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**Introduction**

Vally Lytra

Situating the Relationship: Background

The date 1923 is of particular significance in defining the relationship between Greeks and Turks to the present day. It marked the end of the conflict (1919–22) commonly referred to in Turkish national historiography as the ‘War of Independence’ (*Kurtuluş Savaşı*) and in its Greek counterpart as the ‘Asia Minor Catastrophe’ (*Μικρασιατική Καταστροφή*).[[1]](#footnote-1) The end of the war was sealed by the signing of an international treaty in Lausanne (Treaty of Peace, 24 July 1923). Several months earlier (30 January 1923) the ‘Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations and Protocol’ was signed in Lausanne solidifying the irrevocable and compulsory displacement of about 1.5 million people on both shores of the Aegean (Hirschon 2004, 3–9).[[2]](#footnote-2) These historic events resulted in the establishment of the modern Turkish Republic, which was officially proclaimed on 29 October 1923 in Ankara, and the inauguration of the Turkish national project.[[3]](#footnote-3) For the Greek side, they determined the country’s national borders with the modern Turkish state and marked the demise of its irredentist aspirations to establish a Greek state that would encompass all ethnic Greeks, articulated in the *Megali Idea* (Great Idea)*.*

In the aftermath of these events, both countries concentrated on constructing independent nation-states with ideally homogeneous populations. Within the context of ‘unmixing peoples’ (Hirschon 2004, 4), those who were exempted from the population exchange were assigned minority status and their minority rights were purportedly safeguarded.[[4]](#footnote-4) In effect, by deploying religious affiliation rather than nationality or ethnicity as the defining criterion of identity (Article 1),[[5]](#footnote-5) the Convention stipulated the exception of the ‘Greek inhabitants of Costantinople’ and the ‘Moslem inhabitants of Western Thrace’ (Article 2).[[6]](#footnote-6) As several chapters in this volume document, in subsequent years, the fates of those who remained were shaped among other domestic and international factors by the trials and tribulations of Greek-Turkish relations and the Cyprus issue.[[7]](#footnote-7) The Cyprus issue became particularly relevant after 1960 as Ker-Lindsay in Chapter 5 of this volume postulates, doing ‘more to poison the relationship between Athens and Ankara than the myriad of other issues’.

The salience of the triadic relationship between the peoples of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus is also manifested in the ways dominant historiographies, premised on ethnic nationalism, have constructed national identities in opposition to one another. Although comparative studies of ethnic nationalism in Greece, Turkey and Cyprus have demonstrated the development of divergent goals and trajectories,[[8]](#footnote-8) they have perpetuated a reading of identities as homogeneous, fixed and bounded.[[9]](#footnote-9) In the case of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot national historiographies in particular, the emphasis has unambiguously been placed on ‘the common history, heritage, language, culture and religion with the people of the “motherlands”, Turkey and Greece’ (Papadakis, Chapter 6), a self-positioning commonly articulated in local conversation by many Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots alike (as is illustrated by Demetriou (Chapter 2) and Charalambous (Chapter 7)).

Inspired by the *Greek-Turkish Encounters* series and the space of intercommunal and interdisciplinary dialogue it created (see Foreword), the present volume draws on a range of disciplinary perspectives, notably history, sociology, anthropology, linguistics, literature, ethnomusicology and international relations, to investigate the relationship between Greeks and Turks as well as between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. It aims to contribute to current critical and comparative approaches to the study of the relationship with the purpose of questioning essentialist representations, stereotypes and dominant myths in order to understand the context and ideology of events, processes and experience. It should be noted here that although the subtitle and the introduction make reference to *the relationship* in the singular, the aim of the editor and contributors is to illustrate that there is not one single relationship but a plurality located and distributed across levels from the personal to the communal, to the national and the transnational. This perspective seeks to illuminate the interconnections between levels, often through a comparative angle, and to illustrate that far from being straightforward these relationships are characterised by nuances, ambiguities, omissions and contradictions. Furthermore, by approaching the different aspects of these relationships through a range of disciplines, the volume hopes to bridge traditional disciplinary boundaries and create a discursive space for dialogue in order to understand, interpret and theorise this relationship from both diachronic and synchronic approaches.

