

THE POLITICIZATION OF MEMORY BETWEEN PAST, PRESENT, AND
FUTURE: GENERATIONAL REMEMBERING AMONG TURKISH CYPRIOT
FAMILIES

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

BY

BEYZA HATUN KIZILTEPE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

SEPTEMBER 2020

Approval of the thesis:

**THE POLITICIZATION OF MEMORY BETWEEN PAST, PRESENT, AND
FUTURE: GENERATIONAL REMEMBERING AMONG TURKISH
CYPRIOT FAMILIES**

submitted by **BEYZA HATUN KIZILTEPE** in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of **Master of Science in Political Science and Public Administration,**
the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Ayşe AYATA
Head of Department
Political Science and Public Administration

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömür BİRLER
Supervisor
Political Science and Public Administration

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Necmi ERDOĞAN (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Political Science and Public Administration

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömür BİRLER (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Political Science and Public Administration

Assist. Prof. Dr. Umut BOZKURT
Eastern Mediterranean University
Political Science and International Relations



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

Name, Last Name: Beyza Hatun KIZILTEPE

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE POLITICIZATION OF MEMORY BETWEEN PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE: GENERATIONAL REMEMBERING AMONG TURKISH CYPRIOT FAMILIES

KIZILTEPE, Beyza Hatun

M.S., The Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömür BİRLER

September 2020, 182 pages

This thesis attempts to understand how three different generations of Turkish Cypriot families remember the past ethnic conflict between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots and make sense of their experiences of ethnic conflict in terms of politicization of memory. Following this question, one objective of this thesis is to understand, interpret, and analyze the differences and similarities upon their narratives, what is meaningful or relevant to them to mention about the past, and how they experience the influence of the ethnic conflict in their everyday lives. Another is revealing the meanings that respondents give to the past, present, and future of the island with regard to ethnic conflict, and how power relations work in terms of memory, even in the smallest detail in society.

Keywords: Memory, Politicization of Memory, Generational Remembering, Turkish Cypriots, Cyprus Conflict

ÖZ

GEÇMİŞ, ŞİMDİ, VE GELECEK ARASINDA HAFIZANIN POLİTİKLEŞMESİ: KIBRISLI TÜRK AİLELER ARASINDA KUŞAKSAL HATIRLAMA

KIZILTEPE, Beyza Hatun

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömür Birler

Eylül 2020, 182 sayfa

Bu tez, Kıbrıslı Türk ailelerinin üç farklı kuşağının Kıbrıslı Türkler ve Kıbrıslı Rumlar arasında geçmişte yaşanmış etnik çatışmaları nasıl hatırladıklarını ve hafızanın politikleşmesi açısından kendi gündelik hayatlarındaki etnik çatışma deneyimlerini nasıl anlamlandırdıklarını anlamaya çalışmaktadır. Bu soruyu takiben, bu tezin bir amacı, üç ayrı kuşağa mensup aile üyelerinin anlatıları üzerindeki farklılıkları ve benzerlikleri görmek, geçmişle ilgili olarak bahsetmek için anlamlı gördükleri şeyleri ve olayları saptamak, ve etnik çatışmaların etkilerini gündelik hayatlarında nasıl tecrübelediklerini anlamak, yorumlamak ve analiz etmektir. Bir diğer amacı ise, katılımcıların etnik çatışma açısından adanın geçmişine, bugününe ve geleceğine verdikleri anlamları, ve toplumdaki en küçük ayrıntıda bile güç ilişkilerinin hafıza açısından nasıl işlediğini ortaya koymaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hafıza, Hafızanın Politikleşmesi, Kuşaksal Hatırlama, Kıbrıslı Türkler, Kıbrıs Sorunu

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömür Birler, whom I model as an academician and human. It would not be an exaggeration to say that I could not complete this thesis without her will to listen her students' ideas, guidance, support, encouragement, and patience. There is no word to express my gratitude for her.

I am thankful to Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan for helping me to see the common grounds of political science and sociology thanks to the lessons I took from him during my graduate education. I would also like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Umut Bozkurt for her critical, thought-provoking, and valuable comments and criticisms on the thesis.

I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu and Assist. Prof. Dr. Besim Can Zırh for their guidance and support during my undergraduate and graduate studies. Their love and enthusiasm for the science of sociology made me love social science and field research.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my dear friend and colleague Mehmet Ali Çelik, whom I always enjoyed talking about the art of social sciences and the life itself. Because meeting an introverted friend and colleague like myself who devotes his life to understanding what is happening in the world is not something that will always happen to a person. I would also like to thank Didem Karagence, Damla Sandal, Banu Özsar, Cansu Taşdemir, Dilara Günalp, and Emin Alp Bıyık for making my life more enjoyable and bearable with their friendship and the unique moments we spent together. And I am thankful for Erman Dolmacı, Ömür Ray, Salih Örses, and Yeliz Osman Cin for their support during my field research in Cyprus.

Finally, I must thank my mother, Ümmühan Çetin, and my brother Adilcan Kızıltepe for their love, support, and respect for me throughout my whole life and this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THEORETICAL DISCUSSION.....	4
2.1 On Historiography and Its Production	4
2.1.1 The Emergence of Memory Phenomenon as a New Perspective on Historiography	11
2.2 On Collective Memory	16
2.2.1 Review on Halbwachsian Tradition: Collective Memory	17
2.2.2 Approaches Emphasizing the Individual and Collective Dimensions of Memory.....	20
2.3 Politicization of Memory in Post-Conflict Societies.....	24
2.3.1 Politics of Memory: Presentist Approach on Collective Memory	26
2.3.2 Limits of the Presentist Approach.....	29
2.3.3 Extending the Limits of Presentist Approach: Popular Memory	32
2.3.4 Entangled Dynamics of Politicization of Memory	36
3. METHODOLOGY	40

3.1	Understanding Remembering through Qualitative Research	43
3.1.1	Preparation of the Interview Form.....	48
3.1.2	Sampling the People: Interviewees Participated in the Research.....	51
3.1.3	Notes on Field Research: Interview Process and Difficulties during Field Research.....	59
3.2	Analysis of Data.....	62
3.2.1	Thematic Analysis: Coding.....	64
3.2.2	Narrative Analysis.....	65
4.	BRIEF GLANCE AT CYPRUS' HISTORY OF CONFLICT	68
4.1	Ethnonationalisms in Cyprus.....	75
4.2	Politicization of Memory Revisited in Cyprus.....	84
5.	UNDERSTANDING THE FIELD RESEARCH	92
5.1	Generational Remembering: Between Individual and Collective Meaning Making through Memory	92
5.2	First Generation Turkish Cypriots: Remembering for the Nation	99
5.2.1	Remembering the Victimization of Turkish Cypriots while Representing Greek Cypriots as Unreliable Perpetrators.....	101
5.2.2	Remembering the Process: Transforming from Victims to Heroes.....	109
5.3	Remembering to Forget the Past and to Justify Their Belief in the Need to Live Separately in the Future.....	112
5.4	Second Generation Turkish Cypriots: Remembering Their Ruptured Lives and Losing Hope for the Future.....	115
5.4.1	Being in Limbo	118
5.4.2	Finding a Reference Point to Blame: Policies of Turkey after 1983.....	124
5.5	Third Generation Turkish Cypriots: Construction of the Post-Memory upon Anticipated Future.....	127

5.5.1	Between Family and Chosen Memory.....	128
5.5.2	Coming to Terms with the Past while Choosing the Anticipated Future as Reference Point of Remembering.....	135
6.	CONCLUSION	143
	REFERENCES.....	150
	APPENDICES	
A.	KIBRIS ARAŞTIRMASI SORULARI / CYPRUS RESEARCH QUESTIONS	161
B.	APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE	169
C.	TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	170
D.	THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU.....	182

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Social Demographic Profile of Interviewees	57
Table 3.2 Themes and Sub-themes of the Research	64



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The rising interest in memory phenomenon among social and political sciences has started in the 1960s within the discussions of historiography by setting the ground for new perspectives. However, despite their differences or the reactionary attitude of memory phenomenon against historiography of nation-states or meta-narratives of history, memory and history also have some common grounds to worth mentioned. They are both mnemonic practices, use the past as raw material throughout their curiosity about it, simultaneously influence each other, and effective in regard of social and political. To be more precise, remembering the past or writing about it from above or below might have a familiar disposition in terms of its method by using past and historiography as its political tool to legitimize its interpretations about the past, present, and the future of the society. From this, politics and power relations in memory first emerged as a reflexive and dualistic one to the official historiography, later extended its meaning as a hegemonic struggle not only from above and below, but also from the center and periphery like a spiral which touch upon all the entities of the society.

Following this, it can be said that the practice of contemplating and writing on the past is not stuck in written and intellectual space as a mental activity per se. Reflecting on the past is not just an intellectual activity, rather an action with social and political consequences. The past is always a contested site, and not only nation-states and majority and minority groups use it as a tool, but also every individual tends to use it as a political tool for their meaning-makings about the past, present, and future of society, especially in post-conflict societies.

This study focuses on the politicization of memory between past, present, and the future with a special focus on generational remembering between Turkish Cypriot families. The primary purpose of this thesis is to understand the dynamics of the politicization of remembering in Cyprus with a particular focus on memory narratives of three different generations of Turkish Cypriot families. In other words, it can be said that to understand how different generations of Turkish Cypriots families choose to remember the past, *what they think about the ethnic conflict in the past and what kind of future they want to see in Cyprus*, is the purpose of this thesis. By doing so, dynamics of the creation of their memory narratives and the principles of the selection of their memory narratives will be emphasized because it is believed that “by their very nature, the recreations of the past produced by memory are partial, unstable, often contested, and prone to becoming sites of struggle.”¹

Cyprus is a suitable “case” to explore questions related to the above-mentioned concerns because an unresolved state of conflict continues on the island of Cyprus since the 1950s. There are numerous memory narratives about the cause and resolution of ethnic conflict among Turkish Cypriots who are separated from Greek Cypriots by the border in Nicosia, which is still the last divided capital of Europe today. For example, individuals can reveal different narratives of the same past according to their political aspirations, generations, gender, etc. This thesis will try to understand how different generations of families who have spent their entire lives in Northern Cyprus and who have similar family structures and class positions prefer to remember the period of ethnic conflict and its aftermath retrospectively, and what kind of future they dream of in terms of the solution of the Cyprus problem. By doing so, it will be asserted that similarities and differences in memory narratives of different generations will make more visible the main promises of this thesis; the politicization of memory is a becoming process between past, present, and future, in which the entangled dynamics

¹ Nicolas Argenti and Katharina Schramm, “Introduction: Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission,” in *Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*, ed. Nicolas Argenti and Katharina Schramm (Berghahn Books, 2010), pp. 1-39, 2.

of remembering are embodied. Hence, this thesis will conceptualize this becoming process as the politicization of ordinary people's memories, especially in post-conflict societies, while using their subjective meaning-makings as their political tools to legitimize their memory narratives about the past, present, and the future of the island.



CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

The objective of this chapter is to seek the relationship between historiography, memory, and the politicization of memory. Following this, how politics and power relations work in terms of memory, even in the smallest detail in society, will be conceptualized. There will be two crucial points to be reached as a result of this theoretical discussion. First, even though it is the individual who remembers and her construction of meanings through memory can only come from her selective and intentional act which questions and judges the past, present, and future of society, remembering the past is not just an individual and power-free act.² Second, the politicization of memory is a becoming process where entangled dynamics of remembering are embodied in between individual and collective, subjective and structural, and social and political.

2.1 On Historiography and Its Production

In this chapter, different approaches to historiography will be demonstrated briefly. Then, the historical background of the emergence of memory phenomenon as a new approach to conventional historiography will be explained. Throughout this discussion, the first step of the politicization of remembering as an intentional and semipermeable act of memory will be highlighted by showing the fact that ordinary

² Barbara Misztal, "Memory and the Construction of Temporality, Meaning and Attachment," *Polish Sociological Review* 149 (2005): pp. 31-48, 46.

people's memories could also become one of the political sides of social forces on historiography.

One of the most contested issues about historiography is how history should be considered as an object of analysis. When asking the question of 'what history is' and starting to answer it, there are a few constitutive points to consider. These points depend upon how the one who asks this question interprets society, the world, social sciences, and her relationship with historical events.

E.H. Carr asserts that historical facts embodied as documents and manuscripts could seem to the historian as fishes on the fishing bench; historian collects them, brings them home, cooks them, and dishes them up as the way she thinks fit and proper.³ In other words, what transforms a historical event into a historical fact base upon this cooking.

Carr's simple but incisive metaphor could be seen as one of the most distinguished descriptions for the meaning of historiography for one specific reason. This description of history writing underlines the fact that historical facts could not speak on their own. What gives them a voice or, in other words, calls them to be heard is the person who works, writes, or reflects upon history. This person or people is the one who has the power to decide which historical events make an appearance on the stage of history as historical facts, in which order, function, and context. However, it is worth to underline that selective acts of individuals always in relation to structures, rather than being pure individual choices.

Indeed, an act of reflecting on history as an object of analysis is inevitably selective. In other words, historical facts are not created equally through the very mechanisms

³ Edward Hallett Carr, *What Is History?* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 3. *All translations from Turkish to English belongs to me.*

of any historiography⁴ because "any single event enters history with some of its constituting parts missing; something is always left out while something else is recorded."⁵ That is why this state of selectiveness oscillates between "what happened and that which is said to have happened."⁶

In sum, history consists of a fluid relationship among the sociohistorical process of what happened and one's chosen and structured knowledge of that process. In other words, an irreducible distinction and overlap between what happened and what is said to have happened.⁷

Contrary to this idea, positivists claim that historical facts are wholly separate and objective from any pursuit that has made history an object of analysis. In other words, they ignore the fine line between agency and structure and underscore that past is wholly separated from what is subjective. Carr explains why this old, self-assertive but persistent idea about being valid could not be acceptable in societal as follows; no document can express other than what the writer thinks. This situation consists of several meanings: These are what the author thinks that happened, what she thinks that could or should have happened, and what the author prefers those who read it to think about what she thinks.

Nevertheless, possibilities about what the author thinks could not be meaningful until she reflects upon the history and become one of the parts of historical production and production of historical facts.⁸ At this point, it is worth to mention that this process between author and historical production is a reciprocal one. Structures and collective

⁴ Michel Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 1st ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995), 49).

⁵ Ibid., 49.

⁶ Ibid., 2.

⁷ Ibid., 3.

⁸ Carr, *What Is History?*, 10.

pasts are also implicated in what the individual does and is, and the crucial thing is to dig into to what extent and how.⁹ As mentioned at the beginning of this section, this reciprocal relationship between agents and structures is also one of the points to consider when one asks the question of what historiography is.

In sum, positivists' claims on historiography are not valid in terms of its ignorance of two basic facts. First, a historian is a product, a subject, a representative of her era and society. Thus, her interpretations and meaning makings are in the interrelation of subjective and objective. Second, she is also one of the political sides of social forces on historiography that could change the course of history and the thoughts of human communities. In other words, the class, gender, race, and the geography to which she belongs determine the historian's relationship with the power in historiography. To put it differently, she does not always refer to what is lost in the face of the so-called transcendent of history; instead, she can play an active role in the historiography.

For this thesis, the aforementioned oscillation between what happened and which is said to have happened will be considered as the ground of historiography. While the facts of the matter or what happened refers to the sociohistorical processes, the narrative of those facts refers to that which is said to have happened.¹⁰ The only way for the past-*whathappened*- to exist or to have content is its dependency on the present-*that which is said to have happened*- because the past is a selected position, rather than something is inherently over there or here.¹¹ Consequently, the starting of one's projection upon historical facts coincides with the mutually inclusive and reciprocal

⁹ David Carr, *Time, Narrative, and History* (Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991), 116).

¹⁰ Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 2.

¹¹ Ibid., 15.

processing process of these two.¹² Therefore, it is a mutually inclusive embodiment of both the historical facts and any attempt to make history an object of analysis.

The features mentioned above of the relationship between historical events and any attempt to make history as an object of analysis are essential in terms of seeing how they relate to the concept of political and power relations, as well as clue us what the most inclusive definition of historiography might be. Herein, attitudes upon objectivity and subjectivity in historiography and formalization of historical events into facts should be underlined in detail.

Positivists assert that historical facts are implicitly objective because their realities are already immanent to them; there is an absolute distinction between history and its interpretation (what we write or say about it).¹³ Constructivists, on the other hand, claim that reality and truth are unpredictable because every interaction with historical facts is fictional. In the same way, any historical narrative could be seen as one fiction among others.¹⁴

While the positivists ignore the function of politics and power relations with its naïve epistemology, the constructivists deny the autonomy of the sociohistorical processes.¹⁵ However, if one wants to be one step closer to understanding the meaning of historiography, she should understand how it works beforehand. Its working goes beyond "the mechanically "realist" and naively "constructivist" extremes."¹⁶ Consequently, it is crucial to underscore the role of power in the production of history. Here, the words of M. R. Trouillot would be massively beneficial, so that worth

¹² Carr, *What Is History?*, 10

¹³ Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 4.

