CHAPTER 1

History, Memory and Emotion:
The Long Term Significance of the 1923 Greco-Turkish Exchange of Populations *

Renée Hirschon

Introduction

This chapter attempts to show how history, memory and emotion interact in the relationship between Greeks and Turks, affecting and influencing relationships at the macro-political level, as well as at the interpersonal level. It aims to underline the importance of the personal, of the emotional, and the subjective in the formation of national images, elements which I consider to be critical, though not openly acknowledged in the sphere of diplomacy and of international relations.

My presentation in this chapter is founded in an anthropological approach, which is essentially holistic. Unlike in other specialised social sciences such as economics and political science, anthropology's functionalist heritage in the British tradition, though now seen as static and limited, nonetheless has its uses insofar as it conceptualises the interconnection of a range of different human activities.[20] It has a particularly valuable role to play as an interpretive approach and, therefore, in

* I am most grateful to Vally Lytra for editorial guidance and suggestions, to the internal readers, as well as to Dimitris Kamouzis and to Dimitrios Gkintidis for constructive comments, all of which have improved this text, although I could not incorporate all of them. I am especially indebted to Emine Yeşim Bedlek for allowing me to use her draft translation from the Turkish of the *Entrusted Trousseau* by Kemal Yalçın, and to Natasha Lemos for additional help.

[20] My approach is wider (developed at the University of Chicago where intellectual influences included those of Talcott Parsons, and systems theory) and also incorporates individual actors in a social, cultural and historical context, in a dynamic way. Resonances with Bourdieu's 'habitus' and phenomenological anthropology can be inferred.

promoting cross-cultural understanding through 'making sense' of the institutions and practices of other societies (see, for example my attempt to explain the Greek crisis through cultural and historical factors which result in 'cultural mismatches' among EU member countries, Hirschon in press 2013).

In this short analysis, it is not possible to cover many of the diverse factors, which operate in framing relationships 'when Greeks and Turks meet one another'. Thus, my focus is necessarily limited, its reference point being the long-term effects of the Compulsory Exchange of Populations, a provision of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, which, in my view, continues to influence the relations between these states and their citizens. I have purposely focused here on the micro-scale, on interpersonal relations, an approach which is anecdotal and case-based, and which can be presented at different levels.[21] The chapter moves from the individual personal (memory accounts of refugees and their descendants), to the locality (the remembered and transformed landscape, the neighbourhood), to the national (history textbooks, perceptions) and the transnational (Greco-Turkish encounters, abroad and in the UK).

Memory is par excellence a human endowment, a widely recognised and studied phenomenon, but it is well to add a cautionary remark and be more precise since there is considerable evidence that non-human creatures also have the capacity for memory.[22] What distinguishes human beings, however, is the capacity to verbalise

[21] Cf. Kirtsoglou's (2006) careful analysis of Greek Army officers' perceptions which deals with the dynamic aspect at two levels, that of personal views and that at the level of a changing international context.

[22] A growing body of literature exists in the various disciplines, which consider these issues. Different approaches are adopted in what has now achieved a distinct status overall as 'memory studies'. These range from the neurosciences, to zoology, ethology, the social sciences and humanities,

their memories through the use of language. The expression of memory through language, whether oral or written, is a unique mark of our species. Anthropologists whose work is concerned with the past invoke history, myth and oral narratives as points of reference (e.g. Tonkin 1991) and their approach is closely related to that of social historians (e.g. Samuel and Thompson 1990). In this approach the question of 'objective' history of the positivist kind is rejected, and my approach as an anthropologist foregrounds the individuals' accounts, and is part of an oral history tradition which I consider useful in uncovering personal aspects of the relationships between Greeks and Turks, in contemporary as well as in past contexts.

Embodied Memory: The Individual Experience

The remarkable figure of Filio Haidemenou and her activities provide a paradigmatic example of the role played at the individual personal level. Filio herself can be seen as a monument, an embodied memory (Csordas 1994).[23] She was a treasure house of stories, a memory bank of the past, and a bridge between the successive worlds of experience of her 100 years, a life spanning the 20th century. Focussing on Filio, we are observing a living monument. Indeed, in herself she provides us with a reference point, uniting history, memory and emotion. But beyond this too, she provides a clear illustration of the ways in which memory can be materialised and enshrined, since she spent many years devoted to creating monuments of the lost past.

Filio was born in Vourla (Urla) near Smyrna/Izmir on 28 October 1899. When I interviewed her in her home in Nea Philadelphia, Athens in 2000 she had celebrated

psychoanalysis, and to the subjective reflexivity of post-modern enquiry. Consequently, there exists a vast body of multidisciplinary bibliographic resources.

[23] 'Embodiment' has been a topic in anthropological enquiry from the 1990s, and has introduced new conceptualisations for the understanding of materiality, and of the body as culturally situated (see Csordas's seminal Introduction, 1994, 1-24).

her 100th birthday and had become the best known among Asia Minor survivors, a public figure appearing on television and in interviews, and in talks to schools. These activities followed great efforts in her 90s, which were the fulfilment of a promise she had made long before. When she fled in terror aged 23, seeing the flames engulfing her 'beloved Vourla', she had vowed never to forget her homeland.

So it was that many years later, in 1990, aged 91, after a turbulent life narrated in *Τρεις Αιώνες, Μια Ζωή* (Three Centuries, One Life) she became instrumental in building a monument to the Asia Minor heritage now boldly commanding the square in the Municipality of Nea Philadelphia, in Athens. She had initiated a fund raising campaign, raised the initial sum of 60 million drachmas (£120.000) and got the project underway. As this project took off, she then began another, single-handed, and even against some local opposition: she initiated the collection of objects for a Museum in Nea Philadelphia with documents, photographs, costumes, and artefacts donated by families from the old established refugee settlements. She made local and national radio appeals, personally took responsibility for the collected items, catalogued them, washed and mended the fabrics herself, lobbied the Municipality for premises and, with the support of the local Mayor, the Museum opened in the late 1990s with over 600 items on display.[24]

Significantly, Filio had been back on visits to Vourla several times since the 1970s. The last time she returned to Vourla was to bring back stones and earth from there to be buried in the monument when it was inaugurated. These were to be placed in the Memorial 'so that it is Mikrasiatiko' (*να φέρω πέτρες και χώμα απ' εκεί για το άγαλμα, για να είναι Μικρασιάτικο*), she told me with emphasis (see also Haidemenou 2005, 207-8).