Defining the Contours of the Relationships

Mainstream historiography of the late Ottoman period has conceptualised the relationship between Greeks and Turks in two ways: on the one hand, it has produced accounts of what Fortna (2013, 6) aptly refers to as ‘an overly idealized Ottoman pluralistic past’. This rather romantic view of the past has constructed the relationship between peoples of different linguistic, religious and cultural traditions as unproblematically coexisting side by side.[[10]](#footnote-10) On the other hand, it has examined the relationship through the lens of nationalism; that is, the emergence of national consciousness and the subsequent creation of nation-states by the non-Muslim subjects in former Ottoman lands. The latter approach has failed to take into account the fluidity of identities and boundary demarcation in the period of transition from empire to nation (see Fortna 2013 for further discussion). Moreover, as the chapters by Ozil and Poulos demonstrate, it has paid limited attention to spaces of contact, such as the social spaces created through the active participation of non-Muslims in the Ottoman state (for example in the administration of educational institutions) and society more generally (for example in musical production) from the mid-19th century onwards (cf. Keyder 1997).

Indeed, ethnographic accounts drawing on archival sources and interviews with refugees collected after the 1923 population exchange have brought the spaces of contact during the late Ottoman period to the centre stage of academic inquiry by foregrounding the shared everyday experience of living in a linguistically, culturally and ethnically rich society, ‘a mode of living’ which Doumanis (2013, 1) refers to as ‘intercommunality’ as well as the complexities, tensions and ambiguities of coexistence.[[11]](#footnote-11) Doumanis (2013, 1) defines ‘intercommunality’ as

 the accommodation of difference between ethnic, cultural and religious communities that happened to occupy the same street, neighbourhood, village or rural environ [*sic*]. These living arrangements were conducted in a spirit of neighbourliness, and underscored by routine practices, social bonds, and shared values.

These spaces of contact and the beliefs and practices they entailed were disrupted with the 1923 population exchange and the transition from the Ottoman Empire to a modern nation-state. In her introduction to the edited collection on the appraisal of the 1923 population exchange, Hirschon (2004, 10) argues that the ‘unmixing of peoples’ had serious long-term effects on the way the relationship between Greeks and Turks was conceived and experienced thereafter:

 Through time, the process of separation rather than symbiosis inevitably entails diminished contact. The loss of shared experience is accompanied by growing ignorance of the ways of the others; thus, separation entails the loss of ground for communication. What is lost is familiarity which carries with it the possibility for understanding and respect, and this is all too often replaced with suspicion, hostility and the inability to cooperate. At the socio-psychological level a process of projecting negative stereotypes onto the ‘other’ exacerbates the collective alienation (cf. Hirschon 2009).

In effect, as ‘diminished contact’ shaped the worldviews of Greeks and Turks post-1923, so did it shape much of the mainstream scholarly research until the 1990s, thereby constructing the relationship primarily as a troubled one; a relationship that was often reduced to defining one side in opposition to the other and where the focus was on moments of tension and hostility and the foregrounding, circulation and consumption of stereotypical representations and beliefs (cf. the chapter by Millas).[[12]](#footnote-12) Since the 1990s there has been a visible and comprehensive contestation of dominant discourses of ‘Turkishness’ and ‘Greekness’ on both sides of the Aegean with the purpose of explaining the dynamics of their changing societies (cf. the chapters by Yanardağoğlu (Chapter 12) and by Dragonas and Frangoudaki (Chapter 14)).[[13]](#footnote-13) While dominant discourses and representations continue to have currency, the critical appraisal of national identity politics has also had an impact on the way the relationship between Greeks and Turks has been framed and interpreted. This critical turn has been reflexively linked with the process of rapprochement between Turkey and Greece in early 1999 when the governments of the two countries came to recognise that ‘in the contemporary international environment a policy of cooperation is far more advantageous than continued confrontation’ (Ker-Lindsay 2000, 216). The earthquakes that struck both countries (in August and September the same year) played an important role at the time in altering public opinion and creating a positive environment for policy implementation (Ker-Lindsay 2000, 216). As a result, this critical turn opened up hitherto limited spaces of contact for the development of dialogue both in the academy (within and across disciplines)[[14]](#footnote-14) and in society at large.

In this context, scholarly research on both sides of the Aegean has revealed an asymmetrical engagement: while Turkey has had a central position in academic representations and public and private discourses in Greece, a parallel focus on Greece in Turkey has been less pronounced (cf. Theodossopoulos 2007b, Özkırımlı and Sofos 2008). Although since 2000 there has been a notable increase of interest about Greece in Turkey, particularly in the field of minority studies (as the chapters by Ozil (Chapter 13) and Yanardağoğlu illustrate), this has not radically shifted the peripheral position of Greece in the academic and public spheres. On the contrary, it may be argued that Turkey’s growing economic power and rise to the status of a regional power in the Middle East have contributed to shifting interest further away from Greece. In Greece, the opposite process seems to be in operation. Academic and public interest in Turkey has ‘boomed’, the latter mediated, for instance, through the consumption of (popular) culture products (see Bayraktaroğlu and Sifianou 2012, also the chapters by Poulos (Chapter 4) and Mackridge (Chapter 8)).[[15]](#footnote-15)