¹⁴ Ibid., 6.

¹⁵ Ibid., 6.

¹⁶ Ibid., 25.

mentioning at length to understand the meaning of historiography and power in its production.

Power is constitutive of history. Tracking power through various "moments" simply helps emphasize the fundamentally processual character of historical production, to insist that what history is matters less than how history works; that power itself works together with history; and that the historians' claimed political preferences have little influence on most of the actual practices of power...Power does not enter the story once and for all, but at different times and from different angles. It precedes the narrative proper, contributes to its creation and its interpretation. Thus, it remains pertinent even if we can imagine a scientific history, even if we relegate the historian's preferences and stakes to a separate, post-descriptive phase. In history, power begins at the source.¹⁷

Hence, it can be said that the practice of contemplating and writing on the past is not stuck in written and intellectual space as a mental activity per se. Reflecting on the past is not just an intellectual activity, rather an action with social and political consequences. In other words,

there exists historicity of history, implying the movement which links an interpretive practice to a social praxis. History thus vacillates between two poles. On the one hand, it refers to a practice, hence to reality; on the other, it is a closed discourse, a text that organizes and concludes a mode of intelligibility.¹⁸

Consequently, beyond two separate claims of positivism and structuralism on historiography, it would be correct to understand the meaning of the past and one's relationship with it as a dialectical relationship between political and power relations.

Suffice it to say that historiography refers to the ever-ending intentional and selective becoming process. Hence, who prefers to work on which historical phenomenon, which historical events are considered worthwhile, deciding which ones are not worth mentioning, the creation of narrative as a result of this decision making process, and situations where historical phenomena seen as taboo-funny-ridiculous-banned for a period could become official history in another period, is political.

¹⁷ Ibid., 28-29.

¹⁸ Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 21.

Following this, this thesis argues that historiography is the ever-ending becoming dialogue among past (what happened), and present social and political situations. Thereupon, the constituent and governor part of this dialogue is the political and power relations.

This ever-ending becoming process is a dialectical one for a reason. A dialectical relationship does not depend upon any kind of dichotomy. The primary dichotomy that dominates the historiography arguments is the dichotomy of objectivism and structuralism. The subset of this dichotomy is the dichotomy of historicism and cynism.

This dialectical relationship rejects historicism, which depends upon the idea that the meaning of history is hidden somewhere outside history, and this state of transcendence makes history and historical facts objective -and transcendental- and universal. Additionally, the dialectical feature of this relationship refuses the idea that the historian is the one who should reveal or discover the past to achieve the approximate truth.¹⁹ Likewise, it strives to overcome cynism, which depends upon the idea of history is the construction of different ideologies, and that is why it cannot have any facts and reality itself, or history represents the equally valid or equally invalid plurality.²⁰

In sum, this thesis considers the meaning of historiography as an endless dialogue and ever-ending becoming process among past and present, which based upon the dialectical relationship between politics and power relations. Besides, this endless dialogue and ever-ending becoming process grounds itself upon a fundamental difference or ambiguity -sometimes ontological, sometimes epistemological- between what happened and what is said to have happened.²¹ That is why it also refers to the

¹⁹ Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 5.

²⁰ Carr, *What Is History?*, 103.

²¹ Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 4.

dialectical relationship between politics and power relations, which is based upon the inclination of the impossibility of the claim to portray what happened as it happened, rather than the truth of the claim that painting it as it really happened.

The next sub-section will be underlined that the politics and power relations debates in historiography lead to the emergence of the memory phenomenon as a new perspective on historiography.

2.1.1 The Emergence of Memory Phenomenon as a New Perspective on Historiography

Rising interest in memory phenomenon among social and political sciences started in the 1960s. Before that, scholars use various concepts such as contestation for a meaning, 'true' recall of the past, historical consciousness, mentality, popular history-making, myth, tradition, the historical and philosophical relations between knowledge and the masses, documentary recording, but most of them rarely had used the term memory. Olick and Robbins follow this rising interest in memory phenomenon and ask, "why have public interests in memory grown so in the last two decades?"²²

Different disciplines respond to this question variously, such as the collapse of meta-narratives and promises of the Enlightenment, healing the destructive effects of fascism and the Holocaust -as a result- the rise of politics of commemorative practices, regret, and victimization. All these answers at least have three common ground: One is, the past is the raw material of all, the other is, all these pathways have shaped the

²² Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds., *The Collective Memory Reader* (New York City, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 107.

directions of historiography upon the memory phenomenon,²³ and the third is, all the responses as mentioned above are related to political and power relations.

The collapse of the promises of the Enlightenment, and nation-states' usage of history and historiography as ideological tools, could be considered as the beginning of the emergence of memory phenomenon in historiography.

The Enlightenment used this raw material to legitimize itself in terms of the sovereignty of positivism and pure objectivity in history. While the ideas of calculation, classification, systematization, and control are Enlightenment's constitutive and rigid methods to sustain its universal liberty, fraternity, equality, toleration, and progress claims, it is no secret that it created another form of domination. In other words, the Enlightenment was a promise of freedom in terms of any fundamental facts of human existence and knowledge, but it turned out a broken promise with Fascism, the Holocaust, and any other practice of mass violence. Simultaneously, it turned out an eternal recurrence of the same as newness, an ever-changing never-changing world.

"Following the decline of postwar modernist narratives of progressive improvement through an ever-expanding welfare state, nation-states turned to the past as a basis for shoring up their legitimacy."²⁴ They started to gain their legitimacy through the homogenization of any group that could be considered as 'enemy' within the ground of official historiography. Simultaneously, nation-states' method of homogenization and considering some groups as a constitutive other, started to rely on violence disassembling as progress, while they had been using the past as their ideological tool to legitimize

²³ Patrick H. Hutton, *The Memory Phenomenon in Contemporary Historical Writing: How the Interest in Memory Has Influenced Our Understanding of History*, 1st ed. (Burlington, Vermont: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 6.

²⁴ Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, Levy, *The Collective Memory Reader*, 3.

their presence and present.²⁵ In a sense, an official sameness of homogenized historiography of nation-states also disguised as a newness. Consequently, historiography's feature of being selective and semipermeable, and its close relationship with politics and power relations became more visible and destructive for the masses.

In this regard, the Enlightenment's optimistic vision of history based on the idea of progress, which entered a crisis in the second half of the twentieth century, made people ask again the question of 'what is history?' in terms of meaning and direction of it.²⁶ In other words, despite the Enlightenment's ideology of progress, which refers to the fascination with the future and meta-narratives, ordinary people started to ask questions about history "with more modest expectations about what the future holds."²⁷

In these circumstances, the meaning and direction of the history that was questioned again lead to the questioning of the meta-narratives of official histories based upon historicism, positivism, pure objectivism, and structuralism.

In this conjuncture,²⁸ the phenomenon of memory became apparent and widespread against the history of nation-states as a rupture alongside a daring act to the recognized

²⁵ For further and detailed discussions about effects of the collapse of Enlightenment and rising nationalism upon the attitudes on historiography, also see; Adorno (1998); Adorno & Horkheimer (1979); Benjamin (1999); Burns (Volume V, 2006); Le Goff & Nora (1985); Lukács (1980).

²⁶ Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory* (New York City, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), xv.

²⁷ Hutton, *The Memory Phenomenon in Contemporary Historical Writing: How the Interest in Memory Has Influenced Our Understanding of History*, 12.

²⁸ It is tremendously crucial here to underline the fact that some scholars see the Holocaust as the milestone of collective memory studies, others see it as the last stage of this emerging process of memory phenomenon in social and political science especially in history and historiography debates. Although they don't often use memory per se as a term, scholars like Aries (1974), Anderson (1991); Benjamin (1968); Chatterjee (1986); Duara (1995); Fanon (1963); Gellner (1983); Hobsbawm (1972 & 1983); Levi-Strauss (1979); Mannheim (1936 & 1945); Nietzsche (1983); Ranciere (1994); Smith (1986); Thompson (1995), had already started to mentioning about the idea and function of memory while they are examining and criticizing such notions like the colonialism, racism, nation-state building, mythicizing, nationalism, ethnification, social change, and temporality. In other words, memory could

social function of the past,²⁹ and conventional historiography. This rising visibility and popularity of memory phenomenon in the twenty-first century was described as the birth of a new historiography. Since conventional historiography which privileges the history of events such as revolutions, wars, significant changes in societies,³⁰ started to collapse and subsequently to be incapable of people's rising need to redemption after massive crimes against humanity, whether mental, oral or written memory of people became ever more visible as the living source and raw material of history.

Additionally, the Enlightenment historicism claims an eternal past through which it ultimately reaches universal history, and grounds its truth claim upon "the historical progress of human beings through a homogenous, empty time"³¹ in which only the stories of the dominants are mentioned. As a result of these promises, the world experienced massive massacres and violence, and people started to ask questions about the past, present, and future of the world. Thus, memory became more visible than ever as the representative of the liberation from the uniformization and pain of the past harmful experiences. Besides, memory phenomenon started to reshape the understanding, methodology, and the content of history and historiography.³² At the same time, it sets the ground of alternative narratives against the meta-narratives of national historiographies, and focusing on "the attitudes of ordinary people toward everyday life."³³

be considered as another analytical tool or category which become visible in peculiar time and for purposes.

²⁹ Le Goff, *History and Memory*, 109.

³⁰ Ibid., 2.

³¹ Walter Benjamin, "On the Concept of History," trans. Dennis Redmond, www.marxist.org, 2005, <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/benjamin/1940/history.htm>.

³² Hutton, *The Memory Phenomenon in Contemporary Historical Writing: How the Interest in Memory Has Influenced Our Understanding of History*, 2.

³³ Ibid., 19.

Patrick Hutton's words are worth to mention at length to explain the historical background of rising interest in memory as a new perspective on historiography.

The decade of the 1960s might be regarded as a golden age of historiography for the new directions of historical research pursued by a younger generation of scholars in Europe and America. That decade witnessed an explosion of new subject matter: women's history, global history, post-colonial history, historical psychology, African-American history, as well as histories of an array of minority groups.³⁴

In sum, the emergence of the memory phenomenon sets the ground for new perspectives on the historiography. Halbwachs gave the first tips of this understanding by conceptualizing history as a collection of the most notable facts in the memory of human beings:

A universal history so conceived is still but a juxtaposition of partial histories embracing a limited number of groups, even if the unique time thus reconstructed extends over vast spaces, it still includes but a narrow part of the humanity peopling this earth. The masses, who also occupy these regions but who never enter into these restricted social circles, also have their history.³⁵

Despite their differences or the reactional attitude of memory phenomenon against historiography of nation-states or meta-narratives of history, memory and history also have some common grounds to worth mentioned. It is better to say that there is a fine line between memory and history and it is quite conventional to demarcate their borders as distinct as possible rather than emphasize their interrelationship. In other words, it will be highlighted that even though official histories offered themselves as the official form of memory, they operate in tandem;³⁶ they are both mnemonic practices, use the past as raw material throughout their curiosity about it, simultaneously influence each other, and effective in regard of social and political.

³⁴ Ibid., 10.

³⁵ Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), 78, 105.

³⁶ Hutton, *The Memory Phenomenon in Contemporary Historical Writing: How the Interest in Memory Has Influenced Our Understanding of History*, 5.

Thereupon, it was a paradoxical kind of newness in terms of its method. Despite its distinctiveness from official historiography in terms of methodology, its method stays subtly unchanged because it is also "called for a reexamination of the past in light of the way the culture, and more specifically the newly conceived notion of a culture of politics, was being refashioned in the present age."³⁷ To be more precise, remembering the past or writing about it from above or below might have a familiar disposition in terms of its method by using past and historiography as its political tool to legitimize its interpretations and actions about society. From this, politics and power relations in memory first emerged as a reflexive and dualistic one to the official historiography, later extended its meaning as a hegemonic struggle not only from above and below, but also from the center and periphery like a spiral which touch upon all the entities of the society. Hence, this thesis conceptualizes this becoming process as the politicization of ordinary people's memories, especially in post-conflict societies.

The next sub-section will critically analyze the meaning of collective memory at length in terms of its social and political effectiveness. By doing so, it will underscore the idea that neither memory nor history can refer to the purely objective, unpolitical, or outside of power relations entity.

2.2 On Collective Memory

This section aims to critically examine the meaning of collective memory through underscoring and analyzing the interrelation of the individual (subjective) and collective (structural) dimensions of it.

The first sub-section will start with sociologist Maurice Halbwachs' prominent contributions to the term. Then it will critically examine how he conceptualizes collective memory.

³⁷ Ibid, 10.

The second sub-section will dwell upon the critique and demarcation of the term, *collective*, with the help of contemporary alternative concepts while regarding the intersection of individual and collective dimensions of memory.

2.2.1 Review on Halbwachsian Tradition: Collective Memory

Halbwachs is considered as the first scholar who conceptualizes the phenomenon of memory at length as one of the basic categories of social structure because he asserts that it is what binds and constitutes society or groups. He examines the conditions of how memory binds groups³⁸ and how individuals jointly interpret what they had experienced. This function of memory is where Halbwachs links it with its collective frameworks.

As a student of Durkheim, he was influenced by Durkheimian idea of collective consciousness,³⁹ thus he sees memory as a socially constructed system of notions by which individuals experience and interpret society, *their past, and present*. Thus, Halbwachs asserts that collective memory is a socially constructed notion which is mainly shaped by the concerns of the present, rather than a given and intrinsic notion, nor is it some mystical group mind.⁴⁰ In other words, collective memory is a reconstruction of the past that interests groups in the light of their present concerns or life situations.

³⁸ The group mentioned here covers a broad spectrum ranging from family, religious groups, nobility to nation-states.

³⁹ Durkheim's influence paved the way for the critiques upon Halbwachs' idea of collective memory in terms of inclination of consensus and cohesion without underlying any possible conflict and dissent within groups, and the issue of other chapter, its interrelation with politics and power relations.

⁴⁰ Maurice Halbwachs and Lewis A. Coser, "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877-1945," in *On Collective Memory* (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 1-34, 22.

Thereof, it is in society, especially in groups, that individuals acquire, recognize, recall, retrieve, and localize their memories.⁴¹ Besides, "every period undoubtedly has a way of thinking and an entire system of evaluations that is applicable to the present and living people."⁴² Thus, the collective memory of a group naturally involves the dominant ideas of that particular period openly or implicitly. Subsequently, individuals' memories are shaped by these social frameworks of collective memory since groups that an individual belongs "determine what is memorable and how it will be remembered."⁴³ In other words, memories occur in the form of systems in real life in which individual memory is a part of an aspect of a system or a group memory, which comes to a person from the social milieu. Thus, memory or its act, remembering, could not be purely subjective and personal.

That is why, "the collective framework of memory would then be only the result, or sum, or combination of individual recollections of many members of the same society,"⁴⁴ and one cannot see the connection between individual and collective memory as related but in effect one.⁴⁵ In particular, since effective social frameworks such as family, ethnicity, and religion upon individuals' memories are plural, then collective memory becomes unitary pluralist, well-bounded, and homogenous aspect.

For instance, individuals' memories within a family cannot be regarded as dissociated from the whole images that comprise the family memory.⁴⁶ With this in mind, the collective memory of a group is a transcript of only the resemblances, and the only

⁴¹ Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, ed., and trans. Lewis A. Coser, 1st ed. (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38.

⁴² Ibid., 129.

⁴³ Barbara A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering* (Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2003), 51.

⁴⁴ Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 39.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 40.

⁴⁶ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 51.

thing that has experienced the change is that group's relationship with other groups rather than in-group relations that might cause a conflict within the group.⁴⁷ In other words,

through all these changes groups need stable supports and frames of reference that enable them to rediscover the past in the present and feel their continuity, as a record of resemblance which ensures that the group remains the same.⁴⁸

At the same time, Halbwachs highlights that it is advantageous to determine the idea that different social groups may have different interpretations of what is significant to remember. However, what matters for each group is their in-group consensus and cohesion about memory; thus, the social interactions that individuals experienced out of their groups, and which can also cause in-group conflicts upon memory is overlooked.

Thereupon, critiques of collective memory mostly regard its unitary pluralism where groups are formed in a limited interaction and collective memory also represents a homogenous social organism/structure.⁴⁹ Besides, critiques also highlight its neglect of the endless social interactions, subsequently the occurrence of possible conflicts about the past and memory in and outside of groups.