[24] www.neafiladelfeia.gr/Default.aspx?pid=134&la=1

The account she gave me in our personal interview revealed a particularly significant dimension of the quality of some personal encounters between Greeks and Turks who have experienced the disruption caused by the Population Exchange of 1923. That is the recognition of their shared experience of loss and of uprootedness, and the injustices inflicted upon them as persons through an international agreement in which they had no say.

An illustrative encounter took place at the place where Filio had gone to school so many years earlier. Although she had not finished the 3rd grade of the primary school because of the disturbances caused by the Young Turks' rise to power in 1908, throughout her life she was not deterred by her minimal formal education, and spoke and wrote with passion about her longing for education. On that visit, she recalls how she went to the flattened site of the famous school in Vourla, the Anaxagorios (*Αναξαγόρειος Σχολή*). Built of marble in the 1700s and called after the philosopher Anaxagoras because he was from there, this grand building had been destroyed by the Turks around the time of the catastrophe. As she bent down to dislodge a piece of marble from the earth, her mind recalled her teachers at the school. She mentioned their names one by one, and what they had taught. Listening to her was like a memorial service (*μνημόσυνο*).[25]

As she got up holding the stone, she was in tears. An elderly Turk came to her and, speaking in Greek, he asked, 'Are you a Vourliotissa?' He revealed that he was one of the 'exchanged' (*ανταλλάξιμος*) whose father was born in Crete. He put his

[25] It is significant that she chose to take stones from the school. The value she placed on education is further witnessed by the fact that she established excellence awards in her name for the best pupils graduating from the high schools of Nea Philadelphia and Nea Halkidona, see http://neafiladelfeia.gr/Default.aspx?pid=186&rowid=201

arm around her, saying, 'Don't cry, yiayia. We have the same pain. Both of us are without a homeland' (*Μην κλαις γιαγιά, έχουμε τον ίδιο πόνο. Είμαστε και οι δυο χωρίς πατρίδα*). Telling me about this encounter, she ended with the poignant comment: 'The people did not have problems between them' (*οι λαοί δεν είχαν τίποτα μεταξύ τους*).

I was reminded of the recollections of the older people I knew in Kokkinia in the 1970s, who often recounted how people of both conflicting nations had suffered, that it was not only the Greeks who had been subject to brutalities. The ability of some of these people to transcend their own painful memories was expressed in the recognition of shared experience, and common responsibility. They would say, 'the expulsion was from both sides' (o *διώγμος ήταν απ'τις δύο πλευρές*), and they were wont to conclude, 'We are all God's creatures' (*του Θεού πλάσματα είμαστε όλοι*) (see Hirschon 2006, 71-5).

Filio was the main driving force behind the monument and the Museum in Nea Philadelphia, and displayed exceptional energy, but she was not alone. She could not have done it without the support of people in the community who were enthused by the project of creating lasting memorials for their lost homelands. Indeed, she founded an association, whose members voluntarily assisted in the creation of the monument and in establishing the museum, and which today numbers about 700 members.[26] The enduring bonds and longing for the places and way of life disrupted by the exchange are evidenced in a growing number of research projects and in the oral accounts of which are becoming better known in the literature (see the oral archives in the Centre for Asia Minor Studies and its publications, for instance Apostolopoulos 1980, Kitromilidis and Mourelos 1982).

[26] See http://neafiladelfeia.gr/Default.aspx?pid=355&la=1

The remarkable book by Kemal Yalçın, *The Entrusted Trousseau: Peoples of the Exchange* (in Turkish, Yalçın [1998] 2008), based on interviews and presented in a semi-fictional form, provides many examples of the deep emotional ties to the homeland that were expressed even 70 years after the expulsion by those who were forced to leave their homes by those who were settled in Greece when the Treaty of Lausanne was applied. The peaceful mixed communities of Cappadocia were most noticeably disrupted by the violence of a political decision, and not by military conflict. In 1924 Yalçın's family was asked by their Orthodox Christian neighbours to look after a trunk containing the dowry goods of their daughter, when the family received the expulsion order and had to leave for Greece. Yalçın himself, two generations later, undertook to return the trunk and goods to the Minoglou family, though their location was unknown. In order to do this, he made two separate trips to Greece, the second one after his father's death in 1994. He was ultimately successful in his quest, found the Minoglou family who had settled in Volos, and returned the long-lost trousseau. Sadly, though, his father was no longer alive to learn of the fulfilment of their family's promise.

Yalçın's book contains moving accounts of his contacts with those expelled from their homeland and their descendants, some of which I present here to illustrate patterns and the quality of the bonds between those displaced through the events of 1922-23. These accounts are worth attention for what they reveal of the common and shared experience of loss of their homeland, today's modern Turkey, the recognition of a shared culture, and the immediate appreciation of the 'other' (see also contributions in Theodossopoulos 2006).

Among those interviewed by Yalçın was Eleftheria Staboulis, a high school teacher in Greece. Eleftheria's father, Lazaros, was originally from Kayseri. Her

mother, Sofia Kalinikidou had six children. Four of them died on the way to Greece. The older sister aged 10 was lost on the way and to this day they do not know what became of her. The family had travelled from Kayseri to Yozgat, from Yozgat to Sinop, from Sinop to Çanakkale, and finally from Çanakkale by boat to Greece where Eleftheria was born. Her father longed for his village near Kayseri and frequently narrated stories about his life there to his children. He always wanted to go back, so that when permission was given in 1974 for Asia Minor refugees (*mübadiller*) to visit Turkey, her father asked Eleftheria to return to his hometown on his behalf since he was now elderly and no longer fit 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 neighbours. Go and find our home. Bring me a bag of soil from our garden and a bottle of water from our fountain if it is still there. Before I die, may I drink the water from our spring and kiss our soil; then let me die!