A radical process of separation also occurred in Cyprus in 1974. In the aftermath of the Athens-backed military coup against the Makarios administration and the subsequent Turkish invasion (officially known in Turkey as the Cyprus Peace Operation), 160,000 Greek Cypriots and over 40,000 Turkish Cypriots were forcibly displaced from their homes in the north and the south respectively, culminating in the geographical, ethnic and political division of the island (see the chapter by Ker-Lindsay).[[16]](#footnote-16) The unilateral declaration of independence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in 1983, successive failed UN reunification initiatives, including the 2004 comprehensive reunification plan, which was accepted by two-thirds of Turkish Cypriots but rejected by three-quarters of Greek Cypriots, and the subsequent EU accession of the Greek Cypriot controlled Republic of Cyprus have further consolidated the division of the island.

Against this backdrop, as Loizos (2007, 178–9) points out, bi-communal initiatives, though mostly small scale, have been instrumental in constructing spaces of contact, that is, ‘creating contexts in which Turkish and Greek Cypriots can communicate more freely with each other than they normally could do in the divided island during the years 1964 to 2003’, thereby contributing to processes of rapprochement. Loizos (2007, 183–4) further outlines a series of changes in the political, educational and communications arenas (such as increased access to tertiary education and the establishment of new media outlets) which took place in the 1990s and culminated in the relaxation of the restrictions on movement from north to south and *vice versa* in 2003. These changes and the new spaces of contact they opened up have the potential to question nationalist discourses and stereotypes between Turkish and Greek Cypriots and renegotiate individual and collective identities (cf. Demetriou 2007). Nevertheless, such renegotiations may be fraught with tensions and ambiguities, as the chapter by Charalambous on the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language to Greek Cypriot secondary school pupils reveals.

Intersecting Themes and Perspectives

The framework builds on the four interrelated levels outlined in the previous section, namely the personal, the communal, the national and the transnational. The aim is twofold: firstly, to illustrate the connectivity among these different levels and the importance of examining them together rather than in isolation and, secondly, to demonstrate how these levels of analysis come together in different nexuses and are interpreted by different disciplinary approaches.

The Personal

‘The personal’ is at the heart of ‘who people are to each other’, that is, to their identities (Benwell and Stokoe 2006, 6). Many contemporary theories of identity are premised on an understanding of identity as fixed, bounded and private, as a property one has or does not have. In this sense, identity is defined as ‘an “essential”, cognitive, socialized, phenomenological or psychic phenomenon that governs human action’ (Benwell and Stokoe 2006, 3). This understanding of identity contrasts with a broadly ‘social constructionist’ reading of identity as

 a public phenomenon, a performance or construction that is interpreted by other people. This construction takes place in discourse and other social and embodied conduct, such as how we move, where we are, what we wear, how we talk and so on (Benwell and Stokoe 2006, 4).

Central to this conceptualisation of identity is that identities are constructed relationally through systems of opposition as social actors categorise themselves and others in various ways depending on context and participants (Lo and Reyes 2004, 118). However, these systems of opposition may not have the same salience for both parties involved and their foci and meanings may shift over time.

Several of the contributors address the issue of identity in ‘different *context[s] of construction*: the different discursive environments in which *identity work* is being done’ (Benwell and Stokoe 2006, 5, emphases in the original). Millas illustrates how through a process of critical self-reflection he guided his university students in Turkey and Greece to identify, interrogate and ultimately challenge hegemonic representations of national identity defined by essentialist discourses of language, culture, ethnicity and religion, circulating in institutional and everyday contexts. The chapters by Demetriou and Charalambous provide nuanced accounts of how identities are ascribed, disputed, resisted and negotiated in narrative (stories told in interviews) and in classroom exchanges between teacher and pupils respectively. At the same time, they reveal how social actors ‘persist in seeking essentialised groundings for the selves they encounter and the selves they offer’ (Howard 2000, 383). Demetriou illustrates how narrators construct ‘a hierarchy of differentiation’ (Lo and Reyes 2004, 119) through the telling of stories of conflict and war in Cyprus: depending on their biographies, narrators situate, evaluate and interpret their experiences of loss of property, life and bodily integrity and those of others in strikingly different ways. Charalambous brings to the fore the tensions, omissions and silences in processes of ‘othering’ in Turkish as a foreign language class in a Greek Cypriot secondary school. A common concern of all three chapters is the juxtaposition between the positionings of the self vis-à-vis the nationalist rhetoric. The chapter by Poulos extends the discussion on identity construction by shifting our gaze to a discursive environment that has received scant attention, namely the realm of music production in which the author eloquently situates the emergence and development of the musical category of the ‘*Rum* Composers of Istanbul’.