In conclusion, Halbwachs is a pioneering figure who highlights that groups construct their images of the world by establishing an agreed version of the past. However, he is criticized in terms of his neglect about how the dynamics of collective remembering work and how collective memory is formed between individual and collective.⁵⁰ In other words, the fine line between individual and collective dimensions of memory is

⁴⁷ Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 36-37.

⁴⁸ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 51-52.

⁴⁹ Collective memory is represented here as sui generis because Halbwachs uses it as an analytical tool while emphasizing the reconstruction of the past in the present by each group in accordance with their unique myths, legends, fantasies, which unavailable, or close to the interaction, to outsiders. This situation is also where Halbwachs influenced by Durkheimian idea of collective consciousness.

⁵⁰ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 54.

reduced to the latter by him; meanwhile, individual dimensions of it are represented as parts of the whole within their social organism.

Halbwachs is not the only one who dwells upon social perspectives on memory, yet, he was indeed the one who explicitly used the collective memory term, and paved the way to the emergence of other concepts about it within social and political science. Even though Halbwachs' ideas about memory is vanguard albeit limited, they lead scholars to ask some crucial questions about both the meaning and function of memory, and its relatedness to variant concepts regarding politics, distortion of the past, and power relations in the historiography discussions.

2.2.2 Approaches Emphasizing the Individual and Collective Dimensions of Memory

This section will dwell upon the critique and demarcation of the term, *collective*, with the help of contemporary alternative concepts while regarding the intersection of individual and collective dimensions of memory.

Olick reconceptualizes the umbrella term, *collective memory*, into a *social memory*, which refers to the interaction between collective and collected memory regarding the interplay of individual and collective dimensions of memories. While he explains the meaning of social memory, he does not deny the importance of the idea of a collective memory; rather, he defends its convergence with collected memory.

The idea of collected memory asserts that it is the social frameworks which shape what individuals remember, but it is only individuals who remember. That is to say, social structures and constitutive symbols of societies can only be real insofar as individuals, whether organized as group members or not, treat them as such or instantiate them in practice.⁵¹ In other words, there is no purely individual memory without social

⁵¹ Jeffrey K. Olick, "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures," *Sociological Theory* 17, no. 3 (1999): pp. 333-348, <https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00083>, 338.

experience, nor is there any collective memory without individuals actively participating in it.⁵²

Different from the idea of collective memory, social memory prefers to underscore the possible conflicts about memory. By doing so, this approach also highlights the social interactions of individuals more than the collective memory approach.

In other words, the social memory approach gives priority to research that questions the importance of collective designation rather than assuming a unitary pluralistic collectivity that always has a collective memory.⁵³ In sum, social memory examines social interaction that specific sets of mnemonic practices in multiple social sites where individuals and groups are shaped by the past consciously or unconsciously.⁵⁴

Kansteiner argues that narrowing the term collective memory to social memory is not enough to underline effectively where, how, and why individual and collective dimensions of memory interact in societies. He asserts that "the social base or social function of collective memory"⁵⁵ should be highlighted to find an answer to this challenging question and criticizes the collective memory concept in terms of two aspects. First, he criticizes its tendency to represent collective memory as distinct as possible from individual memory, rather than emphasizing on their interaction. Second, he criticizes its overlook upon collectivity, which hinders the illumination of

⁵² Ibid., 346.

⁵³ Ibid., 339.

⁵⁴ Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices," *Annual Review of Sociology* 24, no. 1 (1998): pp. 105-140, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.105>, 112.

⁵⁵ Wolf Kansteiner, "Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies," *History and Theory* 41, no. 2 (2002): pp. 179-197, <https://doi.org/10.1111/0018-2656.00198>, 181.

the political basis of historical representations,⁵⁶ thus, historical conditions of the selectiveness of memory.

Kansteiner says that social scientists should look for appropriate methods to overcome these two problems and suggests the adaptation of the relationship between reception and audience behavior in media and cultural studies to collective memory studies. For this purpose, he reconceptualizes collective memory as

the result of the interaction among three different historical entities: the intellectual and cultural traditions that frame all possible representations of the past, the memory makers who selectively adapt and manipulate these traditions, and the memory consumers who use, ignore, or transform such artifacts according to their interests.⁵⁷

In sum, individual and collective dimensions of memory could not be understandable by only emphasizing the importance of influential collective factors that shape and limit the worldviews of the members of any given collective,⁵⁸ but also by aforementioned "hermeneutical triangle," one can find out the interaction of social and political effectiveness of memory, which refers to what stories about the past matter to whom, and how they have been distributed.⁵⁹

Similarly, Alon Confino points out that memory is the subjective experience of a social group through which individual and collective dimensions of it, what is political in memory, and selectiveness of it, are embodied. By conceptualizing memory so, he appeals "the commingling of reception, representation, and contestation"⁶⁰ within

⁵⁶ Ibid., 180.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 180.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 196.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 195.

⁶⁰ Alon Confino, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (1997): pp. 1386-1403, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2171069>, 1399.

memory rather than treating memory as a symptom of pure individualism or collectivism.

This view is illuminating regarding the fact that one's understanding of the social and political effectiveness of memory⁶¹ and politicization of it. In other words, his arguments might lead one to question the terrain of politics in memory; the fluid demarcation between cultural, political, and social through which selective representation of the past and social and political meaning-makings of groups and individuals become visible.⁶²

Contrary to Confino and Kansteiner, Eviatar Zerubavel claims that memories tend to be shaped by definite social order, a distribution of the sensible in Rancierian sense, that tell an individual quite specifically what she should remember and forget about the past.⁶³ Zerubavel's definition of memory carries enormously the Halbwachs' notion of collective, but with a particular emphasis on the social and political effectiveness of memory within groups. According to him, collective memory signifies a past that is both commonly shared and jointly remembered.⁶⁴

Proof to this, he asserts that there are rules of remembrance within mnemonic communities, such as family, the ethnic group, generation, nation, and their mnemonic battles through which mnemonic socialization of a society is manifested. He describes these mnemonic communities as a social environment which affects the way individuals remember the past.⁶⁵ After all, he is acutely aware of the fact that individual and collective dimensions of memory. However, the pendulum, which oscillates

⁶¹ Ibid., 1393.

⁶² Ibid., 1402.

⁶³ Eviatar Zerubavel, "Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past," *Qualitative Sociology* 19, no. 3 (1996): pp. 283-299, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02393273>, 286.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 294.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 283.

between individual and collective dimensions of memory, inclines to the social construction of it.

As stated previously, it is the interaction between individual and collective dimensions of memory, which grounds the meaning and social and political effectiveness of memory. In a sense, mnemonic environments such as family, ethnic group, religious community, generation, nation, workplace are all more extensive than the individual yet at the same time smaller noticeably than the individual's act of remembering where social rules of remembering are embodied. Thus, this thesis also emphasizes the interrelation of these two by using the word remembering as a consciously selective and intentional act of memory.

2.3 Politicization of Memory in Post-Conflict Societies

Ideas about what one should remember and consequently forget and this semipermeable process of remembering the past gives one a first and foremost clue about one of the basics of the social and political effectiveness of memory. As noted above, this debate started to be discussed over the post-conflict societies that experienced war or massive violence. Consequently, the idea that conflicts between minority and majority groups in terms of mnemonic battles prepares the ground for the construction of different narratives, identities, ideologies, turning points about the past.

Later, this debate is expanded with the idea that memory is a product of individual's act of remembering but is always produced in relation to the social and political frameworks of a society where individuals live, and it is crucial to examine how individuals might relate to the politicized collectivities, such as ethnicity, those individuals are embedded and embodied within, especially if they had experienced any type of conflict in their societies.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 76-77.

As noted above, there are massively various approaches that evaluate the social and political effectiveness of memory in post-conflict societies. However, they can be clustered in two groundbreaking and interrelated approaches; politics of memory and politicization of memory.

Since this thesis is basically about how different generations of Turkish Cypriot families remember the ethnic conflict between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriot, it will focus on the politicization of remembering, where "the larger interpersonal and cultural worlds in which individuals live"⁶⁷ and the interrelation of the past experiences, present life situation, and anticipated future constitute their memories.

Last but not least, the meaning of both politics of memory and politicization of memory should be introduced briefly, before stepping into the in-depth discussions about their meanings.

First, the politics of memory has a presentist attitude and based upon discontinuity and antagonistic dichotomies. On the contrary, the politicization of memory-based upon becoming, temporality, and entangled dynamics of remembering. Second, the politics of memory highlights the structural effects on individual memory in which the interrelation of individual and collective dimensions of memory is reduced to politics. However, the latter highlights the interrelation of individual and collective dimensions of memory by emphasizing that the interrelation of the past experiences, present life situation and anticipated future constitute their memories. Despite their differences, they are similar in terms of selectiveness, what is political in memory, and the effectiveness of memory in post-conflict societies and historiography discussions. In brief, the politics of memory analyzes the social and political effectiveness of memory in a structural sense, but the politicization of memory analyzes it in everyday life circumstances of ordinary people.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 77.

2.3.1 Politics of Memory: Presentist Approach on Collective Memory

Before memory becomes a subject matter of politics and conflict among groups, individuals' memories "appears a politically neutral notion."⁶⁸ In other words,

although cultural, literary, historical, and other debates about the meaning and import of the past are not political in and of themselves, they become part of the politics of memory once they have worked their way through the sluices that link the formal and informal public spheres. In this sense, the politics of memory is not only about the ideas present in the formal institutions of the state,⁶⁹

but also how counter-memories that occur in conflict experienced societies.

This sub-section will examine the presentist approaches to memory phenomenon. It will underline how different groups or power holders use the past as a political tool to suit present needs and to legitimize their chosen past by making certain events in history relatively more important than others.

The presentist approach always employs the idea of the present to explain the meaning and social and political effectiveness of memory. According to the presentist approach, memory is the construction of the past, which primarily shaped by the present concerns of groups.⁷⁰

Each group has a memory of their past and if individuals' social frameworks or groups change, their collective memories also change. Since the individuals, their actions, and the memory of those actions establish the frameworks of social life and collective memories,⁷¹ if one changes its relationship or presence within-group, then it is like a

⁶⁸ Terry Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture* (Blackwell Publishing, 2000), 21.

⁶⁹ Peter J. Verovšek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4, no. 3 (2016): pp. 529-543, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2016.1167094>, 536.

⁷⁰ Coser, "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877-1945," 34.

⁷¹ Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 124.

sudden rupture or vanishing which does not assume any continuity with previous social frameworks and collective memories.

In a sense, individuals', who 'own' a viewpoint on collective memory and who also remember as group members, viewpoints change as with the change of their positions in the group, and their position itself changes as their relationships to other social milieus change.⁷² Simply because "images of the past are strategically invented to suit present needs."⁷³

In sum, the presentist approach refers to the reconstruction of the past retrospectively. Thus, groups choose different memories and historical events in order to explain any issue in the present.

Misztal entitles the presentist approach as the invention of the tradition perspective or theory of the politics of memory, which underscores how past and public notions of memory are manipulated by present dominant interests to create new political realities, defining nations, and sustaining national communities.⁷⁴ She asserts that this current defines collective memories as inventions of the past and "institutionalization of remembrance within national rituals."⁷⁵

By the same token, Verovšek points out that politics of memory

mediated through complex mechanisms of conscious manipulation by elites and unconscious absorption by members of society. These social frameworks not only give meaning to individual memories; they also provide a broad historical imaginary that shapes the selection and interpretation of formative events.⁷⁶

⁷² Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 48.

⁷³ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 50.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 56.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 56.

⁷⁶ Verovšek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," 531.

Similarly, Zerubavel claims that this approach inclines to highlight the antagonistic dichotomies by narrative construction about the past. It maps the past with the construction of a master commemorative narrative, which refers to the community's reinterpretation of history and its past from the current ideological stance.⁷⁷ While master commemorative narrative assigns relative importance to specific events, it also conceives them as turning points of ongoing but fragmented reconstruction of the past. Conversely, the alternative commemorative narratives occur under and against the master commemorative narrative to oppose it and constitute a counter-memory.⁷⁸

The politics of memory approach⁷⁹ has started to under-challenged; whether the reconstruction of the past should only carry the attitude of presentism, sudden ruptures, and antagonistic dichotomies. In other words, it does not doubt that an effort to underscore how the present concerns affect the selective and semipermeable (re)interpretation of the past is not misleading; instead, it is limited, one dimensional, and has a frozen vision.

In sum, despite its limitations, this approach helps scholars to extend the unitary pluralistic approach to collective memory by underscoring ideas such as power relations, conflict, politics within memory by asking such questions, who is responsible, or control the selectivity of memory, and what are the causes of it? Such questions of the politics of memory approach also underline how a master commemorative narrative is created as the exercise of power and authority of elites upon lower-class or minority groups, which emphasize collective past and aspiration

⁷⁷ Yael Zerubavel, "The Dynamics Of Collective Remembering," in *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 3-13, 8.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 10.

⁷⁹ For a valuable case studies which emphasizing this approach see also Budiawan, "When Memory Challenges History: Public Contestation of the Past in Post-Suharto Indonesia," *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 28, no. 2 (2000): 35-57; Noam Leshem, "MEMORY ACTIVISM: RECLAIMING SPATIAL HISTORIES IN ISRAEL," in *The Politics of Cultural Memory*, ed. Lucy Burke, Jim Aulich, and Simon Faulkner (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2010), 158-182.

for a shared destiny of the community.⁸⁰ Moreover, it paved the way for more complex discussions about the relationship between the past and the present, and the political instrumentality of memory by underlining how different groups or power holders use past as an ideological tool to suit present needs and to legitimize their chosen past through making some specific events in history relatively more important than others.

2.3.2 Limits of the Presentist Approach

The significant limitations of this approach are its state-centeredness and linear binary, which only emphasizes the "mechanism of state rituals as the means of the production of official memory"⁸¹ and seeing counter commemorations as passive and reactionary while being under and against the master commemorative acts. In other words, the presentist approach reduces the entangled formation of memory onto an antagonistic relationship between 'perpetrators' and 'victims.' Former represents who imposes and 'evil'; the latter represents 'good,' what is solely imposed from above or being under the domain of imposed even when it objects.

Alternatively, Barry Schwartz asserts, collective memory is established as both a cumulatively and an episodically.⁸² "The fact that old beliefs coexist with new, as each generation modifies the beliefs presented by previous generations, illustrates that collective memory adapts to society's changing needs and tendencies."⁸³ In other words, he claims that the ultimate consequences of the presentist approach would be

⁸⁰ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 56-61.

⁸¹ Ibid., 56.

⁸² David Middleton, Derek Edwards, and Barry Schwartz, in *Collective Remembering Inquiries in Social Construction* (London: Sage Publications, 1990), pp. 81-107, 104.

⁸³ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 72.

nothing but a history without continuity, which consists of a series of various perspectives' snapshots from different and distinct times.⁸⁴

He tries to endeavor to detect the dynamics of remembering by proposing a third way between the pure individualistic and pure collectivist approaches on memory. In other words, he highlights the interrelation of individual and collective dimensions of memory where entangled dynamics of the act of remembering might come to the fore as a cumulative form, rather than linear binaries. To put it differently, rather than understanding memory from the extreme perspectives, whether "nothing contingent about our historical understandings,"⁸⁵ or "there is nothing constant,"⁸⁶ which both could be considered as monotonous binaries, he conceptualizes memory as a dynamic and cumulative process.

While accepting criticisms on the presentist approach, Peter Verovšek conceptualizes it on collective memory as an instrument of politics in the present, and he interrogates it not only as of the expressions by actors within state institutions, but also the interactive canals through which ideas upon past are transmitted, contended, silenced, and negotiated out of formal settings.⁸⁷ In other words, Verovšek's approach focuses on both "the contested interpretations of the past by official actors and on how these ideas are produced, influence, draw on, and conflict with other narratives that are present within society at large."⁸⁸

Critiques mentioned above about the presentist approach helps scholars to represent the social and political effectiveness of memory in post-conflict societies as a

⁸⁴ Coser, "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877-1945," 26.

⁸⁵ Barry Schwartz, "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory," *Social Forces* 61, no. 2 (December 1982): pp. 374-402, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2578232>, 377.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 377.

⁸⁷ Verovšek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," 529.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 535.

becoming process rather than linear and state-centered binaries between specific groups through antagonistic dichotomies.

More specifically, the social and political effectiveness of memory is an entangled process which not only observed by the dichotomy between the nation-states' official memories and minority groups' memories. Instead, it is a process through which one might observe how the politicization of memory functions as a spiral in everyday life circumstances, where everyone could be considered as one of the parties of power relations in the production of history.

This point has one significant consequence for this thesis' aim; it would be too naïve to assume that memory from above or from below in the post-conflict societies is a power-free and the relationship between parties of power relations is just a linear or antagonistic one.