Eleftheria went to Kayseri to fulfil her father's wish and found their family house. It was in bad condition with a family residing there, so she preferred to sit in the garden. She told how she spent time taking in the atmosphere and listening to the water running in front of their house. Then she filled a bag of soil and a bottle of water and took it back to her father as requested.

My father filled his pillowcase with the earth I brought him and, until the day he died he would lay his head on it to sleep. He drank the water from their fountain sip by sip, and slept on that pillow of soil until he died. When Eleftheria ended her narration, she started weeping. Her voice was trembling. She lit a cigarette. 'We were the people of that earth. Why did we become enemies?' she finished her words with this question (Yalçın 2008, 40-41).

Yalçın continued his search for the Minoglou family and interviewed Prodromos Vasiliadis, born in 1910 in Salihli/Manisa. He was 12 years old in 1922 when together with his mother, already a widow because his father had died long before, he abandoned his homeland in panic. The family had owned a grocery store and a vineyard in Salihli. None of his brothers or sisters had been to school because of poverty and he was the only person who had a primary school education, but he had left the school in the 4th grade. In 1919, the Greek army passed through Salihli, but in 1922 they returned in flight, heading to Smyrna due to the defeat. He remembered people panicking and preparing their belongings to leave Salihli. It was the retreating soldiers who told them to leave: 'In 1922 the Greek soldiers were fleeing. They told us all to flee too and not to delay because the irregulars were coming'. Prodromos fled to Smyrna with his family because the irregulars (*τσέτες*) were attacking them, not the soldiers of Kemal. After enduring the turmoil in Smyrna, the family was taken to Salonika. Without a father, the family suffered a great deal of difficulty. In 1924, Prodromos moved to Katerini and worked in several places to survive. He married in 1935.

Prodromos, aged 64, finally made a return trip to Salihli in 1974. When he arrived he started crying. Somebody saw him and asked him where he was from. Some local people tried to comfort him and called Ali Ağa, one of the elders of the town. Ali Ağa remembered his father Panayoti and hugged him, and then took him to his former family house where he was welcomed by the woman who lived there, but Prodromos felt unable to enter. He sat on the stairs of the house and wept. On his return to Greece he brought with him a bag of soil from Salihli. Concluding his narration, Prodromos was moved to tears and said how he wished to return to Salihli (Yalçın 2008, 133-136).

Yalçın also visited Father Yorgos who was from Ayancık/Sinop (Yalçın 2008, 123-131). He was born in 1906 in Ayancık, an Orthodox Christian, and Turkish was his mother tongue. The importance of shared cultural practices is revealed in this narration, for Father Yorgos expressed his joy in welcoming somebody from Asia Minor, who shared with him the same culture, traditions and language. When Yalçın greets Father Yorgos by kissing his hand, Father Yorgos says, 'Did you see - he has kissed my hand! He is a Turk. This is a tradition in our culture. The hands of the elders are kissed.'

As they drank their coffee, Father Yorgos narrated his life-story. His father had been a tailor, and they had been wealthy in Anatolia. His maternal uncle was a wealthy man who made boats. In Ayancık, there were 80-90 *Rum* families, and the rest were Turks and Armenians. He stated that there were no problems between different ethnic groups. When his father was conscripted into the Ottoman army during World War I, his uncle took care of them, but when the Armenians were rounded up and disappeared, they started to feel insecure and they moved to Istanbul.

Father Yorgos recalled his time there in 1922 when he was 16 years old, when he played football for the Galatasaray team, and how he enjoyed the beauty of İstanbul, how they swam at Kadıköy beach, and went sailing to the Princes' Islands. In 1923 the Lausanne Treaty was signed, but Father Yorgos and his family wanted to remain in İstanbul. However, only those *Rum* residents of İstanbul who had resided in İstanbul before 1918 were allowed to stay in the city. The rest had to migrate to Greece according to the Lausanne Convention. Father Yorgos's family stayed in İstanbul for two more years (illegally for about a year) and then left for Greece. They tried to find a place that resembled Ayancık, and finally decided to live in Platamona.

They spent about two years living in tents and in 1926 the government provided them with a refugee house. He made his living by farming and shoe-making.

Father Yorgos recalled Ayancık vividly and talked about its beauty and what a happy life they had enjoyed there. His narration included political references: he stated that nobody from Ayancık joined the Greek army during the Greco-Turkish War, but it was the Greeks in İzmir who joined the Greek army. He blamed Britain for encouraging the Greeks to invade Asia Minor, thereby destroying their peaceful lives in Turkey. Greeks and Turks killed each other for nothing, he said. According to Father Yorgos, Mustafa Kemal was a great man. However, he should not have sent Asia Minor Greeks to Greece because Turkey lost its most educated and skilled people. Father Yorgos said that they had waited for many years, expecting to be forgiven by Mustafa Kemal, so that they could go back to their home country. His advice to the new generations of Greeks and Turks was not to fight again, but to work hard to make peace (Yalçın 2008, 130-131).

Yalçın ends the account by expressing surprise that Father Yorgos seemed stronger than his own son, a much younger man who had been born in Greece. When Yalçın asked what the reason was, Father Yorgos revealed his devotion to his original homeland, saying, 'I drank the water of the Black Sea while growing up; that's why I am strong. It is a remedy and made me strong'. In a further query, Yalçın asked Father Yorgos about his fluency in Turkish. Father Yorgos's answer revealed again the long-term attachment to home and the importance of roots, for he said, 'Turkish is the language of my home country. I will not forget it'. His long years in Greece had not eliminated his notion of his mother tongue and of the homeland, the place which

had nurtured him[27]. It is notable how the enduring power of that bond is symbolised through the soil and the water, and constitutes a common theme in these accounts.

Refugee Settlement as the Topos of Memory

It is clear from the many studies of displaced peoples that a sense of continuity is a critical part of the process of adjustment, a reaction to the disruption of exile, and a means for establishing a basis for social life. In this section I note the ways in which the re-creating of the landscape and of place associations assert the relationships within and between communities. Long term nostalgia and the re-creation of familiar places in a new space appears to be a central element in the process of adjustment as examples from many diverse societies show (Colson 2003).