The Communal

Similar to the identity of the individual, ‘community’ expresses ‘a relational idea’. It suggests that

 the members of a group of people (a) have something in common with each other, which (b) distinguishes them in significant way from the members of other putative groups. ‘Community’ thus seems to imply simultaneously both similarity and difference (Cohen 1985, 12).

Communities can be national, regional or administrative; they may represent linguistic, cultural or religious groups; and due to the impact of the new information and communication technologies and globalisation, communities are increasingly virtual and transnational. In this respect, a focus on community inevitably calls for an investigation of boundaries and the processes of boundary demarcation where the terms ‘we/us’ are contrastively defined in relation to ‘others’. Post-structuralist and post-modernist approaches to community have emphasised the situated social construction of communities and the articulation of identities in communities. In his critical investigation of language and community, Rampton (2000, 12) argues that

 randomness and disorder have however become much more important in recent social theory, where instead of trying to define the core features of any social group or institution, there is major interest in the flows of people, knowledge, texts and objects across social and geographical space, in the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, and in fragmentation, indeterminacy and ambivalence.

The social construction of community and boundaries of inclusion and exclusion permeate the chapters of this volume. A salient approach in illuminating these concepts is by seeking to capture the members’ experience of them. In Chapter 1, Hirschon presents the recollections of refugees of the 1923 Population Exchange and their descendants. At one point, the elderly Filio Haidemenou concludes a poignant retelling of her visit to Turkey many years later in the following words: ‘the people did not have problems between them’. By collapsing ethnic, linguistic, cultural and religious boundaries, the narrator seeks to stress the common humanity, shared experience and way of life *between* the two communities, disrupted by the population exchange. At another instance, Hirschon illustrates how refugees transported regional stereotypes from the former homeland to transform space into place in their newly established neighbourhoods in the urban settlement of Kokkinia, in Greece: for instance, ‘Ai Nikola was said to be the “aristocratic neighbourhood”, because its residents were from Constantinople, and therefore somewhat superior’. Far from representing themselves as a homogeneous, bounded refugee community, narrators highlight the heterogeneity as well as the regional and social fragmentation *within* the community.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Another approach focuses on the social construction of community and boundary demarcation in text production (for example novels, history textbooks, historiography, cartoons). Lemos, in Chapter 9, illustrates how two novels inspired by the Greco-Turkish war (1919–22) and its aftermath, namely *Yaban* (The Outsider) by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu and *Το Νούμερο 31328* (Number 31328) by Elias Venezis, draw on recurring themes (such as the suffering of innocent Anatolian inhabitants at the hands of the invading Greeks or the vengeful Turks respectively) to foreground lines of ethnic, social, political and ideological differentiation between and within communities. Mackridge, in Chapter 8, introduces yet another kind of community: the linguistic communities of Greek and Turkish speakers and the ‘leaky’ boundaries between the two languages in contact. Drawing on a range of genres, Mackridge explores Turkish loan works that have traversed the linguistic boundary and have been incorporated into Greek, their multifarious meanings and competing associations and social values.

The National

‘Primordialist’ accounts of nations are premised on the ‘givenness of ethnic and national ties’ (Özkırımlı 2000, 75). In this one language – one culture – one nation-state paradigm, each individual ‘belongs’ to a particular nation and ethnic identity is understood as fixed and stable over time and space. Critiques of ‘primordialist’ theories have highlighted the ‘element of artefact, invention and social engineering which enters into the making of nations. Nations do not make states but the other way round’ (Hobsbawm 1990, 10). Rather than being the product of pre-existing ethnicities, nations are now thought to be socially constructed in the context of modernity. Notwithstanding, as Özkırımlı and Sofos (2008, 10) remind us in their introduction to the comparative study of Greek and Turkish nationalisms:

 nationalism selects, reconfigures, and sometimes recreates older traditions and identities in accordance with present concerns. Sometimes the choices of nationalists may not be the product of conscious political design, but of various contingencies.

Several chapters illustrate how ‘primordialist’ theories have infused official narratives in Greece, Turkey and Cyprus.[[18]](#footnote-18) These narratives represent ‘the “Greek” or the “Turkish” nation as the reincarnation of a perennial “Greek” or “Turkish” essence, which managed to preserve its character intact despite vicissitudes of history’ (Özkırımlı and Sofos 2008, 6). Regardless of the enduring legacy of these grand narratives and their reproduction in the public and private spheres, in recent years these long-cherished narratives have begun to be challenged. In the field of education for instance, top-down educational policies conceived to promote intercultural understanding in Cyprus and to reform minority education in Western Thrace have sought to question and transform hegemonic societal and popular representations, albeit not without contestations, tensions and ambivalences (see the chapters by Charalambous and by Dragonas and Frangoudaki respectively).