In sum, despite its limitations, the approach might help to enhanced one's horizon of understanding about the dynamics of how individuals remember without a rigid demarcation between a memory from above and memory from below.⁸⁹ These entangled dynamics are the constitutive part of the politicization of memory since ordinary people's narratives about remembering are the crucial element to understand how politics and power relations work in terms of memory even in the smallest detail in society.

⁸⁹ Mamdani (2001) and Nietzsche (1886) are two excellent works which try to demolish this dualistic understanding of power in terms of both epistemology and ontology.

2.3.3 Extending the Limits of Presentist Approach: Popular Memory

This sub-section will critically examine the popular memory approach, which assumes a "more complex view of the relation between the past and the present, and between the official memory and counter-memories."⁹⁰

The rising interest in power relations within memory mostly owns its reputation to hegemony theory, and this interest is different from the presentist approach's dualistic and linear view by asserting that "memory contestation takes place from above and below, from both center and periphery."⁹¹ Thereupon, any power relation rooted in memory can ideally be apprehended by the reinterpreted version of the hegemony theory.

The popular memory group, which was founded by Birmingham cultural studies theorists in 1982, develops popular memory to describe what they understand from "the collective and contradictory relationship of society to its past and the collective need for guidance in the struggle to make the future."⁹² Gramsci's hegemony theory⁹³

⁹⁰ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 50.

⁹¹ Olick & Robbins, "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices," 126.

⁹² Popular Memory Group, "Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method," in *Making Histories: Studies in History-Writing and Politics*, ed. Richard Johnson et al. (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 205-253, 207.

⁹³ Gramsci begins to conceptualize hegemony with the following question: The October Revolution happened in Russia, why there was no revolution in Europe? The answer he found was that there was no Palace understanding in the West where state sovereignty like Russia was directly visible and functioning. In the West, the state was forming its sovereignty elsewhere. In other words, in the West, the state is not seen as holding power by pure force and coercion. On the contrary, the state combines coercion and consent in the West; it is the unification of civil society and political society. This situation causes Gramsci to dwell upon cultural theory due to his interest in political theory and politics. He examines the solidity of popular beliefs, in other words, he dwells upon cultural spheres where hegemony is solidified because the material that hegemony cultivates is common sense. For instance, street names or names of children that varying from one historical period to another represent these cultural spheres. This situation is where Gramsci's historical perspective on hegemony becomes more visible. He endeavors on the reconstruction process of the ways of thinking, feeling, and understanding of the masses in terms of a process of differentiation and change. In sum, Gramsci's key concept of hegemony, related to the production of "consent" in civil society, is crucially important for analyzing

inspires them and popular memory refers to the two mutually complementary relations;

the relation between dominant memory and oppositional forms across the whole public (including academic) field, and the relation between these public discourses in their contemporary state of play and the more privatized sense of the past which is generated within a lived culture.⁹⁴

In other words, every memory that is outside the dominant memory belongs to the popular memory of the people, and thus memory becomes a hegemonic struggle in the course of everyday life.

They are interested in "all the ways in which how a sense of the past is constructed in societies,"⁹⁵ layers of individual memory, how and when popular memories conflict or negotiate with dominant memory, and "the interaction between private and public senses of the past;"⁹⁶ individual and collective dimensions of memory.

Take a step forward; they underline the dialectical interaction between popular and hegemonic discourses of memory as a site of struggle. That is to say, dominant political order could not be monolithic or totalizing; instead, it is a dynamic, conflictual, and unstable site of contestation between political and social forces of history production. At the same time, popular memory struggles to construct different versions of the past as a challenge to dominant discourses, and the insurance of its pervasiveness and domination in the public sphere.⁹⁷

Following the popular memory approach and hegemony theory, Berthold Molden asserts that

the power in/of memory, because it forces us to examine the relationship between cultural processes, individual experiences, everyday life situations, politics, power relations, and memory.

⁹⁴ Popular Memory Group, "Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method," 211.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 207.

⁹⁶ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 63.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 63-64.

hegemony is built by prioritizing some memories over others according to the specific power constellations of a given society. There is no one history because every historical event can have different meanings, can be ignored, or interpreted from radically different perspectives.⁹⁸

Molden also highlights that

there most likely will not be one common discourse of all the formerly subaltern memory groups. Much rather, fractions among them will persist, and eventually formed new hegemonic memory culture will not represent all those involved in the memory revolution.⁹⁹

The popular memory approach's disposition to confront the dominant memory and actively include subordinated voices in memory paved the way for a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between politics, power relations, and memory. Their approach is at least more comprehensive than the presentist approach in terms of opening a space to the human action and subjectivity in memory through remembering as an act of it, rather than viewing the individual's action and subjectivity as a passive, manipulated, and controlled from above/by dominant memory.

From this, Molden suggests that subjectivity in the politicization of memory in terms of history production can be defined as any social action, in the fields of official state, supranational politics, critical academia, and marginalized ethnic groups, primarily relies upon historical references or tries to influence the interpretation and representation of history.¹⁰⁰

Misztal agrees with Molden and argues that seeing memory as a site of struggle through the interpretation of hegemony theory helps one to comprehend the entangled

⁹⁸ Berthold Molden, "Resistant Pasts versus Mnemonic Hegemony: On the Power Relations of Collective Memory," *Memory Studies* 9, no. 2 (2015): pp. 125-142, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698015596014>, 127-128.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 131.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 134-135.

fact that memories are constructed from below can exist in different relations to the official representation of the past, ranging from sharp contrast to close similarity.¹⁰¹

This idea is crucial to comprehend the meaning of the politicization of memory. It can be both consensual and conflictual with the official historiography and meta-narratives, rather than being a false-consciousness or a pure reaction to them as an alteration or curing of 'misunderstandings' about the past for the sake of reaching the historical truth. In other words, counter-memories also have been trying to legitimize themselves as one of the social and political forces of power relations in historiography, memory, and society. In other words, "the power relations of memory are more complex than binary clashes of memory."¹⁰²

Thanks to the popular memory approach, this changing attitude about politics and power relations in memory is also what sets the ground for the politicization of memory. It suggests that memory is not something frozen; instead, it is a never-ending cumulative, and reciprocal becoming process of meaning-making in time. Thereupon, the relationship between political forces of power relations within memory

are neither permanent nor completely stable, powerful actors may lose ground and influence in the interpretation of history, while formerly silent communities of experience may "suddenly" challenge the regnant master narratives. Nevertheless, those who are neither trying to strengthen nor to defy a dominant interpretation are also still part of the correlation of forces in the political field of historical representation: as consumers or ignorers of specific history politics, as potential recruits, and, most importantly, as the carriers of alternative, though not yet articulated narrations of history.¹⁰³

The next sub-section will assert that one must add the role of the human agency through their individual stories to understand how politics and power relations work

¹⁰¹ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 66.

¹⁰² Molden, "Resistant Pasts versus Mnemonic Hegemony: On the Power Relations of Collective Memory," 137.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 135.

in memory in the smallest details in post-conflict societies.¹⁰⁴ In other words, the entangled, selective, and intentional character of remembering will be underlined in terms of its method by using the past as its political tool to legitimize its own will. Because it is believed that these entangled dynamics of remembering are the decisive part of the politicization of memory since ordinary people's narratives on memory are the crucial element of the intersection of remembering and what is political in it.

2.3.4 Entangled Dynamics of Politicization of Memory

There is no doubt that "memory is produced by an individual but is always produced in relation to the larger interpersonal and cultural world in which that individual lives."¹⁰⁵ At this point, what makes the subjective act of remembering, the dynamics of this process, and consequently, its product memory political, is crucial to understand the politicization of memory. The critical question is how one can study these dynamics? This sub-section will be highlighted the role of the human agency through individual stories of them to understand the effectiveness of politics and power relations in memory.

Maltby, critically assess the above-mentioned idea by using the stories of the individuals to see the intersection of subjective experiences of them and how politics and power relations work in terms of memory in the smallest details in post-conflict societies. She suggests that it is through the stories of ordinary people, who experienced conflict and living in a post-conflict society today, one can better

¹⁰⁴ To accomplish this, throughout the data analysis part of this thesis, the dynamics of how individuals remember in post-conflict societies will be highlighted without a rigid demarcation between a memory from above and memory from below.

¹⁰⁵ Mitztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 77.

understand the dynamics of their rememberings and power relations embedded within these dynamics.¹⁰⁶

In conform to Maltby, Hirsch and Stewart assert that the dynamic situations in which individuals are operating to make sense of the past, establish the present, and anticipate the future¹⁰⁷ must be underlined to understand how politics and power relations work in terms of memory in the smallest details in post-conflict societies. Hence, subjectivities in oral histories of individuals might contribute toward the illumination of the so-called objective history of a society,¹⁰⁸ and how dynamics of politicization of remembering's of ordinary people in post-conflict societies functions.

Along with the ideas mentioned above, Misztal argues that sufficient attention to the human agency must be given by focusing on the dynamics in which individuals' personal stories and experiences are structured and become political.¹⁰⁹ Hence, the construction of meanings is what individuals actively create and perpetuate, as an intersubjective and intentional act, but can exist only through their relation with memory and what has been shared with others.¹¹⁰

Argenti and Schramm explain this changing attitude to memory phenomenon throughout the active human agency and its relationship with society within the politicization of memory in terms of "how political violence is remembered, how memories of this violence are transmitted, and the uses to which the memories are

¹⁰⁶ Sarah Maltby, "Remembering the Falklands War: Subjectivity and Identification," *International Journal of Communication* 10 (2016): pp. 1-29, 7.

¹⁰⁷ Eric Hirsch and Charles Stewart, "Introduction: Ethnographies of Historicity," *History and Anthropology* 16, no. 3 (2005): pp. 261-274, 262.

¹⁰⁸ Nicoletta Christodoulou, "Contested Language, Memory, and Oral History as Curriculum Questions: A Tale from Cyprus," *European Journal of Curriculum Studies* 2, no. 2 (2015): pp. 324-345, 332.

¹⁰⁹ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 74.

¹¹⁰ Misztal, "Memory and the Construction of Temporality, Meaning and Attachment," 46.

put."¹¹¹ They assert that the reciprocal interrelation of individual experience and society, agents and structures in other words, by

looking at how memories of large-scale man-made catastrophes are passed on from the original generation of victims and perpetrators to their children, the question arises how do inchoate, individual experiences of political violence – devoid as they often are of any logic, structure or narrative sense – coalesce into an accepted body of knowledge that can be coherently uttered and invested in collectively as legitimate and representative.¹¹²

Casey conceptualizes remembering through the perspective of Husserlian phenomenology with a particular focus on traumatic situations' memories. He asserts that memory "takes us into things which refer to the proper objects of phenomenological investigation. In remembering, we come back to the things that matter."¹¹³ "In this respect, commemorating enables the past not just to evanesce in the present but, more crucially, to traverse the present on its way to becoming future."¹¹⁴ In what follows, "we make the future possible precisely by envisaging it in terms of the past we bear in the viscosity of the present, allowing its remanence to arise in the act of foreshadowing what might be."¹¹⁵

Following Casey's discussions, this thesis will also focus on the stories, interpretations, and meaning-makings of ordinary people, who experienced ethnic conflict and living in a post-conflict society today, to illustrate politics and power relations works within memories in the smallest details in post-conflict societies. Therefore, it also conceptualizes remembering as a conscious, selective, and intentional act.

¹¹¹ Nicolas Argenti and Katharina Schramm, "Introduction: Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission," 3.

¹¹² Ibid., 1.

¹¹³ Edward S. Casey, *Remembering A Phenomenological Study*, 2nd ed. (Indiana University Press, 2000), xxiii.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 256.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 278.

Additionally, remembering the past could not be only about the relationship between past and present; instead, it is always oscillating in between past, present, and future.

Last but not least, the politicization of memory does not only operate through the procedures of understanding the social and political structures of memory in a specific society but also to clarify the dynamics in which rememberings and subjective meaning-making of individuals take place. Following this, remembering might be described as one's way of being in time, especially in post-conflict societies, where the relationship between subjective experiences and the influence of social and political structures of memory gain importance. Furthermore, rememberings of individuals in post-conflict societies become considered as an intentional act, which tends to be in-between past, present, and future because they incline both to establish their presents and envisage their future regarding past experiences to accomplish a society for themselves.

In sum, this thesis attempts to understand how different members of Turkish Cypriot families remember the past ethnic conflict between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots and make sense of their experiences of ethnic conflict in terms of historiography and politicization of remembering? Following this research question, one objective of this thesis is to understand, interpret, and analyze the differences and similarities upon the rememberings, and thus narratives, of three different generations¹¹⁶ of a single-family. Another is revealing the meanings that respondents give to the past, present, and future of the island in terms of ethnic conflict.

¹¹⁶ The concept of generation and generational remembering will be explained in the data analysis part of this thesis at length.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The fact that at every given historical point in time, there is a substantial amount of knowledge which is accessible to us only seen in social perspective. But since we do not as yet live in a period free from mundane troubles and beyond history, our problem is not how to deal with a kind of knowledge which shall be "truth in itself, "but rather how human beings¹¹⁷ deals with her problems of knowing, bound as she is in her knowledge by her position in time and society.¹¹⁸

It is evident that research topics of any scientific study mostly come from curiosity, political interests, observations of a researcher, and readings that have been done so far by her. I always have been interested in political topics, and thus questions regarding the history, the causes, and the actors of political phenomenon become my focus point. Why and how one particular event is narrated differently by groups? What is the truth in terms of conflictual situations such as ethnic conflict? Who represents, and what is the meaning of being a perpetrator or a victim in any political situation? Should the borders of the latter and the former be demarcated rigidly?

Different groups have asked these questions for centuries, and one of the most important reasons for these questions to be asked frequently is how things are remembered to become an area of struggle through which political, social, and cultural struggles also become visible in everyday life.

¹¹⁷ In original, writer prefers to write man and his; however, I prefer to write it as human beings and her so editing belongs to me.

¹¹⁸ Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, trans. Louis Wirth and Edward Shils, 2nd ed. (Routledge, 1998), 168.

Methodology means how epistemology and ontology are perceived by the researcher,¹¹⁹ and as a result, how research is conducted with specific methods. Thus, scholar's assumptions, purposes, and interests shape which kind of methodology they will choose. First and foremost, this thesis asserts that historiography, differences in memories of the past, and politicization of remembering could not be understood by a rigid and antagonistic dichotomy, especially when the topic is about remembering the ethnic conflict, mass violence, civil war, or genocide.

This thesis attempts to understand *how different members of Turkish Cypriot families remember the past ethnic conflict between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots and make sense of their experiences of ethnic conflict in terms of historiography and politicization of remembering?* Following this research question, one objective of this thesis is to understand, interpret, and analyze the differences and similarities upon the rememberings, and thus narratives, of three different generations of a single-family. Another is revealing the meanings that respondents give to the past, present, and future of the island in terms of ethnic conflict. That is why the research methodology of this thesis depends upon qualitative research methodology through which

one can explore a wide array of dimensions of the social world, including the texture and weave of everyday life, the understandings, experiences, and imaginings of research participants, the ways that social processes, institutions, discourses or relationships work, and the significance of the meanings that they generate.¹²⁰

It should be highlighted here that even though the methodology of this thesis visibly grounds itself upon interpretative social science by following the basics of understanding and detailed readings of the texts such as conversations and narratives, the purpose of this thesis is in between interpretative and critical social science. It will focus on critically understanding the narratives of three different generations of Turkish Cypriot families about ethnic conflict in Cyprus; what is meaningful or

¹¹⁹ See., Jennifer Mason, "Finding a Focus and Knowing Where You Stand," in *Qualitative Researching*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2002), 13-24.

¹²⁰ Jennifer Mason, *Qualitative Researching*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2002), 1.

relevant to them to mention about the past; how they experience the influence of the ethnic conflict in their everyday lives, and finally where and how their narratives about ethnic conflicts in the past match (or not) with the narrative of official history. It is believed that by doing so, the purpose of this thesis also inclines to reveal the underlying sources of marginalized thoughts, and marginalized rememberings of the past.

Before stepping into deeply evaluate the reasons for choosing qualitative research as a research methodology of this thesis, Peter Verovsek's words would be an excellent beginning to justify the methodology of this thesis, thus, worth quoting at length;

Although disaggregating memory and placing a clear focus on its political effects and implications will help ease some of the difficulties, scholars in the field also need to find better ways to isolate the effects of past events on politics in the present. One way to do this is to move to a lower, more local level of analysis since this will allows researchers to isolate treatments better and track the effects of their variables. Additionally, scholars will have to identify cases where essential events in memory act as an exogenous shock and do not merely build on previous narratives or fall into preestablished collective identities. Greater conceptual clarity and research designs that approach political memory in new and ingenious ways to isolate its effects on politics will help the politics of memory to live up to its potential as one of the most exciting new areas of scholarship within the study of politics.¹²¹

As such this thesis' conceptualization of remembering, *as a never-ending dialectical relationship between the experienced past, present life situation, and anticipated future within the entangled and everyday dynamics of politicization of remembering*, tries to extend the rigid demarcations and antagonistic dichotomies such as good and evil, perpetrators and victims. The methodology of this thesis will follow this attempt with the help of an interpretative social science approach.