In the Greek context, Kokkinia provides an appropriate example. Now known by its official name of Nikaia, it was established on the outskirts of Piraeus in the 1920s in response to the urgent problem of housing in the urban areas. Kokkinia was one among many urban refugee settlements, established under emergency conditions to accommodate a jumble of people from all over today's Turkey – Thrace, Asia Minor and the Black Sea area. Following the stipulations of the Lausanne Treaty of 1923, in which a compulsory exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey took place, the first ratified by international treaty, it was of major proportions. The exchange involved over 1.2 million Christians who were forced to settle in Greece and 350,000 Muslims who were expelled to Turkey (Hirschon [1989] 1998, 36-9, Hirschon 2003, 14-5). Mistakenly and inaccurately called 'repatriation' in an

[27] Herta Muller, 2009 Nobel Literature Laureate, eloquently criticises the simplistic misuse of the exilic phrase, 'My homeland is my native tongue'. Her own experience of life in exile does not reduce it to a matter of language, but she emphasizes that language is one part of belonging within a familiar social and cultural context (2002, 24-25).

inaccurate understanding of the events, this accord actually constituted a systematic application of what we now call 'ethnic cleansing', in order to create homogeneous nation states out of mixed and diversified societies (see chapter 10 by Tsitselikis for a discussion of the population exchange).

In other parts of Greece, resettlement of whole villages also took place. The policy makers placed great emphasis on rural settlement where in northern Greece alone a total of 2000 new villages were established, the rationale being that people would be more likely to become self-supporting as agricultural producers. The policy in northern Greece also served geopolitical ends since it reinforced the ethnic homogeneity of a formerly diverse region (Hirschon [1989]1998, 40, 258 n.3).

All over the country, the refugee population faced severe problems of survival. Despite an auspicious start, the urban settlements did not prosper. International and national funding had dried up but the basic infrastructure was incomplete; roads, drainage, schools, hospitals could not be provided. It was not long before most of the urban settlements became politically and economically marginalised (see Hirschon [1989]1998, 42-55). Nonetheless, some 50 years later in Kokkinia, the coherence of social and cultural life was striking. The vast urban sprawl was differentiated into neighbourhoods, each purportedly having its own characteristics and atmosphere. Strikingly, these derived from regional stereotypes from the former homeland. For example, the district of Yermanika was said to be noisy and quarrelsome because many people from Smyrna had settled there (Hirschon [1989]1998, 68), while the nearby neighbourhood of Osia Xeni was characterised as quiet and respectable since it was said that the residents were mainly from the Pontus region, and they were regarded as be peace-loving, and orderly. Ai Nikola was said to be the 'aristocratic

neighbourhood', because its residents were from Constantinople, and therefore somewhat superior (Hirschon [1989]1998, 22-4).

These characterisations of neighbourhoods, however, were not objectively based since Kokkinia had been settled by people from widely diverse geographical areas. There was no orderly resettlement by place of origin, but an *ad hoc* distribution of various types of housing allocated at random (ibid, 68). Of great significance therefore, is the perception of the urban landscape and its character. The attribution of stereotypical regional characteristics can be called a process of 'cognitive mapping' - by assigning regional characteristics to a new unchartered territory, the dislocated refugees apparently created what can be identified as a kind of 'social landscape geography' using regional stereotypes as a means of familiarisation and personalisation of the environment. Most striking is the fact that these regional characterisations were held in collective memory and continued to hold currency more than fifty years after settlement, into the second and even third generations (Hirschon [1989]1998, 24-26).

In Kokkinia, other socially significant landmarks were created. This is a recognised and fundamental process in relocation (Hirschon [1989]1998, 26). Street names recalled homeland localities: Adramytiou, Ikoniou, Moschonision, Philadelphias, Mikras Asias. Churches in Kokkinia were dedicated in memory of the sanctuaries abandoned in the homeland: the churches of St Fotini, of St Nicolas, of Evangelistria, were built to enshrine the icons brought from the homeland, and thus constituted the material locus of links with the past. Notably, stones or soil were incorporated in these buildings whenever the refugees were able to bring them back after return journeys to their place of origin (see first-hand accounts in the previous section). These were among the elements employed to transform space into place - to

reconstruct a meaningful environment, and to create a sense of continuity in the disruption of their expulsion.

Similarly, all over rural Greece, refugee settlements were called by their homeland names, prefixed by 'Nea' for 'New' – evidence of the need for continuity of place and its associations. Exchanged people from Cappadocia who had been settled in the northern Greek villages of Nea Prokopi and Nea Karvali centred their communities on the transported relics of the saints from the homeland enshrined in the churches. These have become major places of pilgrimage (Stelaku 2003), as has the shrine of the Panayia Soumela, recreated in Verria (northern Greece) for the wider community of people from the Pontus region. On the island of Limnos, descendants of Reisderiani refugees who were settled in the village of St Dimitrios have a lively oral culture and continue to uphold their Asia Minor traditions in distinctive narratives, poetry and song, even into the fourth generation (Tsimouris1997). The ways in which continuity is promoted are evident in many other refugee settlements in Greece, both in rural and in urban settings.

Patterns and Distortions in National Perceptions

Some of the informal mechanisms, which promoted a sense of continuity in the disrupted lives of the refugees and exchanged peoples are discussed in the previous section. These include the collective and informal memory of places in the homeland. At a different level of significance is the conscious application of notions regarding the 'other', in both national states, through official historiography and in policy decisions.

For Greeks and Turks, different interpretations of the events around 1922-23 clearly demonstrate how a moment of shared history holds opposite meanings for each side. For Turkey, 1922-23 is a time of triumph, ending the War of

Independence, a victory, which culminated in the establishment of the Turkish Republic. For Greece, however, 1922 marks the Asia Minor Catastrophe, a disaster, which ended the Hellenic presence in the Anatolian heartland.

