bekler*. Çeviren Kriton Dinçmen. İstanbul: Arion, 1995.
———. *Hē Mikrasiatikē Katastrophē kai hē stratēgikē tou imperialismou stēn anatolikē Mesogeio* (The Asia Minor Catastrophe and the Strategy of Imperialism in Eastern Mediterranean). Athens: Kedros, 1975.
Sotiriyu, Dido. *Benden Selam Söyle Anadolu'ya*. Çeviren Attila Tokatlı. İstanbul: Sander Yayınları, 1980.
Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. England: Penguin, 1991.
Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Aschroft, Gareth Griffiths and Hellen Tiffin, 24-28. London: Routledge, 2003.
Strauss, Johann. "Is Karamanli Literature Part of a 'Christian-Turkish (Turco-Christian) Literature'?" In *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies*, edited by Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler, 153-200. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
Tanc, Barbaros. "Where Local Trumps National: Christian Orthodox and Muslim Refugees since Lausanne." *Balkanologie*, Vol. V, No. 1-2 (Dec. 2001): 279-289.
Taylor, Charles. *Multiculturalism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.
Thompson, Paul. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. U.S.A: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Todorova, Maria. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Tokalak, İsmail. *Bizans-Osmanlı Sentezi: Bizans Kültür ve Kurumlarının Osmanlı Üzerindeki Etkisi*. İstanbul: Güler Boy, 2006.
Tonkin, Elizabeth. *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History*. U.K: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
Tosun, Ramazan. *Türk-Rum Nüfus Mübadelesi ve Kayseri'deki Rumlar*. Niğde: Tolunay, 1998.
Toynbee, Arnold J. *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*. U.S.A: Martino, 2009.
Trim, David J. B. "The Huguenots and the Experience of Exile: (Sixteenth to Twentieth Centuries) History, Memory and Transnationalism." In *The Huguenots: History and Memory in Transnational Context*, edited by D.J.B. Trim, 1-42. Brill, 2011.

Trumpener, Ulrich. “Germany and the End of the Ottoman Empire.” In *The Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire*, edited by Marian Kent, 107-136. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.
Tsitselikis, Kostas. “Yunanistan’da Müslüman Toplulukların Örgütlenmesi: Süreklilik ve Ayrılık.” In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 341-355. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
———.*Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. London: Edward Arnold, 1977.
Tül, Şükrü. *Şirince/Once Upon a Time Çirkince*. İstanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2008.
Tziovas, Dimitris, ed. *Greek Diaspora and Migration since 1700: Society, Politics and Culture*. U.K: Ashgate, 2009.
Umar, Bilge. *İzmir’de Yunanlıların Son Günleri*. Ankara: Bilgi, 1974.
Uran, Hilmi. *Hatıralarım*. Ankara: H.Uran, 1959.
Vansina, Jan. *Oral Tradition as History*. U.S.A: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
Varlık, Bülent. *19. Yüzyılda Emperyalizmin Batı Anadolu’da Yayılması*. Ankara: TİB, 1976.
Vartan Paşa. *Aḳabi Hikyayesi: İlk Türkçe Roman, 1851*. Prepared by Andreas Tietze. İstanbul: Eren, 1991.
Veeser, Aram, ed., *The New Historicism*. U.S.A: Routledge, 1989.
Veremis, Thanos M. and Mark Dragoumis. *Historical Dictionary of Greece*. London: Scarecrow Press, 1995.
Vourita, Eftihia. “Population Transfers and Resettlement Policies in Inter-war Europe: The Case of Asia Minor Refugees in Macedonia from an International and National Perspective.” In *Our Selves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity since 1912*, edited by Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis, 111-133. U.K: Berg, 1997.
Vryonis, Speros. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. U.S.A: University of California Press, 1971.
———.*The Mechanism of Catastrophe: The Turkish Pogrom of September 6-7, 1955, and the Destruction of the Greek Community of Istanbul*. New York: Greekworks, 2005.
Welch, David. *Germany, Propaganda and Total War, 1914-1918: The Sins of Omission*. London: Athlone, 2000.
White, Hayden. “New Historicism: A Comment.” In *The New Historicism*, edited by Aram Veeser, 293-302. U.S.A: Routledge, 1989.
Xingjian, Gao. “Literature as Testimony: The Search for Truth.” In *Witness Literature*, edited by Horace Engdahl, 113-127. Singapore: World Scientific, Publishing, 2002.
Yalçın, Kemal. *Emanet Çeyiz: Mübadele İnsanları*. İstanbul: Birzamanlar Yayıncılık, 2008.
———. *Seninle Güler Yüreğim*. İstanbul: Birzamanlar Yayıncılık, 2006.
———. *Sarı Gelin-Sari Gyalin*. İstanbul: Birzamanlar Yayıncılık, 2006.
Yenişehirlioğlu, Filiz Çalışlar. “Mübadele ve Kültürel Miras.” In *Yeniden Kurulan Yaşamlar: 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, compiled by Müfide Pekin, 421-446. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
Yiannakopoulos, Georgios A, ed. *Refugee Greece: Photographs from the Archive of the Center for Asia Minor Studies*. Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 1992.

———. “The Reconstruction of a Destroyed Picture: The Oral History Archive of the Center for Asia Minor Studies.” *Mediterranean Historical Review*, (8:2, 1993):201-217.

Yıldırım, Onur. *Diplomacy and Displacement: Reconsidering the Turco-Greek Exchange of Populations, 1922-1934*, edited by Shahrough Akhavi. U.S.A: Routledge, 2006.

http://www.lozanmubadilleri.org.tr/hakkimizda
http://www.waterstones.com/waterstonesweb/pages/content/1025/
http://www.haber7.com/haber/20060502/Hilal-Hac-ve-Kimlik.php