¹²¹ Verovsek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," 539.

3.1 Understanding Remembering through Qualitative Research

As mentioned in the previous section, qualitative research is an activity that locates both the researcher and participant in the world. Then it tries to make the world visible by a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, and recordings while attempting to make sense of/interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people attribute to them.¹²² In other words, questions such as how individuals make sense of the world, how they experience certain events, what kind of meaning they attribute to a specific phenomenon, are crucial questions for qualitative research, which is more interested in the quality of experience, rather than causal relationships.¹²³

The path opened by German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey regarding the meaning of understanding in social science, was followed by Max Weber, and extended by Pierre Bourdieu. While Dilthey explained it as "the everyday lived experiences of people in specific historical settings,"¹²⁴ for Weber it was firm understanding (Verstehen) in meaningful social action, which "acquires its meaning in a social context among people who share a common meaning system."¹²⁵ When the two definitions are combined, understanding through qualitative methodology is interested in "matters of motive and in the quality of experience undergone by those in the situation studied."¹²⁶

¹²² Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, "Introduction The Discipline And Practice Of Qualitative Research," in *The Sage Handbook Of Qualitative Research*, ed. Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 3rd ed. (Sage Publications, 2005), pp. 1-33, 3.

¹²³ Igor Pietkiewicz and Jonathan Alan Smith, "A Practical Guide to Using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis in Qualitative Research Psychology," *Czasopismo Psychologiczne Psychological Journal* 20, no. 1 (2014): 1-7, <https://doi.org/10.14691/CPPJ.20.1.7>, 1.

¹²⁴ W. Lawrence Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 7th ed. (London: Pearson Education Limited, 2014), 103.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 104.

¹²⁶ Elliot W. Eisner, "What Makes a Study Qualitative?," in *The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and Enhancement of Educational Practice* (New York City, New York: Teachers College Press, 2017), 27-43, 35.

However, Bourdieu extends these two approaches on understanding by asserting that understanding and explaining are one;

attempting to situate oneself in the place the interviewees occupy in the social space in order to understand them as necessarily what they are, by questioning them from that point on, and to some degree to take their part by giving oneself as a researcher a generic and genetic comprehension of whom these individuals are, based on a (theoretical or practical) grasp of the social conditions of which they are the product: this means a grasp of the circumstances of life and the social mechanisms that affect the entire category to which any individual belongs (high school students, skilled workers, magistrates, whatever) and a grasp of the conditions, inseparably psychological and social, associated with a given position and trajectory in social space.¹²⁷

Remembering is a lived process of making sense of experience through constructing and navigating complex temporal narratives and structures, and simultaneously ascribing meaning to the past, present, and future, and this process has tremendously significant value for social research both as an object and technique.¹²⁸ This process is a selective one, *semipermeable*, where one can find

the value of memory for social scientific concerns with unpicking the complex ways in which the social and cultural frameworks that shape not only our most mundane and seemingly idiosyncratic remembering activities, but also the confusions, silences, and absences in memory.¹²⁹

Along with using memory as an object and techniques of analysis is crucial for social science because it has a distinct epistemology and ontology from a positivist research approach of conventional historiography. Thereupon, it is believed that there are a few reasons why understanding through qualitative research, in terms of the interpretative social science approach, is one of the best ways to analyze remembering.

Understanding through qualitative research is an interpretative approach. That is why it aims to look beneath the surface of why people do what they do while uncovering

¹²⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, "Understanding," in *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, ed. Pierre Bourdieu (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999), pp. 607-627, 613.

¹²⁸ Emily Keightley, "Remembering Research: Memory and Methodology in the Social Sciences," *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 13, no. 1 (2009): pp. 55-70, 55, 56.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 57-58.

the largely tacit, natural knowledge, the symbolic meanings, motives, and rules, which provide the social and political orientations for an individual's actions.¹³⁰ In other words, the interpretative approach tries to understand "the social world people have produced and which they reproduce through their continuing activities,"¹³¹ and meaningful social and political actions of people within their social world because people give meaning to that world, make sense of their experiences, and thus constitute their social realities within that world. As well as that,

these subjective meanings are not private; they are intersubjective. Members of a particular group or society share common meanings and interpretations, and they maintain them through their ongoing interaction together¹³²

within social and political frameworks of society.

Understanding through qualitative research is an intentional approach. Like social action is an activity with a purpose or intent in which people attach subjective meaning to the world, society, their experiences, and historical events,¹³³ remembering is an intentional act of calling the past retrospectively to make sense of the present life situation and anticipate future in terms of one's social and political realities. That is why the ontological stance of both understanding and remembering can be regarded as a relativist, and that grounds itself upon the idea that there may be multiple and changing social realities, and each one may be considered as real to its inhabitants.¹³⁴ However, social realities not only consist of the meanings and interpretations given by the social actors to their actions and experiences, other people's actions, social situations, and historical events but also consist of the influence of structures such as ideology and power relations within society. That is why these meaning-making

¹³⁰ Norman Blaikie, *Designing Social Research: The Logic of Anticipation* (Polity Press, 2000), 115.

¹³¹ Ibid., 115.

¹³² Ibid., 115.

¹³³ Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 104.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 117.

processes of individuals, especially when it comes to remembering conflictual situations or ethnic violence,¹³⁵ could not be considered as a purely inner intersubjective and interpretative construction of reality as a process; instead, it should also be noted that external realities also operates on this process. In sum, the social and political meanings of individuals are contingent, context-specific, both subjective and structural, and thus require both intentional, interpretative, and reflexive orientation.¹³⁶

As mentioned in the literature review part, studies of social memory are interested in the reciprocal positioning of individual and collective aspects of remembering, which pave the way to the exploration of the relationship between official narratives and representations of the past, and one's subjective remembering.¹³⁷ This approach of social memory studies paved the way to the role of the past and its recall in social relationships and the relationship of remembering to social, cultural, and political power because an individual's remembering is the intersection of collective influences.¹³⁸ The same methodological approach also belongs to the domain of understanding through qualitative research because it also has a reflexive approach. Reflexive orientation sees the internal and external reality as two sides of a single dynamic whole that is in the process of becoming; work together as one and are interwoven to affect each other, instead of treating them as being opposites.¹³⁹

¹³⁵ The intentionality of using this phrase is based upon the idea that the continuation of perspectives, reinterpretations, rememberings and narratives that create hostile dichotomies in the divided communities or in the spaces of enduring ethnonational conflict, will constantly reproduce ongoing unsolved situation rather than sustaining peace and dialogue. See., Nicolas Argenti and Katharina Schramm, eds., *Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission* (Berghahn Books, 2009).

¹³⁶ Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 109.

¹³⁷ Keightley, "Remembering Research: Memory and Methodology in the Social Sciences," 58.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 58.

¹³⁹ Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 116.

Following these approaches, this thesis will attempt to understand how different generations of the same family subjectively experience the influence of the past ethnic conflict in their everyday lives without forgetting the effects of structures such as the narrative of official history and education system. That is why where and how their narratives match (or not) with the narrative of official history, where transmit of silent practices and tacit knowledge of the past within the everyday private social lives¹⁴⁰ become visible, is also will be a critical topic for this thesis.

Other crucial aspects of qualitative research are small details in everyday lives that can be helpful to the researcher while revealing the hidden and structured meaning-making processes and lived experiences. In other words,

analysis of socially meaningful action through the direct detailed observation of people in natural settings in order to arrive at understandings and interpretations of how people create and maintain their social worlds,¹⁴¹

is an asset. That is why thirty semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with 'native'¹⁴² Turkish Cypriots from ten families in total; three different members of each family who belong to different generations, in their everyday environments such as houses, workplaces, or other specific places where they would like to spend their times.

It is important to note that as a final point, the main concern guiding this thesis is not to reach a general conclusion that would represent the thoughts and, subsequently, the demands of all Turkish Cypriot families and their descendants in Northern Part of Cyprus. Instead, it can be stated that what kind of various meanings and narratives exist within different generations of the families about past ethnic conflicts and what kind of remembering interpretations they have occurred. Therefore, this thesis studies the interrelation of similarities, differences, and specificities in narratives of three

¹⁴⁰ Carol A. Kidron, "Toward an Ethnography of Silence: The Lived Presence of the Past in the Everyday Life of Holocaust Trauma Survivors and Their Descendants in Israel," *Current Anthropology* 50, no. 1 (2009): pp. 5-27, 5, 6.

¹⁴¹ Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 103, 104.

¹⁴² The meaning of native in here will be explained in the two next sub-section at length.

different generations of each family rather than generalizations of their narratives. Especially, inductive reasoning or generalization such as 'all the Turkish Cypriots who had experienced the active ethnic conflict times on the island think like this or in the same way' would not be made because people develop ways to maintain or reproduce a sense of reality based on systems of meaning that they create in the course of social interactions with others. These social interactions are specific, temporal, and always in becoming process. Additionally, categories such as generation could be explanatory in such situations because "they are surrogate indices for the common experiences of many persons in each category."¹⁴³ In sum, remembering is an active act of reconciliation of past, present, and future; thus, memories as the product of rememberings are essential as they bring societies' or groups' changing sense of who we are and who we were, coherently into view of one another.¹⁴⁴

3.1.1 Preperation of the Interview Form

In light of all these main premises of qualitative methodology and the above discussions, for this research, the most appropriate method of data collection is a semi-structured in-depth interview, which aligns with the interpretative approach. Qualitative interviews sometimes are called a conversation with a purpose. In other words, the researcher would like to get a particular kind of information through interviews. In semi-structured qualitative interviews, questions are pre-formulated; they are open-ended questions that allow the respondent to give in-depth answers, and that can be adjusted, and the order of the whole interview can be changed according to the flow of conversation. In-depth interviewing is one of the ways to understand people's constructions of reality and meanings, and it is also about the significance they give to their actions. It is a practice of asking people in such a way that they can

¹⁴³ Norman B. Ryder, "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change," *American Sociological Review* 30, no. 6 (1965): pp. 843-861, 847.

¹⁴⁴ Keightley, "Remembering Research: Memory and Methodology in the Social Sciences," 57.

tell about their constructions of reality in their terms; thus, it addresses the rich context that is the substance of their meanings in depth.¹⁴⁵

This thesis aims to understand how different members of Turkish Cypriot families remember the past ethnic conflict between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots and make sense of their experiences of ethnic conflict in terms of history writing, creation of social realities, and politicization of remembering. It aims to understand and analyze differences and similarities upon the rememberings and narratives of three different generations of a single-family to revealing the meanings, especially hidden by the experiences and perceptions of these generations, that respondents give to the past, present, and future of the island in terms of ethnic conflict. Throughout these specific aims and following Halbwachs' constituent assertion about social frameworks of memory, which highlights that one's memory is the intersection of collective influences ranging from the conventions of the family to the cultural norms of a specific society, how individual and collective aspects of remembering and an individual's ability to remembering from its social and political context functions within societies will be analyzed.¹⁴⁶

While designing the questions of the in-depth interviews, several main parameters were determined following the objectives mentioned above and questions. Questions were posed in the topics listed below;

1. Socio-demographic characteristics (age, gender, birthplace, the location of the place of birth before and after 1974,¹⁴⁷ level of education, world-

¹⁴⁵ Robert Walker and Sue Jones, "Depth Interviewing," in *Applied Qualitative Research* (Gower, 1985), 45-56, 46.

¹⁴⁶ Emily Keightley, "Section Five: Linking with the Past: Engaging with Memory," in *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, ed. Michael Pickering (Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 175-193, 176.

¹⁴⁷ The specificity and meanings of these dates will be highlighted later at length.

views¹⁴⁸, whether being a member of any political party or association or not)

2. Questions about (her or her family's) migration story between 1960 and 1974, 1974 and 1983
3. Questions about the perceptions of history in terms of past active ethnic conflict and its influences of today (conflict milestone incidents, history books, sources affected one's perception about conflict milestone incidents, between official and personal history, whether there are any 'guilty' person or group in ethnic conflicts or wrong decisions and moves to 'blame')
4. Questions about memories (primary-memories, post-memories, learned memories about the history of ethnic conflict), making sense of the past, present, and future of the island in terms of ethnic conflict, (lived experiences, secondary sources of the information, family environment, intergenerational transfer of the memories within a family, education (school) environment, personal environment, comparison of sources of information)
5. Questions about ethnic discrimination and perceptions of being other (the use of language which creates hostile dichotomies between Turkish and Greek Cypriots, narratives of the moments thought to be discriminated by someone because of being a Turk, defining oneself concerning national identity, meanings of Turkish Cypriot, Greek Cypriot, and Cypriot)
6. Overall Evaluation (meanings given to remembering and forgetting the ethnic conflict, and come to terms with past, perceptions of the future of the island and peaceful co-existence of Turkish and Greek Cypriots,

¹⁴⁸ The language of the questions is designed as simple and modest as possible. That is why, one of the common sensical usages of ideology, which is world-view, is used to understand people's ideologies.

meanings attaching to the bi-communal society, federation, and being divided (Green Line / UN Buffer Zone)

3.1.2 Sampling the People: Interviewees Participated in the Research

Thirty semi-structured in-depth interviews¹⁴⁹ were conducted with three different generations of ten different Turkish Cypriot families in the divided capital of Cyprus, Nicosia, Kyrenia, and Famagusta (only one single-family) during November and December 2019.

The sampling of this thesis depends on five criteria, which are;

- Three separate periods that can be counted as milestones in the history of ethnic conflict between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots, and therefore age,
- Being born in Cyprus¹⁵⁰, having spent most of her life in Cyprus and now living in Cyprus,

¹⁴⁹ See., the interview guide both in Turkish and English in Appendix A.

¹⁵⁰ After 1974, which is officially called Happy Peace Operation, the government of Turkey developed a population policy that depended upon encouraging immigration from Turkey to Cyprus to increase the proportion of the Turkish population on the island. Then, these people became citizens of Turkish Republic of Cyprus but there emerged an ongoing debate upon 'being a native/resident Turkish Cypriot' and 'being an immigrant/settler Turkish (Cypriot)'. In the literature, various studies are made based on the relationship between these two, their language use, which mainly reveals the tension between them, and their perceptions about each other in terms of otherness and discrimination. Although these discussions are not the subject of this thesis, it is believed that the selection of family members who spent all their lives in Cyprus, which are called 'native' Turkish Cypriots, while the sample of the thesis was created, does not support and reproduce these discussions about otherness and discrimination. There are two constitutive elements in selecting research participants through such a sample. One is that the ethnic conflict that started on the island in the mid-1950s are primarily wanted to be discussed with the first generation, which has experienced these conflicts at first hand as their life histories. The second is based on using generation as an analytical tool in the Weberian sense. As a result of this analytical setup, the basic reason for choosing such a sample is to understand the similarities and differences in the perceptions and meaning-makings of three generations of the same family, who respectively have experienced the past conflicts in Cyprus at first hand, and who experience these conflict second or third hand with their post-memories.

- Being a member of the same family.

To be more precise, traumatic events like war or ethnic conflict and episodes following them, are considered as milestones in identifying the kinds of situation to which persons respond differently and establishing a status to which future experiences are oriented¹⁵¹ throughout the literature of generational remembering. That is why the first period indicates between conflicts began in the 1950s, and the military intervention carried out in 1974 by Turkey; the second indicates between 1974 and 2004 (when Annan Plan Referendum was held), and the third indicates the time after 2004. Following these three criteria and Mannheimian conceptualization of a generation¹⁵², generation classification of this thesis was made in terms of who spent her youth years (18-35 years old) in one of these historical periods, when events that caused accelerated social, cultural, political, and economic structural changes in the island, and belonging to the same families. As a result, the limitations determined for participation in this thesis are as follows:

- Ten people who were born in Cyprus between 1940 and 1960, spent most of their lives in Cyprus (individuals may have lived outside Cyprus for short periods and specific reasons - university education or fleeing from war) and are now living in the Northern Part of Cyprus. In other words, this generation is the generation that experienced ethnic conflict and violence between 1957-74, primarily between the first years of youth and adulthood.

- Ten people who were born in Cyprus between 1960 and 1980, spent most of their life in Cyprus (individuals may have lived outside Cyprus for short periods and specific reasons - university education or fleeing from war) and are now living in the Northern Part of Cyprus. In other words, this generation is the children of the first generation who did not experience the beginning of ethnic conflict first-hand but experienced and (might) have a first-hand memory of the 1974 operation, the establishment of the

¹⁵¹ Ryder, "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change," 848, 851.