This marked asymmetry in the experiences of the two countries continued as one of the noteworthy features of the period following the Exchange (Hirschon 2003, 13ff). The divergent paths of the two nation-states in the following decades ended what once constituted a common or shared history. The separation was reinforced by nationalistic accounts of the past, especially by the official teaching of history, which tended to emphasise hostile relations, aggression, oppression, and mutual betrayal. Estrangement was the inevitable consequence of the building of nation-state identity in which hostility towards the 'other' is cultivated and becomes the prevailing collective attitude (see Millas, chapter 3, for an eloquent discussion of the various sources influencing perceptions of the 'other').

It is clear that trust is an essential element in the negotiation of relationships of all kinds but, in the case of Greece and Turkey, institutionalised enmity and suspicion have dogged the perceptions of each side for long periods. Contributing to this point and highlighting the fluctuating nature of international relations between Turkey and Greece, a pattern is detectable in which the periods of rapprochement have alternated with periods of hostility over the past ninety years.

Significantly, when relations between the two countries are amicable, proposals are made to revise the history textbooks on both sides. In Greece, the revision of the 6th grade primary school history textbook by M. Repoussis and others was published in 2006 but, at a time of growing nationalist sentiment, a widespread controversy was stirred up involving educationalists and the general public regarding its revisionist approach, most of whom had not seen the textbook. Among the critics

were the late Archbishop Christodoulos and some Church spokesmen who objected to the account of the Ottoman period, criticising the neglect of what is commonly seen as the Church's major role in preserving Greek identity through language and religion, especially through the 'secret school' (*κρυφό σχολειό*) that operated under the oppression of the Ottoman regime (a now challenged myth). Concerning the 1974 events in Cyprus and their representation, the Cypriot Minister of Education sent corrective comments to the Greek Education Minister, recommending that phrases in the book such as the 'Cyprus problem' or the 'Cyprus issue' be replaced by the 'tragedy of Cyprus', a more emotional formulation. Criticisms, even from liberals and left-wing critics, centred on the misleadingly anodyne phrases regarding the flight of the civilian population and the destruction of Smyrna, and to the absence of references to atrocities by the combatants on both sides in the 1919-22 war.

The textbook was withdrawn both in order to correct the careless factual errors, a justifiable activity, but also because considerable pressure was exerted to have the text rewritten in order to promote 'Greek consciousness'. While this was being done, the previous textbooks containing the unexamined nationalistic view of the past were used. Four years later, a new history textbook has been issued for the school year beginning in September 2012. Whether this version of past history will also be controversial remains to be seen. In Cyprus, where intercommunal divisions are extreme, a wider awareness of the critical role played by education has developed and discussions around school curricula are ongoing: for example, regular meetings sometimes involving up to 250 teachers engaged with curriculum reform take place, which has been viewed as an optimistic sign (see Loizos 2006, also Papadakis and Charalambous, in chapter 6 and chapter 7 respectively).

Through the representations of the schoolbooks and of popular ideas, the image of the 'threatening Turk' is depicted graphically. The phrase '400 years of slavery' is a well-worn cliché which resonates evocatively in the public mind and remains largely unexamined; it is both the backdrop to, and the generator of ingrained fears and mistrust. In a critical examination of the history behind these attitudes, Pesmazoglou (2001, 2007) exposes the European roots of anti-Turkish sentiments and how they have been incorporated into the construction of modern Greek identity. Greek children are taught to think of Turks as bloodthirsty, lacking culture and civilization, the Ottoman period is presented as a dark age, one of continuous cruel oppression, and the contemporary media play up the images of violence in the news coverage (e.g. during demonstrations outside the Patriarchate in Istanbul, and fatal incidents in Cyprus). Against such ideological weight, even the most liberal-minded Greeks, left-wing critics, academics, and well-educated members of upper-class families have admitted to me that, on their first visit to Turkey, they have felt insecure, nervous and fearful.

At the personal level, then, we see how easily images arise unbidden even in the minds of those who may have worked consciously to overcome their prejudices, evoking emotions which may act to inhibit their ability to face up to them. How powerful are the unchallenged sets of perceptions that we are endowed with through our given culture and heritage as citizens of particular nation-states, whose basis for membership is exclusive and rooted in oppositional images.

On the Turkish side, parallel problems are evident. Just as the Ottoman period is distorted and misrepresented to students in Greece, so for the Turks, the Byzantine Empire 'is neglected even ignored' (Millas 1995, 29). In a 400-page Turkish high school textbook, Hittites get more than two pages while Byzantium warrants only

nine sentences (Millas 1995, 29). In another Turkish high school book a passage on the military incursion of 1919 emphasizes 'the Greek cruelty which the Turkish people will never forget' (Millas 1995, 29). Generally, Greeks are characterized as aggressive and violent, with long-term expansionist territorial ambitions, which surprises Greeks who hear this. Contrary to the international recognition of the two countries' boundaries, Turkish text books have propagated the idea that Greece does not have legitimate claims to the Dodecanese islands (Millas 1995, 30). Persistent disputes over rights to the Aegean airspace and the territorial waters, as well as the rocky outcrops that almost brought the countries to war in 1996 (Imia/Kardak incident) are undoubtedly related to this background.

As Keyder (2003) shows in his assessment of the consequences of the exchange for Turkey, the revision and presentation of history in the service of the nationalist project severely distorted the peoples' actual experience. Characterizing the endeavour as concealment, repression, and silence, Keyder asserts that the official discourse 'became an exercise in pure artifice' and he notes that 'there are silences in every nation's history that underlie an active effort to forget' (Keyder 2003, 48). Instead of the operation of memory in recreating the past, there is an opposite process, that of forgetting.

The recognition of the silence, which characterizes the approach to nationalist history on the Turkish side is thoroughly discussed in a synoptic article by Yildirim (2006a). His two scholarly studies published in the same year are invaluable and unique in their comparative perspective, with detailed attention to the archival as well as published literature on many aspects of the exchange. Yildirim's work exposes clearly a similar nation-building trajectory on both sides, nonetheless with significant contrasts and an overall marked asymmetry of experience. This latter feature is now a

recognized finding which emerged originally from the bilateral approach promoted at the 1998 commemorative conference assessing the consequences of the Lausanne Convention for both Greece and Turkey (Hirschon 2003, 13-20).