Not surprisingly, the populations exempted from the 1923 exchange did not fit each nation’s essentialist identity formulations and from the onset they were perceived as a threat to their homogeneity. Even though their minority rights were ostensibly protected by an international treaty, state policies, institutional practices and discriminatory measures effectively contributed to their marginalisation and silencing in both countries.[[19]](#footnote-19) The chapters in the last section of this book critically assess some of the obstacles minorities have faced in exercising their rights: the administrative and legal lacuna in the management of non-Muslim educational institutions (Ozil); the Patriachate’s on-going battle for the official recognition of its legal status and ecumenical character, its right to own and maintain property, to train its clergy and offer religious education (Kamouzis); freedom of opinion and expression in the minority press (Yanardağoğlu); social and educational inequality between majority and minority members (Dragonas and Frangoudaki). Özkırımlı and Sofos (2008, 178) succinctly sum up how the two opposing nationalisms have shaped the minority experience in both countries as follows:

Despite their putative differences and the alleged superiority of each of the two nationalisms over the other, the undercurrent of violence, symbolic and material, seems to have been the common denominator.

The Transnational

International actors, supranational organisations and not-for-profit organisations have been instrumental in shaping bilateral relations between Greece and Turkey and have had an enduring presence in past and present initiatives to end the long-standing division on the island of Cyprus. For instance, Kamouzis contextualises the discussion of current and on-going efforts to provide solutions to the problems of the Patriarchate in the context of official European and American pressure on Turkey to promote reforms for the improvement of the conditions of its non-Muslim minorities. In a similar vein, Ker-Lindsay situates the historical overview of the Cyprus issue in successive UN initiatives for a permanent solution. Moreover, the minorities in both countries have sought solutions to their own problems by increasingly internationalising discriminatory state policies against them, thereby undermining the monopoly of the nation-state (further discussed in the chapters by Kamouzis and Yanardağoğlu).

The authority of the nation-state has been further challenged due to processes of globalisation and the impact of new information and communication technologies. Many public spaces, such as the media, education and the political arena have become progressively more globalised. Migration flows have enhanced cultural diversity and hybridity and minorities have shifted their discourse of recognition from an emphasis on constitutional rights to human rights. A case in point are the novel possibilities new information and communication technologies open up for minority media and minority education, as elaborated by Yanardağoğlu and Dragonas and Frangoudaki respectively. The recent establishment of the on-line radio, *Ihos-tis-Polis*, and the publishing house *Istos* in Istanbul reveals a new willingness on the part of the minority community on the one hand to reach out to a wider audience beyond the national borders of Turkey and on the other hand to participate actively in the development of democratisation and transparency in Turkish civic society. By the same token, in Greece, new technologies have provided a powerful pedagogic and transformative tool in Western Thrace and have contributed to improving minority children’s formal and informal learning environments and increasing their visibility and audibility in mainstream Greek society more generally.

About this Book

The 14 chapters that follow investigate the relationship between Greeks and Turks, as well as between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots from the perspective of a variety of academic disciplines. The contributors deploy diverse epistemological traditions and methodological perspectives to illuminate the relationship. Several chapters adopt a diachronic approach and chart the continuities, ruptures and transformations. In this respect, some authors take 1923 and the transition from empire to republic as their point of departure while others examine the relationship from the late-Ottoman period onwards. A number of chapters aim to provide snapshots by focusing on particular historical periods or on the here-and-now. Several contributors approach the relationship through a comparative perspective and in the process revisit the role of well-established social actors and highlight that of less studied ones. Overall, the chapters present fresh, up-to-date insights into the relationship and share a critical perspective.

The book is organised in three sections which broadly reflect over-arching themes emerging from the chapters, although inevitably some themes cut across sections. ‘Rethinking Remembrance and Representation’ opens with two chapters exploring memory and loss from an anthropological standpoint. Renée Hirschon questions how the interaction between history, memory and emotion has shaped the relationship between Greeks and Turks, particularly with regard to the individual and collective articulation of national imaginings. Taking as a point of entry the long-term effects of the compulsory exchange of populations stipulated by the Lausanne Convention (1923), the author weaves insights from her own extensive research over four decades as well as the work of others to foreground the importance of the subjective experience. In so doing, she explores the individual and social construction of memory, characterised by the privileging of particular narratives over others, omissions and silences.