¹⁵² Mannheimian conceptualization of generation will explained at length in the next section.

TRNC in 1983, and the referendum of 2004 between the first years of youth and adulthood.

- Ten people who were born in Cyprus between 1984 and 2001, spent most of their life in Cyprus (individuals may have lived outside Cyprus for short periods and specific reasons - for example, university education or fleeing from war) and are now living in the Northern Part of Cyprus. This group was acquired their memories about the two periods mentioned above as post-memory via different sources of information such as family, school, and media.

Parenthesis should be opened here to explain why the members of the same family have chosen as the unit of analysis of this thesis. Family is the principal socialization agency in which social construction of one's interpretations and meaning-makings about society started. To be specific, "it is an omnipresent authoritarian component of the child's environment, a primary group satisfying virtually the entire range of needs and furnishing the context within which the concept of self-relative to others first arises."¹⁵³ As stated previously, remembering is an intentional act in which the interrelation of past experiences, present life situation, and the projection of the future are made within social frameworks of society. Since family members are the who usually constitute the first, often most critical social frameworks for a child,¹⁵⁴ the role of the family as the first mnemonic community in the field of memory studies has been discussed, especially when the post-memory (memory of the next generations after the first generation) and generational remembering is concerned.

Further, the family serves as a kind of crucial link between the individual interpretations of the past and larger frames of collective remembrances, such as public

¹⁵³ Ryder, "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change," 853.

¹⁵⁴ Astri Erll, "Locating Family in Cultural Memory Studies," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 42, no. 3 (2011): pp. 303-318, 305.

remembrance or official images of the past.¹⁵⁵ Additionally, generational differences in a single-family in terms of remembering the past do not only rely upon adult-youth, old-new, non-modern-modern, national-transnational conflict but also differences in interpretations about the past, which are linked to broader societal processes tied to the age stratification system.¹⁵⁶ In other words,

if relations between generations are to be seen as historically changing, and these changes are linked to larger events taking place in the society, the analysis must isolate how these historical events affect people.¹⁵⁷

In line with this idea, it is believed that how remembrances of the Cyprus ethnic conflict differ from generation to generation become more narrowed, in a methodological sense, and more meaningful in terms of making sense of experiences of ethnic conflict within single-families. Therefore, three different generations of Turkish Cypriot families were chosen as the unit of analysis of this thesis.

Briefly, in-depth interviews with thirty people belong to three different generations of the same families by a semi-structured interview form, lasting from one hour to two hours, were conducted within the scope of a field study between November and December 2019. Interviewees reside in Nicosia, Kyrenia, and Famagusta (one single-family), so they were held in these three cities.

During the interviews, the tape recorder was used after obtaining the permission of all interviewees. It was stated to all interviewees that the voice recordings and the personal information and thoughts mentioned in these recordings would not be shared with anyone other than the researcher, and the information will be used only for this scientific research by anonymizing the real names, and any other characteristics that might reveal the identity of the interviewee.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 308, 315.

¹⁵⁶ David I Kertzer, "Generation as a Sociological Problem," *Annual Review of Sociology* 9, no. 1 (1983): 125-149, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.001013>, 144.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 143.

While trying to reach the interviewees, the snowball sampling method was used. Snowball sampling is a method used in cases where information about the universe is lacking, or it is difficult to reach individuals who constitute the universe. In this case, the researcher firstly researches several people who are eligible to be included in the sample and collects information or get helped by them about other people who meet the same criteria.

The method was started by reaching the youngest of these three generations, namely the third generation. The reason why the snowball sampling was started by reaching the members of the third generation was that the belief of the first communication would be more comfortable and accessible with them in terms of being peers. I first went to Cyprus in 2018 to attend a project and met with plenty of Turkish Cypriot peers whose political ideologies are ranging from the nationalist, liberal, communist, and social democrat. Their varying perceptions and narratives about Cyprus conflict, how previous generations consider them as an active member of their societies who can create a social and political change for the sake of Turkish Cypriots, how they are considered as the ones who "have to remember in accordance with the dictates of older generations; their parents' homes have to become their homes, their parents' sufferings have to become their suffering, and so on,"¹⁵⁸ was tremendously influenced me to conduct this research, and that is why the appropriate interviewees were found with the help of them. Using snowball sampling by starting with peers and their friends also helped to win the confidence and trust of other interviewees easily because they are the close relatives of the third generation.

Fourteen of the people participating in the interviews stated that they were male, fifteen were female, and one was genderless. More specifically, there are six women and four men in the first generation, six men and four women in the second generation, and five women, four men and one genderless person in the third generation.

¹⁵⁸ Bryant, Rebecca, and Yiannis Papadakis, eds. *Cyprus And The Politics Of Memory: History, Community And Conflict*. I.B.Tauris, 2012, 20.

One primary school graduate, four primary school dropouts, and two secondary school graduates belong to the first generation. Half of this generation stated that they were born and raised in mixed villages. All of the men of this generation have worked outside the home and stated that their jobs are generally supportive, reinforcing, and less income-generating jobs than Greek Cypriots. Three of the women belonging to this generation stated that they worked outside the home before the conflict broke out, while three stated that they never worked outside the house, and both groups did not work outside the home after the conflicts. This generation identified themselves as mujahideen regardless of gender and as nationalist and Turkish Cypriot, *who has different perceptions about the meaning of these two – my interpretation.*

The second generation, born between 1960-1980, is the most diverse group in terms of education level and employment status. One woman is a university graduate, and three are high school graduates; one man is a university graduate, four are high school graduates, and one is secondary school graduates. Seven members of this generation stated that they did not have any membership in any political party, one had sympathy, and two had a membership.

The generation between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five are all university graduates or higher, one with political party membership, three with non-governmental organization membership, and two with sympathy for a political party. Nevertheless, everyone except one person in this generation stated that politics in Cyprus by parties is unreliable and hopeless. Two of them identified themselves as a social democrat, and others do not want to identify themselves with any rigid political ideology such as nationalist, left-wing, right-wing; instead, they would like to identify themselves as a pacifist, *who has different perceptions about the meaning of peace and conflict resolution in Cyprus - my interpretation.*

As a final point of this section, one crucial element of this sampling must be highlighted. Debates about any kind of historical situation, be it ethnic conflict, civil war, or slavery, could not be only discussed by professional historians or by the 'guidance' of them. With this in mind, citizens and many more like journalists, ethnic and religious leaders should be considered as one of the various narrators of

remembering and interpretation of history within history production.¹⁵⁹ After all, stories that had been told outside of history books or classrooms might be the crystal-clear representations of the embodiment of how remembering and its narratives become political and part of power relations within society. Following this idea, sampling of this thesis was made by attaching importance to the meaning-makings and interpretations of ordinary people, and their daily life experiences, while it was assessing the conditions of selectiveness in remembering the past.

Table 3.1 Social Demographic Profile of Interviewees

	Nickname	Birth	Generation	Birthplace	Sex	Education	Occupation	Political Ideology (in terms of Cyprus ethnic conflict) ¹⁶⁰
1	Deniz	1990	3rd	Nicosia	-	Postgraduate	NGO worker	Anti-militarist, multiculturalist, unitarist
2	Merve	1987	3rd	Famagusta	F	Postgraduate	Ph.D. Student	Feminist, unitarist
3	Mehmet	1991	3rd	Kyrenia	M	Postgraduate	Student	Federalist
4	Sena	1985	3rd	Nicosia	F	Postgraduate	Private sector manager	Centralist, two-state solutionist
5	Aslı	1993	3rd	Nicosia	F	Graduate	Ph.D. Student, Private sector employee	Unitarist

¹⁵⁹ Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 19.

¹⁶⁰ Participants themselves explained their political ideologies during the introductory questions in the questionnaire.

Table 3.1 (continued)

6	Edis	1994	3rd	Famagusta	M	Postgraduate	Unemployed	Social demo crat unitar ist
7	Hazal	1990	3rd	Nicosia	F	Postgraduate	Teacher	Social demo crat unitar ist
8	Beyza	1995	3rd	Famagusta	F	Graduate	Private sector employee	Huma nist
9	Hüsnü	1997	3rd	Nicosia	M	Graduate	Unemployed	Separ atist
10	Murat	1991	3rd	Nicosia	M	Postgraduate	Private sector employee	Huma nist, multic ultura list
11	Ali	1963	2nd	Nicosia	M	Highschool	Retired cop	Separ atist conse rvativ e
12	Selma	1963	2nd	Famagusta (Southern part of Cyprus)	F	Graduate	Retired teacher	Feder alist
13	Mahmut	1960	2nd	Famagusta	M	Highschool	Self-employed	Separ atist
14	Melek	1967	2nd	Nicosia	F	Highschool	Retired private sector employee	Centr alist, two- state soluti onist
15	Hatice	1972	2nd	Limasol (Southern part of Cyprus)	F	Highschool	Retired private sector employee	Huma nist
16	Melda	1969	2nd	Famagusta	F	Highschool	Invisible homemaker	Huma nist
17	Göksel	1966	2nd	Paphos (Southern part of Cyprus)	M	Graduate	Teacher	Social demo crat federa list
18	Kadir	1969	2nd	Famagusta	M	Primary school	Machinist	Feder alist
19	Hamza		2nd	Nicosia	M	Highschool	Self-employed	Natio nalist separa tist
20	Fevzi	1958	2nd	Nicosia	M	Highschool	Retired cook	Feder alist
21	Necmi	1941	1st	Kyrenia	M	Primary school drop out	Invisible homemaker	Separ atist

Table 3.1 (continued)

22	Eda	1945	1st	Famagusta (Southern part of Cyprus)	F	Primary school drop out	Invisible homemaker	Natio nalist, separa tist
23	Can	1937	1st	Kyrenia	M	Secondary School	Farmer	Separ atist conse rvativ e
24	Kadriye	1943	1st	Paphos (Southern part of Cyprus)	F	Secondary school	Lady of the house	Centr alist, two- state soluti onist
25	Müşfik	1939	1st	Paphos (Southern part of Cyprus)	F	Secondary school	Lady of the house	Separ atist
26	Derya	1945	1st	Nicosia (Southern part of Cyprus)	F	Secondary school	Invisible homemaker	Huma nist
27	Melda	1952	1st	Paphos (Southern part of Cyprus)	F	Primary school drop out	Invisible homemaker	Separ atist
28	Hanife	1949	1st	Famagusta	F	Primary school	Invisible homemaker	Natio nalist, separa tist
29	Ali	1939	1st	Kyrenia	M	Primary school drop out	Invisible homemaker	Huma nist
30	Tahsin	1941	1st	Nicosia	M	Secondary school	Retired soldier	Feder alist

3.1.3 Notes on Field Research: Interview Process and Difficulties during Field Research

I was in the field as a social scientist who does not have any relation with Cyprus before 2018. That is why interviewees were quite curious about my story and the underlying intentionality of mine to research Cyprus. Some of them even asked such questions; 'why such a sweet girl like you came to from Turkey to Cyprus?' or 'oh, I thought that you are a student of Middle East Technical University Cyprus campus, but do you study at Ankara campus and just came here for your work?' I explained all

the interviewees about my position and how Cyprus and I chose each other reciprocally before I decided to work about Cyprus.

I first came to Nicosia in 2018 for a project, and as I mentioned before, I was impressed by the stories told, and the old and wounded streets of Nicosia, which is full of nostalgia, sadness, and hope. Despite being very close to the southern part of the city, I could not cross the border to reach the other side because I am a citizen of the Republic of Turkey. Thus, it was tremendously impressive to walk through in a divided city, which is the last divided capital of Europe, with a mind full of emotions and theories that I had familiar with memory, forgetting, ethnicity, and borders. Even if I do not have any 'tangible' connection with Cyprus other than having a few Cypriot friends, I knew that this visit of mine would be the beginning of this reciprocally selection story of me and Cyprus.

Later, again in 2018, I did small fieldwork in the Northern Part of Nicosia for my Anthropology of Migration and Transnationality course by conducting semi-structured in-depth interviews with ten Turkish Cypriot youths, and wrote a paper about this fieldwork; "An Attempt to Breaking the Glass of Nationalist Perspectives: Reinterpretation of Unsolved Conflict in Cyprus Through the Perspective of Transnational Memory." I came back to this small fieldwork with so many ideas in my mind and getting more friends and networking. After that, I learned that my belloved thesis advisor spent a period of her life in Cyprus to teach, and she shares and understands how I feel about Cyprus. That was the time I decided to study it.

The social relationship between the respondents and me caused both advantages and disadvantages during the field research. This reflexive turn in interviews should be critically analyzed because it is believed that it affects the data.

Being a citizen of The Republic of Turkey partially affects the responses of interviewees. When some of the participants wished to indicate a critical opinion about the policies of Turkey after 1974, especially about the establishment of the Turkish Republic of Cyprus in 1983, they started their sentences with 'please, do not get me wrong' because my home country is Turkey. After the occurrence of these kinds of

responses one or two times, I tried to explain to them the purpose of this research, a general-purpose of understanding and being a researcher, the craft of social science with a modest language, and the aforementioned story of me and Cyprus.

My will to understand and listen to their stories and opinions without being a representative of any political ideology and country, and interviewees' interests to the story of me and Cyprus turned me into a welcoming guest whose presence was accepted and recognized by the community.¹⁶¹ Consequently, I believed that I gained their confidence by attempting to exclude any kind of asymmetry between us with the help of some constitutive features of understanding. In other words, my attempt to highlight only the respondent's perceptions and meaning-makings of their experiences through measuring what kind of things or situations could cause censorship that prevents saying certain things and the promptings that encourage stressing the interviewees,¹⁶² turned out a successful one. It was a challenging situation, but I could say that I handled it quite well.

Being a female student from Middle East Technical University (METU), also caused both advantages and disadvantages during the field research. METU is a public university known with its students who mostly are left wings and opponents, and one of the most important symbols of the 68' generation in Turkey. Because the topic of this thesis is political, some of the respondents who identified themselves as nationalist, conservative, or sympathetic to the right-wing opinions sometimes want to learn what I am thinking about their responses as a student of METU. I tried to handle

¹⁶¹ Even if the fact that I reached the interviewees by snow-ball sampling method mostly with a help of third generations of the families, I knew that interviewees, especially the second and first generation, will ask me some questions about where am I from, where do I live now, and why I would like to study about Cyprus. That is why I also knew that I need to make more effort than any other social scientist who has some tangible relatedness with Cyprus. For instance, I bring sachets full of lavender to each of the interviewees as a gift and symbol of friendship, and it made all of them happy and surprised. After this kind of *sweetness* of mine, in their own descriptions, most of them also gave me some small objects such as old trinket, jewelry, or something about Cyprus as a gift or invited me a dinner. This kind of gift exchange could not be resembled easily with the theory of Levi-Strauss in terms of reciprocity and encountering with the others, but it reminded me gift exchange theory, and I benefited from this gift exchange a lot when I was trying to gain the trust of my interviewees.

¹⁶² Bourdieu, "Understanding," 609.

their curiosity and persistence about my opinions by emphasizing the idea that I am the assistant director of this interview, whose primary duty is listening actively to the director of the interview, *interviewee*, to build an honest conversation in the social milieu of her. It was again challenging, but after one or two attempts of asking, they realized that I would not adequately express my opinion and gave up asking my opinion and focused only on their thoughts.

The topic of this thesis also caused both advantages and disadvantages during the interviews. All the interviewees were aware of the fact that the topic is a triggering and intensive one, which reminds them of some traumatic events and experiences. Some interviews have been interrupted by tears or evoked sadness while interviewees remembered their war experiences or someone they lost in the ethnic violence. Even grandchilds of some male respondents asserted that it was shocking for them to see their grandfathers crying for the first time while they are talking about war times or Cyprus conflict. However, their excitement and joy of expression, and sharing their experiences through making their voices hearable as the minorities of Cyprus helped them to overcome this tough situation. Besides, it was shocking to hear that some respondents talked about some memories of the war which they had kept as a secret even from their families up to now. In a sense, it seems like some of the respondents found a sort of relief by doing so. Thus, the quality of the responses was notably satisfactory, and this shows that there emerged a healthy rapport between us. The joy of this proven healthy rapport helped me to deal with such a psychologically overwhelming situation while listening to the traumatic stories of the respondents every day of the field research.

3.2 Analysis of Data

In qualitative research, the data analysis is carried out both during the data collection process and after the process is over because "data collection, analysis, and writing are

interrelated parts that do not occur in clearly distinct and progressive stages."¹⁶³ During field research, data analysis of this thesis had already started by highlighting two fundamental principles; whether data confirms or disconfirms initial assumptions, and pursuing the repetitive themes or anomalies in the data that might require special attention.