On the Greek side, an abundance of studies exists from the earliest days, reflecting an effort to remember what is called the Asia Minor Catastrophe, not dwelling on the disaster of a failed campaign but focussing on the mass expulsion. The received view focussed on what became accepted uncritically in Greece as the successful accommodation of the refugees, but this conviction ignored the long-term difficulties experienced by the displaced peoples themselves.

On the Turkish side, the triumph of the War of Independence was celebrated and with it came a silencing of events around the exchange, part of the concerted state effort to create a new Turkish identity (Yildirim 2006b, 138-9, Özkirimli and Sofos 2008, see also Millas 2003 on the silence in Turkish literature for over seven decades). This was largely done through the state-controlled rewriting of Turkish history in the early Republican period, and the consequent silence continued for several decades (Yildirim 2006a, 58-59). Only in recent times has attention at last been directed to the Exchange so that from the 1990s scholars and journalists began to engage with this topic. Yildirim notes two different tendencies, one which accepts uncritically the state-promoted version of events even by liberal Turkish scholars, while a more critical and distanced approach is evident in the work of a number of revisionist historians and social scientists (Yildirim 2006a, 62-3).

A further asymmetrical feature is also evident in that equal attention is not devoted to Greeks by Turks. While Greeks are preoccupied and, at times, even obsessed with what they see as the aggressive hostility of their Turkish neighbours,

for Turkey, there are far more serious problems of instability on their eastern borders, and Greek issues do not dominate their foreign policy concerns.

Another contrast is shown in the record of the displaced peoples' experiences in the two countries. In Greece, homeland associations were formed early and proliferated, while the Centre for Asia Minor Studies (*Κέντρο Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*) established under Melpo and Octavios Merlier in 1930, contains a valuable archive of thousands of interviews, documents and musical recordings from the first generation refugees and exchangees.

Though considerable archival sources exist in Turkey, for many years there was little interest in exploring them so that the few homeland associations soon closed down. Possibly among the most significant developments on the Turkish side, well-illustrating the long-term power of memory and its institutionalised expression, is the establishment of the Foundation of Lausanne Treaty Emigrants (*Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfi*), in 2000-01, an organization which brings together for the first time those people whose forefathers and -mothers were the exchangees of the 1923 Convention. This Turkish Foundation aims 'to preserve and regenerate the collective identity and cultural values of the first generation immigrants and their children'.[9] Its organisers have created a bridging forum between the separated peoples, and it actively promotes bilateral meetings. Among its published aims are

> to support friendship and cooperation among Turkish and Greek people, to protect the cultural and historical heritage of both sides, to conduct research on the population exchange, to organise conferences, and festivals, and to facilitate return visits to the place of origin of peoples on both sides (ibid).

[9] Cf. http:/www.lozanmubadilleri.org/English.htm

This reconciliatory agenda, however, is not generally matched in similar institutions in Greece, where the long-established local homeland associations of many settlements in Asia Minor, Pontus and Thrace often tend to be propagators of an explicitly nationalist agenda. Many Greek homeland associations have become noticeably nationalistic and vociferous. Indeed it is significant that the use of the term 'genocide' was not used in the period of my fieldwork in the 1970s but has been adopted and is commonly used for the events around the Exchange.

It is therefore important to recognise, however, that there are also images and memories of a benign kind, critically dismissed by cynics as mere romanticism, but which are proving to have a curious longevity and vitality. Shared cultural items lend a kind of intimacy (see also Mackridge's cogent discussion of the role of language in this volume). In the Greek context, the role of popular culture is evidenced in the atmosphere of enjoyable recognition generated through some TV serials, soap-operas featuring Greco-Turkish love affairs. Astoundingly successful, the most popular TV programme during 2005-6 was a Turkish love saga 'Borders of Love' (*Yabancı Damat*), featuring a mixed marriage, as well as the small budget Greek film translated into English as 'A Touch of Spice' (*Πολίτικη Κουζίνα*) featuring the life of a *Rum* (Constantinopolitan) family, while some of the adaptive strategies in Greco-Turkish marriages have been the subject of research (Petronoti and Papagaroufali 2006). Another encouraging sign is learning the language of the 'other' which is no longer a taboo, but increasingly considered a desirable accomplishment. Ironically, the bilingualism of many first and second generation people was lost in Greece under the prejudices of that time, but is now being recovered by those born three and four generations later (cf. chapter 7 by Charalambous for competing discourses around learning the language of the 'other' in secondary schools in Cyprus).

Contemporary Encounters

The effective operation of state policy especially through education and the teaching of history is evident in the pervasive attitude of national stereotyping and prejudice which constitutes a major curse of our times. One attempt to examine this problem took place in the context of the Greek-Turkish network of the SEESOX programme at St Antony's College, Oxford University. In 2003, I organised an open discussion session to explore the views of the younger generation, represented by post-graduate students at UK universities. The open panel format broke new ground through involving a range of younger participants with their spontaneous contributions. This revealed the effects of prejudice, some of its sources, and how it is dealt with at the level of personal experience.

The relevance of these accounts lies in the way they expose the ingrained prejudices which are part of the cultural experience of all of us. Bound up with various processes involved in constructing collective social identity and self-definition, the key elements of memory, history and narrative operate in forming attitudes to the 'other'. The accounts voiced in this session revealed how important face-to-face contacts are, since these provide opportunities for first-hand knowledge, and through them, the possibility of building up mutual respect, trust, and friendship.

The discussion, in which lively contributions came from the younger generation, mainly focussed on identifying the various sources, which had influenced attitudes to the other country. Many speakers related how their first encounters with the other side had occurred as students at foreign universities, in classes and halls of residence where they were surprised to discover how many similarities existed, and that they had even been able to become friends. Familiar ways of behaving, some

shared vocabulary and cuisine, indeed a common heritage, is discovered to their mutual amazement.