Olga Demetriou’s discussion of memory and loss complements and extends the previous chapter in at least two ways. First, it recognises the concept of loss, a concept which has rarely been attended to, as a key analytical category in its own right for the investigation of the Greek-Turkish encounter in Cyprus. A focus on loss allows the author to attend to individuals’ varied responses to loss as a result of refugeehood as well as to the nuances and contradictions expressed in their narratives: for instance, on the one hand individuals’ narratives of loss may support and reproduce constructions of loss in the national narrative and on the other hand they may be at odds with and undermine them. Second, the explorations of loss discussed in this chapter move beyond the ethnically determined binary categories of ‘Greek Cypriot’ and ‘Turkish Cypriot’ to foreground the narratives of loss of members of the ‘Greek Cypriot community’ who are ethnically identifiable as ‘Greek Cypriot’, ‘Armenians’, ‘Maronites’ and ‘Latins’ and whose diverse experiences of loss as a consequence of the inter-ethnic conflict have generally been discounted.

The next two chapters examine issues of representation and social categorisation. In a reflexive account of his own teaching practices with his students in Turkish and Greek universities, Hercules Millas explains the process by which he sought to alert his students to the mechanisms of reproduction of national stereotypes of self and other. The critical and comparative examination of the writing of history school textbooks, national historiographies, novels and memoirs was deployed to develop what Millas calls his students’ ‘self-knowledge’ which he sums up as ‘a sense of doubt vis-à-vis national explanations and empathy for the hitherto misinterpreted ‘other’”. Central to the author’s argument is the interaction between private and public, individual and collective representations in shaping the national categories of ‘Greek’ and ‘Turk’.

Taking as a point of departure the musical ensemble *Bosphorus*, a collaboration between Greek and Turkish musicians, who sought to introduce the Ottoman musical tradition to Greek audiences in the late 1980s, Panagiotis Poulos traces the emergence and construction of a distinct musical category, that of the ‘*Rum* Composers of Istanbul’. The author argues that the genesis of this musical category out of the shared musical traditions of late-Ottoman Istanbul needs to be situated in the broader project of modernity, which transformed the non-Muslim musicians of Istanbul into ‘musical “minorities”’ and altered the way this music was hitherto experienced at a sensory level.

The first three of these chapters of ‘The Politics of Identity, Language and Culture’ cluster around Cyprus, with James Ker-Lindsay’s contribution functioning as a framing chapter. Written from an international relations perspective, the chapter features a historical account of the Cyprus issue and the different initiatives that have been proposed to solve it, as well as the main points of contention up to the present. It illustrates why a solution to the Cyprus issue ‘still matters’ and why any attempt to understand, interpret and ultimately solve the Cyprus issue needs to attend to the complex interrelationship among all the actors concerned, the Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Greece, Turkey, the European Union and the United Nations.

The next two chapters consider the interplay of language, nationalism and identity in the field of education. Through the comparative investigation of Turkish and Greek Cypriot history schoolbooks, Yiannis Papadakis studies the ideological positions that have shaped the ways the history of Cyprus is represented. Just like the history textbooks of Greece and Turkey discussed by Millas and by Hirschon, Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot schoolbooks have represented the history of Cyprus through the lens of ethnic nationalism subscribing to a Hellenocentric and a Turkocentric paradigm respectively. Papadakis’ analysis illustrates how the short-lived 2005 history textbooks produced by the Turkish Cypriot Left temporarily challenged these hegemonic discourses, affecting a shift to a Cyprus-centred paradigm, which prioritised the narrative of a shared ‘motherland’ for both Turkish and Greek Cypriots.

While Papadakis’ chapter approaches education from the perspective of the different discourses in history schoolbooks, that by Constandina Charalambous focuses on the teacher and pupils’ linguistic practices and negotiations of dominant representations of ‘us’ and the ethnic ‘other’ or the ‘enemy’ during Turkish-language classes in a Greek Cypriot secondary school. Charalambous sets out to explore how the teacher and pupils grappled with two conflicting ideological positions: on the one hand, the reconciliatory rhetoric which predicated the introduction of the Turkish-language classes and on the other hand the nationalist educational discourses that permeate Greek Cypriot education. Focusing on the teacher’s perspective, the author illustrates how the teacher sought to adopt a ‘neutral’ stance by emphasising the teaching of the target language in terms of grammar and vocabulary and by refraining from the teaching of the target culture and directly referring to the Turks and Turkish Cypriots.