Transcriptions of the whole tape recordings were made critically at length in the sense of rewriting the data. Rereviewing of the interviews was made three times to carry out three necessary steps in data collection: data reduction, data display, and concluding. In other words, three steps followed respectively; going over all the material collected from interviews and selecting particular ones which contains critical information while discarding others, transforming "a seemingly chaotic mess of raw data into a recognizable conceptual scheme"¹⁶⁴ through rereading and systematizing of interview transcriptions, and "making meaningful statements about how data illustrates one's topic of interest."¹⁶⁵

In qualitative research, researchers need to decide which methods to use based on four categories: their research question, design, methodological stance, and purpose. The fact that this thesis aims to understand and analyze differences and similarities upon the rememberings and narratives of three different generations of a single-family to revealing the meanings that respondents give to the past, present, and future of the island in terms of ethnic conflict, and in line with aforementioned four basic categories, qualitative thematic analysis, and narrative analysis method was used.

¹⁶³ Amir B. Marvasti, *Qualitative Research In Sociology* (Sage Publications, 2004), 88.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 90.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 90.

3.2.1 Thematic Analysis: Coding

The coding method was used to organize the data and identify themes and their relations within a social and political context. Coding is a way of repetitive clustering themes in the data, which helps qualitative researchers to see and make visible the frequencies and interconnections of particular themes. Through coding of the interview transcripts, underlying shared interpretations and meanings were tried to be found. Table 3.2 represents the themes and subthemes of the interviews:¹⁶⁶

Table 3.2 Themes and Sub-themes of the Research

FIRST GENERATION	SECOND GENERATION	THIRD GENERATION
Remembering for the nation - Us and them: Remembering class conditions and antagonistic attitudes of Greek Cypriots - Representing Greek Cypriots as the unreliable other - Remembering the victimization of Turkish Cypriots - Remembering the process: Turning from victims to heroes who had the courage to fight against persecution	Remembering their ruptured lives - Loosing hope for themselves but holding on to hope for their children Being in Limbo - Who should be blamed? - Emphasizing the role of Britain, Greece, and Turkey while humanizing the Greek Cypriots - Policies of Turkey after 1983	Construction of the post-memory upon anticipated future - Between family and chosen memory - Multi-perspectivity on ethnic conflict - Come to terms with the past and moving towards the anticipated future Remembering for the reconciliation - Emphasizing on Cypriotism for reconciliation and the future of young Turkish Cypriots

¹⁶⁶ In the next section, it will be explained at length how the contents of the themes and sub-themes mentioned here are created and how they are named.

Table 3.2 (continued)

Remembering to forget the past - Preference to live in the present with Turkish Cypriots - Representing Turkey as the savior of Turkish Cypriots and emphasis on Turkish Cypriots are enough for themselves		
--	--	--

3.2.2 Narrative Analysis

People are telling stories to construct their social identities, make sense of their experiences, and interpret their life and social milieu. Narrative analysis in qualitative research assumes that what, how, and why questions are the crucial aspects of examining the aforementioned actions in social context. Likewise, qualitative researchers investigate the content, structure, and function of a narrative, respectively, what is told, how it is told, and why it is told. Thereof, narrative analysis tries to capture the relationship between subjective experiences of ordinary people and social structures and historical events that shape people and their perceptions.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on the issue of interrelation between generation, remembering, and narrative construction "as a form of historical writing."¹⁶⁷ In this sense, the concept of a generation has been used as a variable because it represents "a possible intermediary in the transformation process, a vehicle

¹⁶⁷ Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 494.

for introducing new postures"¹⁶⁸ in terms of its relationship with narrative formation, interpretation of history, and temporal reasoning.

For different generations, a phenomenon might represent quite different experiences, events, and perceptions.¹⁶⁹ That is to say, different generations might recall different events "in ways that indicate that generational effects are the result of the intersection of personal and national history."¹⁷⁰ This intersection establishes the common ground of Mannheimian idea of generation, narrative construction, and why this thesis chose to use narrative analysis as a method.

Mannheim conceptualizes generation not only with age differentiations but also where this age differentiations gain meaning in social milieu through highlighting the implications of ideological distinctiveness. He asserts that

the ideas expressed by the subject are thus regarded as functions of his existence. This means that opinions, statements, propositions, and systems of ideas are not taken at their face value but are interpreted in the light of the life-situation of the one who expresses them. It signifies further that the specific life-situation of the subject influences his opinions, perceptions, and interpretations.¹⁷¹

Thus, narratives about the past, present, and future of society represent the ongoing process of selection and reconstruction.

In this context, the creation of each narrative refers to "historically situated evaluation of"¹⁷² specific events, which leads "the transformation of what happened into what is

¹⁶⁸ Ryder, "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change," 844.

¹⁶⁹ Frances Pine, "Probing the Past and Imagining the Future," *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 2013, no. 66 (2013): pp. 69-72, <https://doi.org/10.3167/fcl.2013.660107>, 69.

¹⁷⁰ Verovsek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," 259.

¹⁷¹ Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, 50.

¹⁷² Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 8.

said to have happened."¹⁷³ Besides, each narrative is a claim of interpretation, perception, and meaning-making. In line with this, narrative analysis of three different generations of Turkish Cypriot families will be made regarding "the process and conditions of production of such narratives."¹⁷⁴

This production process of different narratives of remembering of three different generations of each Turkish Cypriot families supports two tremendously crucial assertions of this thesis about remembering. First, this production process of narratives highlights how and to what extent politicization of memory comes to fore through selectiveness and intentionality of remembering. Second, narratives of experienced or learned events emphasize the interrelation of the experience, current life situation, and anticipated future.¹⁷⁵

The next chapter will be a brief overview of the last sixty years of the Cyprus society in terms of ethnic conflict with a specific focus on the brief history of the ethnification process and establishment of the nation-states, and dominant national public narratives and history in Northern part of Cyprus.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 113.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 25.

¹⁷⁵ Gabriele Rosenthal, "The Narrated Life Story: On the Interrelation Between Experience, Memory and Narration," *Narrative, Memory & Knowledge: Representations, Aesthetics, Contexts*, 2006, pp. 1-16, 14.

CHAPTER 4

BRIEF GLANCE AT CYPRUS' HISTORY OF CONFLICT

While Cyprus was under the auspices of the Ottoman Empire between 1571 and 1878, it was rented to Britain for 50 years in 1878. During the First World War in 1914, Britain completely took control of Cyprus. Then, the island remained under the auspices of it until the independent Republic of Cyprus, which was established in 1960.¹⁷⁶

The wave of violence on the island did not occur primarily between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. In other words, the first wave of violence did not emerge as an ethnic conflict.¹⁷⁷ As Niyazi Kızılyürek states, they were the people who lived together or shared either the same territory or society and attended each other's special ceremonies up until the emergence of ethnic violence; then, they gained their strictly

¹⁷⁶ Considering the content and aim of this thesis, it is important to explain why the history of Cyprus is being considered since 1571 onwards. The following words of the sociologist Eviatar Zerubavel can be referred. Zerubavel asserts that remembering could not be an arbitrary personal act; rather it is also regulated by social rules of remembrance that tell what one should remember, how should one go far back to remember, or forget. (Eviatar Zerubavel, "Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past," *Qualitative Sociology* 19, no. 3 (1996): pp. 283-299, 286.) Thereupon, individuals designate certain events in history as the actual beginning of a particular history and everything before those events can be regarded as pre-history or unnecessary to remember. (Ibid., 287.) In this thesis, I did not decide politically to which historical events should be considered as pre-historical or beginning of the history as Zerubavel stated previously, rather the participants of this thesis selectively decide. That is to say, the participants of this thesis chose to remember the past with the reference points which they considered to be worth mentioning by going back as far as they choose and above mentioned three historical milestones or breaking points were chosen by them. Thus, it was thought analytically that the short history of Cyprus (conflict) should start from the times that Ottoman Empire ruled the island.

¹⁷⁷ It is necessary to say that various discussions have been made in the literature about how the wave of violence in Cyprus might be described. Whether what Cyprus society had experienced is ethnic and/or ethnonational conflict, it is crucial to emphasize that there was a political struggle and conflict among Turkish and Greek Cypriots in terms of the distribution of wealth, status, authority, and land. A more detailed analysis around this subject will be made in the next sub-section.

demarcated identities while they started to hold a fight in the name of Hellenism and Turkishness.¹⁷⁸

During the early 1950s, while approximately 80 percent of the population was Greek Cypriots, almost 17 percent were Turkish Cypriots, and the remaining three percent were other ethnic and religious groups such as Maronites, Armenians, and Latins. Founded in 1955 under the leadership of Georgios Grivas in such a demographic structure, EOKA started to fight and be visible against the colonial practices of Britain on the island. Nevertheless, EOKA's primary aim was *Enosis* (unification with Greece), and they were a right-wing armed fighting organization with an anti-colonial campaign.¹⁷⁹

This wave of violence, which was directed towards the security forces of colonial rule and the communist Greek Cypriots, started to turn towards Turkish Cypriots after 1958. In that process, besides many Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots were also killed by EOKA. Britain's colonial role on the island was of great importance in the transformation of the direction of violence towards Turkish Cypriots. In other words, Britain used quite the same divide and rule strategies¹⁸⁰ as it did in India, Palestine, Iraq, and confronted many Turkish Cypriots as special, auxiliary police and commando (Special Constable) forces against EOKA, and encouraged the two communities to resort to violence against each other.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸ Niyazi Kızılyürek, *Bir Hınç Ve Şiddet Tarihi: Kıbrıs'ta Statü Kavgası Ve Etnik Çatışma*, 1st ed. (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2016), xv.

¹⁷⁹ Yiannis Papadakis, "Locating the Cyprus Problem: Ethnic Conflict and the Politics of Space," *Macalester International* 15 (2005): pp. 81-98, 84.

¹⁸⁰ Even if it is not one of the main topics of this thesis, it is beneficial to underscore that Britain's colonial strategies are related to the emergence of nations as the new body of the state formation process. Thus, how ethnonationalism started to be constructed in the period of British colonialism will be explained in the next sub-section.

¹⁸¹ Kızılyürek, *Bir Hınç Ve Şiddet Tarihi: Kıbrıs'ta Statü Kavgası Ve Etnik Çatışma*, 103.

By 1958, TMT (Turkish Resistance Organization) was founded under the leadership of Rauf Denktaş.¹⁸² In other words, The Turks of Cyprus¹⁸³ responded to the idea of *Enosis* by demanding the partition of Cyprus (*Taksim*).¹⁸⁴ As mentioned earlier, after this point, the wave of violence prevailing on the island has started to be established as ethnic violence distinctively.

The Independent Republic of Cyprus was established in 1960. It was a regime of guaranteed independence, which Britain, Greece, and Turkey were the guarantor states; each can ensure the permanent presence of their troops on the island to assure the protection of their communities.¹⁸⁵ What is more, according to the population ratio of Greek and Turkish Cypriots, assignments were made in state agencies. Archbishop Makarios III was elected as the first president of the Republic and Dr. Fazıl Küçük as the first prime minister. Despite the Treaty of Guarantee signed by the countries mentioned above in 1959, which prohibited ethnonationalistic projects,¹⁸⁶ the Republic and the joint administration lasted only three years because "the 1960 independence of

¹⁸² Rauf Denktas was the first president of TRNC (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus) and he is considered as the founder of it. He also founded the right-wing UBP (National Union Party) in 1975, which advocates the Turkish nationalism with bio-genetically defined affiliation to the Turks, and two-state solution.

¹⁸³ Identity construction of Turkish Cypriots along with the emergence of ethnonationalism in the island, has experienced a few different stages. This will be explained at length in the next sub-section but it will be necessary here to emphasize that the period that TMT was founded coincide with the discourse when Turkish nationalism and identity was represented in terms of blood tie with "motherland" Turkey. Accordingly Turks of Cyprus were considered as the extensions of Turks in Turkey without any distinct cultural, political, and social feature from motherland Turkey. Once Denktas expressed this idea by saying that "The only true Cypriots are wild donkeys of the Karpaz peninsula." Differently put, identities such as Cypriotness, Turkish Cypriot, or Greek Cypriot was not recognized because it asserted that only Turks and Greeks are living in the island.

¹⁸⁴ Papadakis, "Locating the Cyprus Problem: Ethnic Conflict and the Politics of Space," 84.

¹⁸⁵ Umut Bozkurt and Nicos Trimikliniotis, "Introduction: Beyond a Divided Cyprus, a Society in a State of Transformation," in *Beyond a Divided Cyprus, a Society in a State of Transformation*, ed. Umut Bozkurt and Nicos Trimikliniotis, 1st ed. (Place of publication not identified: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 1-21, 8.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 8.

Cyprus found the two communities intent on pursuing their separate aims of *Enosis* and *Taksim*."¹⁸⁷

In December 1963, the most violent confrontations that the island had experienced began in Nicosia and spread to the rest of the island.¹⁸⁸ 21th of December could be considered as the milestone of the increasing temper.

When some Turkish Cypriots were stopped at a late-night Greek Cypriot roadblock in Nicosia. Within hours, large numbers of Turkish Cypriots had taken to the streets of the capital to protest. This, in turn, led to violent clashes with Greek Cypriots.¹⁸⁹

On December 24, the event is known as Bloody Christmas¹⁹⁰ (also known as bath massacre among Turkish Cypriots) took place, and the conflicts between Turkish and Greek Cypriots continued increasingly until August 10, 1964.¹⁹¹

After that, the period of enclaves began, and Cyprus was de-facto partitioned into two.¹⁹² Turkish Cypriots were controlling four percent of the island, and Greek

¹⁸⁷ Papadakis, "Locating the Cyprus Problem: Ethnic Conflict and the Politics of Space," 84.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 84.

¹⁸⁹ James Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 34.

¹⁹⁰ It was the event that EOKA killed major Nihat İlhan's wife and three children at home. Since all the corpses were found in the bathtub, it has started to be remembered as a bath massacre. In 1966, the house where the incident took place was turned into a museum called the Museum of Barbarism. The museum is one of the places of memory visited mandatorily by Turkish Cypriot students in primary and secondary school on a school trip. Official Greek Cypriot historiography does not prefer to mention Bath Massacre because it was just another event that presents the aggression of Turkish Cypriots. In 2014, the claim, that EOKA did not kill those people in the bathroom, had begun to be discussed among Turkish Cypriots. According to those claims, TMT killed those people as propaganda act to revive the anger of the Turkish Cypriots and to accelerate Turkey's arrival to the island to save them. For a few newspaper articles on the related discussion so far, see <http://www.afrikagazetesi.net/Afrika-Arsiv/Yil/Arsiv%202015/Ocak%202015/2%20OCAK%202014.pdf>; <http://www.kibris724.com/50-yillik-yanan-50967h.htm>; <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/rum-yananina-yanit-icin-geldim-6159622>

¹⁹¹ Kızılyürek, *Bir Hınç Ve Şiddet Tarihi: Kıbrıs'ta Statü Kavgası Ve Etnik Çatışma*, 324.

¹⁹² Nadav Morag, "Cyprus And The Clash Of Greek And Turkish Nationalisms," *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 10, no. 4 (2004): pp. 595-624, 601.

Cypriots were controlling the rest of the territory with a full political leadership and administration since Turkish Cypriots withdrew from all the institutions from the Republic of Cyprus as a counter-attack and to maintain their political leadership and administration within their territory.¹⁹³ Therefore, free movement for the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots was limited on the island; Greek Cypriots could not enter the enclaves of Turkish Cypriots, and Turkish Cypriots could only travel after passing through both the Turkish and Greek Cypriot police checkpoints.

Turkish Cypriots lived in enclaves for 11 years and spent most of this time in the tents,¹⁹⁴ were experienced the economic blockade and harassment by Greek-Cypriot officials.¹⁹⁵ Thus, this period is a "time of unequal social and economic development, a factor that drew the two communities further apart and a reality that persists to this day."¹⁹⁶ The period between 1963 and 1974 was the most intense period of ethnic conflict between Turkish and Greek Cypriots. Throughout that period, more than two thousand Turkish and Greek Cypriots in total went missing.¹⁹⁷

On July 15, 1974, EOKA B (Greek Cypriot paramilitary right-wing extremist organization) made a military coup d'etat against Makarios government. Between 1967 and 1974, Greece was in command of an extreme right-wing junta, and the junta and Greek army and officers in Cyprus aided the coup.¹⁹⁸ Makarios, President of the

¹⁹³ Ibid., 601.

¹⁹⁴ Rebecca Bryant, "Writing the Catastrophe: Nostalgia and Its Histories in Cyprus," *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 26, no. 2 (2008): pp. 399-422, 406.

¹⁹⁵ David Souter, "An Island Apart: A Review of the Cyprus Problem," *Third World Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1984): 657-674, 662-663.

¹⁹⁶ Maria Hadjipavlou, "No Permission to Cross: Cypriot Women's Dialogue across the Divide," *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 13, no. 4 (2006): pp. 329-351, 332.