Volunteering from personal experience, speakers (predominantly postgraduate students from Turkey, Greece and Cyprus at various British universities), related how they had been subject to prejudice from various sources in their home country as well as to an overall ignorance. Some noted that it was not only the content of the school teaching but even more, it was their teachers' attitudes, often highly nationalistic, that had been influential. One Greek student pointed out how he had finally noticed that university teaching in Greece differed from that at school since wider sources were used, and widespread ideas that are generally accepted were questioned.

Several personal accounts revealed how prevalent were prejudices and critical attitudes from the family regarding any positive interest in the other side. A Greek student of refugee origin recalled the bitter memories regarding his grandparents' flight and expulsion in 1922-3, and suggested that a process modelled on the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission could well contribute to creating rapprochement between Turks and Greeks. A Turkish student from Istanbul whose family is of Cretan origin told how she had to break the news to her mother that her research in Imbros/Gökçeada would also involve understanding the situation from the Greek point of view. Her mother was shocked and said, 'Your grandfather's bones would shiver, if he knew what you are doing'. Another young woman recounted how a friend who had grown up in the UK of Greek-Cypriot parents went back to their home village when the borders to the north were opened. She noted that her friend had returned saying, "'It was amazing – they're just like us", and she commented, 'It was as though my friend had imagined them somehow to be monsters, animals, not human beings'. A Turkish-Cypriot woman studying in Birmingham revealed that at

home she had never heard anything about Greek civilization, its history and philosophy; it was only in the UK that she uncovered this whole dimension to her amazement.

Clearly, many young people are actively engaging with and contesting the negative stereotypes and prejudices of the context they have grown up in. The examination and revision of attitudes was a common theme in the accounts from these students, and is ample evidence of the value of face-to face knowledge on an extended basis.

Contact across borders is a marked trend and has been increasing on a number of fronts, not least through tourism. Turkey has become a major destination with about 400,000 Greeks visiting the country in 2006. There has been a remarkable rise in tourism from Turkey to Greece: in 2008 and 2009 Turkish tourists to Greece numbered over 200.000 per year, and rose to 561,000 in 2010 (SETE)[10], despite the inconvenience and cost involved with visa applications.

Even before the 1999 earthquakes there were concerted attempts to create and promote bilateral ties, through initiatives by committed persons. Most active among them were business people, artists, musicians, journalists, some local mayors, and academics who undertook exchange visits and organised joint events.[11] It is notable that even when political relations between the Greek and Turkish states were at their worst, cultural and intellectual exchanges between the two nations never entirely ceased. Despite the 'official discourse', which generally presents Greek-Turkish relations in black-and-white terms, on the Greek side novels, films, songs, which

[10] Association of Hellenic Travel Enterprises, www.sete.gr

[11] For a detailed discussion of these initiatives in the case of Mytilini and Dikeli particularly, see Myrivili 2009, 331-57.

portrayed a more subtle state of affairs were never entirely absent, though the 'silence' in literature on the Turkish side right up to the 1990s should be noted (Millas 2003).

This pattern shows the ambivalence of a relationship in which mutual fascination, and consciousness of common cultural roots co-exists alongside fear, suspicion, and resentment (Kirtsoglou 2006). Notably, ever since 1999 when the major earthquakes in both countries evoked sympathetic responses and led to official political rapprochement, a plethora of cultural and academic exchanges have taken place between Greece and Turkey (see Birden and Rumelili 2009). This created the impression that many important problems had been solved. The watershed visit to Athens by Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan in May 2010 and the hour long live TV dialogue with the Greek Prime Minister, George Papandreou, in which warm expressions of mutual support were broadcast seemed to offer hope for reduced defence spending and the attention to minority rights, but these and other difficult issues continue to beset relations between the two countries (namely Aegean territorial waters, air space sovereignty, the Theological School of Halki in Turkey, the Cyprus stalemate).

Based on the panel discussion session and on the familiarity engendered through popular culture and bilateral meetings, it is clear that great value can be gained in the long-term through increasing contact between Greeks and Turks, especially among young people (see Myrivili 2009, 348-51). Social, cultural and educational exchanges could play a critical role in promoting the understanding of their own society as well as that of the 'other'. It would be well for Greeks and Turks alike to delve into their common collective memories, whether pleasant or painful, and to realize how closely their worlds were intertwined for four hundred years.

Conclusion: The Importance of a Holistic Approach

An anthropological perspective allows us to move from different levels and to include the operation of a variety of factors in our analysis. At the macro-level, there were encouraging indications of a more general climate of goodwill promoted by Greece's support for Turkey's long standing (and still pending) application for membership in the EU. In a period when setbacks occurred, the Greek position supporting Turkey's application has been a critical positive factor. The volatile character of this relationship however, is, always evident whenever tensions arise over intractable issues (Cyprus, the Aegean, the Patriarchate, the Theological School of Halki). Current turmoil in the Arab states (2012-13) is affecting the balance of relationships in the region, including those of Greece and Turkey.

With regard to the contentious relations between Greece and Turkey over the past ninety years, in my view, a bilateral view is essential for a fuller understanding of the complexity of these relations at the state level. Through the templates of documented history and through the oral accounts passed from one generation to another, people develop views and images of the 'other', which are powerful and enduring, and undoubtedly affect the direction of policy.

In this presentation, I have emphasised the importance of 'the human factor' because it is the fundamental element in processes of change. It is chiefly at this level, of the personal in the context of a social, cultural and temporal milieu, that one might hope for deeper transformations, for a long-term restitution and stabilisation of better relations. This chapter aims to create an awareness of the need for a more inclusive consideration of the subliminal responses and the mechanisms through which they are maintained. The significance of these elements, deeply embedded at the individual

level, have nonetheless insidious effects not fully recognised or addressed in certain specialised academic analyses, or indeed, in the international realm of diplomacy.

References

Apostolopoulos, Fotis, ed.1980. *Η Έξοδος. Μαρτυρίες από τις Επαρχίες των Δυτικών Παραλίων της Μικρασίας* [The Exodus. Testimonies from the Districts of the Western Shores of Asia Minor]. Vol. 1. Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies.