The next chapter, by Peter Mackridge combines a close analysis of linguistic features from Turkish in the Greek language across a variety of genres (for example memoirs, dictionaries, jokes, oral conversation, cartoons, newspaper headlines) with their reception. The author describes these linguistic features as a source of stylistic richness in the Greek language and identifies two contradictory attitudes towards their reception. On the one hand, words of Turkish origin are construed as shameful remnants of the country’s Ottoman past, elements that are alien to dominant representations of the national ‘self’ and, therefore, must be erased while on the other hand, they are imbued with emotional resonances and positive associations of familiarity, informality and intimacy, making them an enduring feature of the Greek language.

The final chapter in this section by Natasha Lemos turns to the comparative investigation of early literary works dealing with the Greco-Turkish War (1919–22) and its aftermath. Focusing on two canonical works of this genre, *Το Νούμερο 31328* (Number 31328) by Elias Venezis and *Yaban* (The Outsider) by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Lemos examines the features of the narratives that have made them popular in their own country but little known in the other. In particular, her analysis concentrates on how the two authors represent the image of the self, a topic that has received far less attention than the image of the ‘other’, where the self is constructed as the victim of war atrocities perpetrated by the ‘other’ in quite divergent narratives of the same historical events. As Lemos points out, the enduring popularity of these novels in their home countries is related to the fact that they go beyond straightforward narrations of past events at the time of the war and its aftermath to address social issues relevant to the time of their writing.

The last ‘Discourses of Inclusion and Exclusion Revisited’ opens with Konstantinos Tsitselikis’ contribution introducing the historical and ideological background for the discussion of majority-minority relations between Greece and Turkey and the failure of both countries to incorporate their minorities in the national imaginary. The author focuses on the Lausanne Convention and the subsequent exchange of populations as a cardinal moment in the process of linguistic, cultural, ethnic and religious homogenisation of the two nation-states and the subsequent minoritisation of the segment of their respective societies that was exempted. Tsitselikis traces academic and public discourses on the population exchange from a diachronic perspective: from early critiques by scholars of international law and the reproduction of dominant Hellenocentric and Turkocentric paradigms, through mainstream historiography to the emergence of an ideological and representational shift since the early 2000s through critical, interdisciplinary and comparative approaches.

The next three chapters deal with the Greek-Orthodox (*Rum*)minority of Istanbul in relation to three key minority institutions: the Church, the media and schools in Turkey in diachronic perspective. Dimitris Kamouzis’ chapter features a detailed historical account of the official positions and unofficial negotiations between the Greek and Turkish governments and the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the context of the 1924 patriarchal election and the subsequent expulsion of Patriarch Constantine VI. The author assesses the continued resonance of these events on the tripartite relationship among Greece, Turkey and the Ecumenical Patriarchate vis-à-vis the patriarchal issue today, namely the official and definitive recognition of the Patriarchate’s legal and ecumenical status and the concomitant ability of its religious and cultural institutions to function unhindered, as well as the role of international actors, such as the EU and the USA.

Eylem Yanardağoğlu offers a critical analysis of the development, decline and transformation of the Greek-Orthodox minority media from 1923 until today. The author illustrates the constitutive relationship between domestic policies and international conditions in the shifting trajectories of minority media in Turkey and how key minority media practitioners and community representatives have responded to them over time. In addition, the chapter examines recent changes in the Greek-Orthodox minority media, notably the establishment of a new publishing house, an on-line newspaper edition and radio station, which Yanardağoğlu situates at the intersection of two on-going and complementary processes: on the one hand, an ‘opening up’ in Turkey with regard to ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities and on the other hand, the active engagement of the minority community itself with civic society after a long period of self- and state-imposed silence.

The chapter by Ayşe Ozil investigates the legal and administrative framework, which has governed the functioning of Greek-Orthodox minority educational institutions in Turkey. The author argues that this framework is characterised by fundamental discrepancies, omissions and ambiguities and short-term solutions, which have determined the administrative and legal status of these institutions from the late Ottoman period when the current school system was conceived until the present day. Defined as ‘private’ institutions under Turkish law but largely understood as ‘communal’ institutions by the members of the Greek-Orthodox minority, the schools have been severely limited in the application of the minority’s legal rights in the field of education.

The final chapter in this section and the book in general shifts our attention to majority-minority relations on the other side of the border, in Western Thrace in Greece. Similar to the previous chapter, it continues on the topic of education, a topic central in the negotiation of majority-minority relations as the educational field is a prime site for the maintenance and reinforcement of a minority’s linguistic, cultural and identificational resources and the protection of its rights. In this context, Thalia Dragonas and Anna Frangoudaki present an overview of a 15-year intervention (1997–2013) entitled ‘The project for the reform of the education of Muslim minority children’. The aim of the project has been the comprehensive overhaul of minority education within and beyond the classroom setting through the development of innovative pedagogic practices and methodologies as well as new materials for the teaching and learning of Greek as a second language combined with extensive teacher training and work with the minority community. The quantitative and qualitative changes that have resulted from the implementation of the project have sought to empower the social actors involved (minority pupils, parents, teachers and other community members), combat chronic school underachievement and reverse the structural inequalities minority children face at school and in Greek society more generally. These positive changes attest to the on-going process of transformation of Thracian society in general and minority education in particular.