Birden, Rana, and Bahar Rumelili. 2009. "Rapprochement at the Grassroots: How Far Can Civil Society Engagement Go?" In *In the Long Shadow of Europe: Greeks and Turks in the Era of Postnationalism*, edited by Othon Anastasakis, Kalypso Nicolaidis, and Kerem Oktem, 315-30. Leiden/Boston: Martinus Nijhoff.

Csordas, Thomas, ed. 1994. *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Colson, Elizabeth. "Forced Migration and the Anthropological Response" *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16(1):1-18

Haidemenou, Filio. 2006. *Τρεις Αιώνες, Μια Ζωή* [Three Centuries, One Life]. Athens, Livani.

Hirschon, Renée. [1989]1998. *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*: *The Social Life of Asia Minor Refugees in Piraeus*. 2nd Edition. Oxford/New York: Berghahn Books.

Hirschon, Renée, ed. 2003. *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey*. Oxford/New York, Berghahn Books.

Hirschon, Renée. 2006. "Knowledge of Diversity: Towards a More Differentiated Set of 'Greek' Perceptions of 'Turks'". *South European Society & Politics* 11(1):61-78.

Hirschon, Renée. 2009. "History's Long Shadow: The Lausanne Treaty and Contemporary Greco-Turkish Relations". In *In the Long Shadow of Europe: Greeks*

and Turks in the Era of Postnationalism, edited by Othon Anastasakis, Kalypso Nicolaidis, and Kerem Oktem, 73-94. Leiden/Boston, Martinus Nijhoff.

Hirschon, Renée. in press 2013. "Cultural Mismatches: Greek Concepts of Time, Personal Identity, and Authority in the Context of Europe". In *Europe in Modern Greek History*, edited by Kevin Featherstone, London: Hurst & Co.

Kitromilidis, Paschalis, and Giannis Mourelos, eds. 1982. *Η Έξοδος. Μαρτυρίες από τις Επαρχίες της Κεντρικής και Νότιας Μικρασίας* [The Exodus. Testimonies from the Districts of Central and Southern Asia Minor. Vol. 2. Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies.

Kirtsoglou, Elisabeth. 2006. "Phantom Menace: What Junior Greek Army Officers Have to Say about Turks and Turkey". *South East European Society and Politics* 11(1): 179-94.

Keyder, Çağlar. 2003 "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 Renée Hirschon, 39-52. New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Loizos, Peter. 2006. "Bicommunal Initiatives and their Contribution to Improved Relations between Turkish and Greek Cypriots". *South East European Society and Politics* 11(1):179-94.

Millas, Hercules. 1991. "History Textbooks in Greece and Turkey" *History Workshop Journal* 31:21-33.

Millas, Hercules. 2003. "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 Renée Hirschon, 221-33. New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Myrivili, Eleni. 2009. “Transformation of Political Divides: Commerce, Culture and Sympathy Crossing the Greek-Turkish Border”. In *In the Long Shadow of Europe: Greeks and Turks in the Era of Postnationalism*, edited by Othon Anastasakis, Kalypso Nicolaidis, and Kerem Öktem, 331-58. Leiden/Boston: Martinus Nijhoff.

Müller, Herta. 2002. “When we don’t Speak we Become Unbearable, and When we Do, we Make Fools of Ourselves. Can Literature Bear Witness?” In *Witness Literature: Proceedings of the Nobel Centennial Symposium*, edited by Horace Engdahl, 15-32. Stockholm: The Swedish Academy.

Özkırımlı, Umut, and Spyros A. Sofos. 2008. *Tormented by History: Nationalism in Greece and Turkey*. London: Hurst & Company.

Pesmazoglou, Stephanos. 2001. “Η Μυθολογική Θεμελίωση του Νέου Ελληνικού Κράτους” [The Mythical Founding of the Modern Greek State]. Symposium Proceedings *Μύθοι και Ιδεολογήματα στη Σύγχρονη Ελλάδα* [Myths and Stereotypes in Contemporary Greece]. Athens: Etaireia Spoudon (Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and General Education), Moraitis School.

Pesmazoglou, Stephanos. 2007. “Η Ευρωπαϊκή Μήτρα της Νεοελληνικής Απόρριψης ‘του Τούρκου”’ [The European Matrix of the Modern Greek Rejection of “the Turk”]. Symposium Proceedings *Ευρώπη και Νέος Ελληνισμός* [Europe and Modern Hellenism]. Athens: Etaireia Spoudon (Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and General Education), Moraitis School.

Petronoti, Marina and Eleni Papagaroufali. 2006. “Marrying a Foe: Joint Scripts and Rewritten Histories of Greek-Turkish Couples” *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 13:557–84.

Samuel, Raphael, and Paul Thompson, eds. 1990 *The Myths We Live By*. London, Routledge.

Stelaku, Vasso. 2003. “Space, Place and Identity: Memory and Religion in Two Cappadocian Greek Settlements”. In *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, edited by Renée Hirschon, 179-93. New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Theodossopoulos, Dimitrios, ed. 2006. When Greeks Think about Turks. Special Issue. *South East European Society and Politics* 11(1).

Tonkin, Elizabeth. 1991. *Narrating our Pasts: The Social Construction of History.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Tsimouris, Giorghos. 1997. “Anatolian Embodiments in a Hellenic Context: The Case of Reisderiani Mikrasiates Refugees”. PhD diss., University of Sussex.

Yildirim, Onur. 2006a. “The 1923 Population Exchange, Refugees and National Historiographies in Greece and Turkey” *East European Quarterly* 40(1):45–70.

Yildirim, Onur. 2006b. *Diplomacy and Displacement: Reconsidering the Turco-Greek Exchange of Populations, 1922–34*. New York/London: Routledge.

Yalçın, Kemal. [1998] 2008. *Emanet Çeyiz: Mübadele İnsanları* [The Entrusted Trousseau: Peoples of the Exchange]. Istanbul: Birzamanlar Yayıncılık.