To conclude, the chapters in this edited collection seek to illuminate aspects of the relationship between Greeks and Turks, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots since 1923. Inevitably, certain aspects of the relationship are examined in more depth than others (such as the centrality of the subjective and agentive dimension of the relationship, the interanimation of local and global processes, practices and discourses). There is no doubt that much more can be said on the subject. Three aspects of the relationship that can provide valuable areas for future explorations are, firstly, the heterogeneity of the minority experience in terms of language, culture, social class, religious and political affiliation and education, secondly, the flows of people and ideas beyond the national borders of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus and the new encounters these flows have effected in transnational contexts and, thirdly, the examination of contact encounters in virtual communities and networks.
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1. In the early days of the conflict, the war was referred to as the ‘National Struggle’ (*Millî Mücadele*) by the Turkish side. It was waged against the Allied Forces who had occupied Turkey following the defeat of the Central Powers, including the Ottoman Empire in World War I. The Greco-Turkish war was part of this broader conflict. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Hirschon (2004, 4–5) adds that continuous armed conflict in the region from the Balkan Wars (1912–13) onwards had caused the forced displacement of Muslims and Christians alike well before the compulsory population exchange of 1923. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Fortna (2013, 5) explains that it is only after the establishment of the Turkish Republic that the notion of ‘“nation” as ethnically, linguistically and culturally understood’ becomes clearly articulated. It is during that period when the notion of *millet*, understood as ‘a community defined on the basis of common religion’ that previously encompassed other Muslim groups, such as Kurds, Albanians and Circassians, ‘underwent a semantic metamorphosis so as to become coterminous with the “nation”’. See also Aktar (2004) and Özkırımlı and Sofos (2008) for further discussion of the transformation of Turkish nationalism. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For a critical assessment of the Lausanne Convention and its effect on minorities, see the chapter by Tsitselikis, also Alexandris (2004), Oran (2004), Yagcioglu (2010) and Akgönül (2008), among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Article 1 of the Convention refers to ‘the compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox religion and Greek nationals of the Muslim religion’. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Article 2 further stipulated that only those Greek inhabitants established before 30 October 1918 in the Prefecture of the City of Constantinople were to be exempted. In the Treaty of Peace, the Greek Orthodox inhabitants of Imbros (*Gökçeada*) and Tenedos (*Bozcaada*), two islands near the Dardanelles straits, were also exempted. It is worth noting that the issue of naming, that is, the social categories deployed for the respective minorities, is a complex and highly contentious one. Demetriou (2013), for instance, identifies naming as one of the three pillars around which the Greek state constructed its minority policy, the other two being genealogy (and the understanding of ‘race’) and the concept of ‘state care’ which determined the management of resources made available to the minority. For further discussion, see Alexandris (2004), Oran (2004), Örs (2007) and Lytra (2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See, for instance, Ozil and Yanardağoğlu’s diachronic accounts of Greek Orthodox schools and media in Istanbul respectively and the chapter by Dragonas and Frangoudaki on minority education in Western Thrace. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. A case in point is that for the Turks the Greeks are not the most significant national ‘other’. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. For further discussion, see Kızılyürek (1999), Yildirim (2006), Özkırımlı and Sofos (2008) and Hatay and Papadakis (2012). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
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11. See Apostolopoulos (1980), Kitromilidis and Mourelos (1982), Hirschon ([1989]1998) and this volume. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. It is important to point out that within the context of this relationship, commonly perceived as troubled, there have been periods of rapprochement in bilateral relations, such as the period 1930–54 (Oran 2004). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
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15. I thank Bengisu Rona and Yorgos Dedes for drawing my attention to these on-going divergent processes. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Note that between 1964 and 1974 bi-communal relations on the island had been affected by hostilities between the nationalists on both sides, making contact between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots difficult (Loizos 2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Cf. Hirschon (1999, 2009). For further evidence of the social construction of community and boundaries from the members’ perspectives as well as the tensions involved, see the chapters by Yanardağoğlu, Demetriou and Charalambous. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. For instance, the discussion of mainstream historiography on the population exchange in the chapter by Tsitselikis and of history books in the chapters by Millas, Papadakis and Hirschon. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. For further discussion, see Özkırımlı and Sofos (2008), also Hirschon (2004), Akgönül (2008). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)