¹⁹⁷ Paul Sant Cassia, *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus* (New York City, New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 2.

¹⁹⁸ Yiannis Papadakis, "Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process," *American Ethnologist* 25, no. 2 (1998): pp. 149-165, 160.

Republic of Cyprus, on July 15, 1974, would explain this situation as the coup of the Greek junta on the island.

As a result of all those, on July 20, 1974, Turkey launched a cross-border military operation called invasion by the majority of Greek Cypriots and official historiography of the Republic of Cyprus and called 'happy peace operation' by the majority of Turkish Cypriots and official historiography of TRNC (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus). It was the final phase in the physical separation of the two communities, where

those enclaves not within the area captured by the Turks were emptied as their inhabitants headed north for the safety of Turkish-controlled Cyprus while the vast majority of Greek Cypriots in the north were forced to abandon their homes for Republic-controlled territory in the south.¹⁹⁹

Between 1974 to 1983, "around 45,000 Turkish Cypriots were displaced from the island's south to the north, and around 165,000 Greek Cypriots were displaced from north to south."²⁰⁰ Hence, "the ensuing population exchanges made the two parts almost totally ethnically homogeneous and divided Cyprus into two officially."²⁰¹

In 1983, despite the nine years that have passed from the island's partition, a joint solution could not be reached between Turkish and Greek Cypriots, a de-facto independent state, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) was established. TRNC is internationally recognized only by Turkey.

In late 2002, the UN Secretary-General released the Annan Plan²⁰² for a solution to vanishing the ongoing conflict. Massive protests by Turkish Cypriots in favor of the

¹⁹⁹ Morag, "Cyprus And The Clash Of Greek And Turkish Nationalisms," 602.

²⁰⁰ Bryant and Papadakis, *Cyprus And The Politics Of Memory: History, Community And Conflict*, 5.

²⁰¹ Yiannis Papadakis, "Locating the Cyprus Problem: Ethnic Conflict and the Politics of Space," 85.

²⁰² The Annan Plan was the bi-communal and bi-sectional plan that offered the Greek and Turkish Cypriots the opportunity to live within a single state and was the closest to the federal solution. To reach the full plan, see http://www.hri.org/docs/annan/Annan_Plan_Text.html

Annan Plan and against the potential EU entry of the Republic of Cyprus without Turkish Cypriots led to the opening of the checkpoints that divide the island into two.²⁰³ On April 23, 2003, the Turkish Cypriot government announced that three border gates on the island would be opened to direct passage of the civilians with identity cards without taking an official permission paper to cross border 48 hours before. The first crossings took place through the Ledra Palace²⁰⁴ border checkpoint, and as the majority of the participants of this research stated, it was the first time that some Turkish Cypriots met a Greek Cypriot in their lives, and vice versa.

In 2004, the Annan Plan referendum was held. Almost 78 percent of Turkish Cypriots said yes to the plan, while 75 percent of Greek Cypriots said no. "Following the referendum failure, Cyprus entered the EU as a divided country in a state of limbo."²⁰⁵ Right now, the Republic of Cyprus, which is only represented by Greek Cypriots bureaucratically, is a member of the UN, and Turkey only internationally recognizes TRNC.²⁰⁶ Today, Turkish Cypriots live in the northern part of Cyprus, while Greek Cypriots live separately in the southern part.²⁰⁷

²⁰³ Bryant and Papadakis, *Cyprus And The Politics Of Memory: History, Community And Conflict*, 6.

²⁰⁴ Today, only diplomats can drive through the border check-point of Ledra Palace and civilians can only pass on foot. The area where Ledra Palace located is between the Northern Part's and the Southern Part's border is a buffer zone under the control of the United Nations. There is a community center in the buffer zone called Home for Cooperation, which was founded by the Historical Dialogue and Research Center in 2011 in order to organize multicultural, multinational, and multilingual activities (workshops, conferences, film screenings, etc.) and make this buffer zone / dead zone a meeting space for all communities in Cyprus. To the story of Ledra Palace and solidarity house in detail, see <http://www.home4cooperation.info/history-of-the-h4c>

²⁰⁵ Nicos Trimikliniotis and Umut Bozkurt, "Introduction: Beyond a Divided Cyprus, a Society in a State of Transformation," 11.

²⁰⁶ It is noteworthy that the Republic of Cyprus represents the whole island, thus the Northern Part of the island is considered as occupied by TRNC.

²⁰⁷ The only place where is an exception as a mixed village, Pile, located in the Larnaca region. For an interview with the villagers during the Annan Plan discussions, see <https://m.bianet.org/bianet/siyaset/14614-pile-koyluleri-bmnin-kibris-planini-anlatti> Accessed on: February 3, 2020. For studies on the Cyprus problem, the Annan Plan and the village of Pile, see Papadakis (1996); Papadakis (2000).

4.1 Ethnonationalisms in Cyprus

Nationalism is a phenomenon that should be analyzed in a concrete historical context to make sense of it.²⁰⁸ In other words, "the world of nations, ethnic identity, and national ideology are neither eternal nor ahistorical or primordial but are rather socially constructed and function within particular historical and social contexts."²⁰⁹

Despite ahistorical views of nationalism, which attempts to make a mere theoretical discussion about the meaning and emergence of nationalism in general, this chapter will historicize the emergence of both ethnicization and the nationalization process of Cyprus. It will argue that the social and political changes experienced by Cyprus society from the Ottoman Empire rule to today, have led to the emergence of ethnonationalism on the island. Thus, this sub-section aims to summarize how nationalism and ethnicization, thus, ethnonationalism, emerged through which the island's tangled social and political history. Differently put, placing the Cyprus ethnic conflict and its reasons within the regional setting of transformations²¹⁰ will be the aim of this chapter.

Bozkurt and Trimikliniotis scrutinize that the liberal conflict resolution and the global/regional geopolitics model are insufficient to understand the Cyprus conflict in terms of Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot relations in historical context.²¹¹ They argue that ethnicity, nationalism, and class struggles are intercrossing in the context of

²⁰⁸ Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "The Dialectic of Intolerance: Ideological Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict," *The Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* VI, no. 4 (1979): pp. 5-31, 5.

²⁰⁹ Nikos Christofis and Thekla Kyritsi, "Cypriot Nationalisms in Context: History, Identity, and Politics," in *Cypriot Nationalisms in Context: History, Identity, and Politics*, ed. Nikos Christofis and Thekla Kyritsi (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), pp. 1-22, 12.

²¹⁰ Nicos Trimikliniotis and Umut Bozkurt, "Introduction: Beyond a Divided Cyprus, a Society in a State of Transformation," 5.

²¹¹ Nicos Trimikliniotis and Umut Bozkurt, "Rethinking the Postcolonial Cypriot Statehood: The Cyprus Problem, Class Struggles, and Ethnic Conflict," in *Beyond A Divided Cyprus: A State And Society In Transformation* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 47-66, 48.

Cyprus; consequently, class struggles and politics have been articulated within ethnic claims.²¹² Thereupon, they assert that class structure and positioning, and class-based political structures of power and ideologies must be analyzed to understand the basis of ethnic/national articulations in Cyprus.²¹³ Following this, upcoming paragraphs will make a brief attempt to understand the interrelation of the embodiment of class relations and ethnonationalism in Cyprus.

There was indeed a traditional coexistence between Turkish and Greek Cypriots in the three centuries of Ottoman rule between 1571 to 1878 in Cyprus. Within this coexistence, they were differentiated regarding their religion, language, familial and social life, and in-group marriage practices²¹⁴ because Ottoman Empire had a different kind of governance system than nation-states, which was the millet system. The Millet system could be considered as a special kind of multi-culturalism, which categorized the subjects of the Empire based on their confession and ethnoreligious community.²¹⁵

The system "gave a degree of internal autonomy to separate religious communities, "under the guidance of its respective religious authorities."²¹⁶ Thus, it allowed Greek-Orthodox Church to establish leadership within the Christian community in the island, and it reinforced group relatedness of the community in terms of religious lines, which later paved the way to the opposition to Ottoman rule, thus, Islam, and to desire for union with Greece, particularly after the beginning of Greek War of Independence in 1821.²¹⁷ Then, the development of Greek nationalism was accelerated by British rule

²¹² Ibid., 52, 53.

²¹³ Ibid., 48.

²¹⁴ Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," *Race & Class* 25, no. 1 (1983): pp. 59-76, 61.

²¹⁵ Nikos Christofis and Thekla Kyritsi, "Cypriot Nationalisms in Context: History, Identity, and Politics," 7.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 7.

²¹⁷ Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," 61.

because the relations between these two communities had become transformed into formalized ethnic divisions and bi-national consciousness under the new political system.²¹⁸

"There is no doubt that nationalism, once it developed into a mass movement,²¹⁹ genuinely embodied the aspirations of the great majority of the Greek population of Cyprus throughout British rule."²²⁰ British constitutional/administrative structure was a constituent part of the construction of ethnic identities and nationalism in different ways.²²¹ That is to say, a new constitutional structure accelerated the politicization of subjects "in a nationalist-exclusivist direction of ethnic and religious-cultural divisions."²²² For instance, the 1882 constitution gave Greek Cypriots the opportunity of participation in the administration system of the island, the right to fly the Greek flag, and building schools organized on religious lines.²²³ Thereupon, existing group differences and national policies of political elites²²⁴ were fostered; thus, the embodiment process of ethnic identities and nationalism started.

Turkish Cypriots were mainly government employers and were more urban than Greek-Cypriots under Ottoman rule.²²⁵ However, "with the advent of British

²¹⁸ Ibid., 62.

²¹⁹ It is crucial here to note again that the alliance between Greek Cypriot peasants and working class, the Greek bourgeoisie, Archbishop as the leader of the Orthodox community, and the Church against British colonial rule, led the Enosis movement's transformation into a mass movement (Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," 64).

²²⁰ Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "The Dialectic of Intolerance: Ideological Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict," 24.

²²¹ Umut Bozkurt and Nicos Trimikliniotis, "Rethinking the Postcolonial Cypriot Statehood: The Cyprus Problem, Class Struggles, and Ethnic Conflict," 54.

²²² Ibid., 54.

²²³ Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," 63.

²²⁴ Ibid., 63.

²²⁵ Ibid., 72.

colonialism in 1878, the Muslim ruling elites/class of landowners lost their privileges and gradually lost their influence" on the political sphere. Besides, "during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Turkish-Cypriots were largely confined to traditional, unskilled occupations,"²²⁶ and peasantry. However, Greek Cypriots have always been the dominant group of the economic sphere of Cyprus society. Since Ottoman rule did not let them be in the administrative system, they were the peasants, merchants, and intermediaries of the society. This uneven development or division of labor had started to reform during the British rule.²²⁷ Greek Cypriot peasantry's and working class's extreme economic exploitation and privilege of British capital against local capital²²⁸ during this era paved the way an interrelation between anti-colonialism and nationalism among Greek Cypriots. Differently put, "anti-colonialism and nationalism were firmly married in the consciousness and political action of the Greek Cypriot peasant and working class."²²⁹

Meanwhile, the Turkish Cypriot community's fear of Greek Cypriot domination²³⁰ in almost every sphere of society became visible. British colonial rule was successful in taking advantage of Turkish Cypriots' fear and resentment against Greek Cypriots and Greek Cypriots' desire to be the only Self of the island, and turning the newly emerged dispute into an institutionalized "dialectic of intolerance as the major characteristic of

²²⁶ Umut Bozkurt and Nicos Trimikliniotis, "Rethinking the Postcolonial Cypriot Statehood: The Cyprus Problem, Class Struggles, and Ethnic Conflict," 50.

²²⁷ This transformation refers that Greek Cypriots developed also commercially and administratively. In other words, "the non-Muslims achieved a clear superiority in the field of the economy, particularly in trade." (Niyazi Kızılyürek, "Modernity, Nationalism and the Perspectives of a Cypriot Union," *CEMOTI, Cahiers D'Études Sur La Méditerranée Orientale Et Le Monde Turco-Iranien* 34 (2002): pp. 211-232, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3406/cemot.2002.1664>, 214) For instance, the average per capita income of Greek Cypriots was 20 percent higher than that of Turkish Cypriots in 1961. (Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," 71, 72).

²²⁸ Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," 63.

²²⁹ Ibid., 64.

²³⁰ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "Modernity, Nationalism and the Perspectives of a Cypriot Union," *CEMOTI, Cahiers D'Études Sur La Méditerranée Orientale Et Le Monde Turco-Iranien* 34 (2002): pp. 211-232, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3406/cemot.2002.1664>, 215.

local political culture."²³¹ Differently put, in consequence of Britain's colonial policies upon the national aspirations of the subject people and the organization of ethnic relations in binational society, an extremely intolerant temper in local politics and social life of the island was nurtured.²³²

It is necessary to open a parenthesis here. It can be said that there was a common purpose and solidarity between Muslim and Orthodox Christian peasants during the Ottoman rule, which can be understood from the fact that there were various peasant rebellions organized jointly, the last one took place in 1833.²³³ Nevertheless, "the development of Greek national consciousness and a nationalist middle class among Greek Cypriot changed the nature of the collective action."²³⁴ Differently put, unlike peasants who do not have an idea of the nation and ethnicity in their categories of understanding, and instead tended to think about and categorized the differences in terms of religion and the local community, the newly emerged middle class began to think as ethnic groups with separate political goals.²³⁵

In those circumstances, the Cypriot Communist Party (KKK) was formed in 1926 with a slogan of a united anti-British front of Greek and Turks.²³⁶ Then, the Progressive Party of Working People (AKEL) was formed in 1941 as the extension of the KKK. The establishment of AKEL was a significant turning point in the political life of the Cypriot communities. It was a critical development that threatened the traditional

²³¹ Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "The Dialectic of Intolerance: Ideological Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict," 25.

²³² Ibid., 25.

²³³ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "Modernity, Nationalism and the Perspectives of a Cypriot Union," 214.

²³⁴ Ibid., 214.

²³⁵ Ibid., 214.

²³⁶ Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," 65.

leadership of the Church²³⁷, which has so far been unrivaled for the Greek Cypriot community.²³⁸ It could have also been an opportunity for the Turkish Cypriot community, which largely imprisoned to unskilled and exploited occupations and the fear of Greek Cypriot subjugation under the British rule. Nonetheless, AKEL's attitude towards *enosis*, which considered Turkish Cypriots as a minority who has a common interest with the Self (Greek Cypriots) rather than considering them as a representational political group,²³⁹ made it unable to provide an ideological leadership upon also Turkish Cypriot community, for whom *enosis* means political, social, and cultural subjugation,²⁴⁰ thus, being a minority in Cyprus. Hence, the British constitution was considered by Turkish Cypriots as the protection of their rights in federal character; thus, they firmly chose to be under the control of British rule.

The fact that "the class element was too bound to the ethnic category at the level of political practice for a socialist organization like AKEL to act effectively"²⁴¹ and equally upon Turkish and Greek Cypriots, the activities of right-wing Greek nationalist EOKA and right-wing Turkish nationalist TMT, and the establishment of Cyprus Turkish Party in 1955, finally split the fragile relationship between Turkish and Greek Cypriots.²⁴² In other words, rising nationalist interests, ethnic division, and conflict were structured historically.

²³⁷ AKEL and the church mostly disagreed due to AKEL's political program and its leftist view. For this reason, when the right-wing EOKA was established, the supporters of AKEL and all the groups, especially the communists, that criticized the policies and actions of the church and EOKA were targeted by the public.

²³⁸ Kızılyurek, *Bir Hınç Ve Şiddet Tarihi: Kıbrıs'ta Statü Kavgası Ve Etnik Çatışma*, 61.

²³⁹ Floya Anthias and Ron Ayres, "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus," 69.

²⁴⁰ Ibid, 66.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 69.

²⁴² Ibid., 69.

To sum up, what has been said so far, Turkish Cypriot nationalism highly popularized with an anti-*Enosis* and reactive character against Greek Cypriot ethnonationalism in the 1930s, and the Turkish Cypriot urban elite who favored the continuation of British rule were the launchers.²⁴³ It was also affected by the British constitutional system and its policy of fostering the uneven development between Turkish and Greek Cypriots regarding the economic, political, and cultural spheres of Cyprus. Thus, Turkish identity among the island's Muslim population became dominant as a reactive act to rising Greek Cypriot ethnonationalism during the period of British colonialism.²⁴⁴ Until the foundation of EOKA and its gradually become a visible aim of *enosis*, the purpose of the Turkish Cypriot ethnonationalism did not depend upon the establishment of an independent state; instead, there was a demand for an inclusive place for Turkish Cypriots within a partnership state with the Greek Cypriots.²⁴⁵

Nevertheless, "the spread of nationalist feeling amongst the Turkish Cypriots gained momentum in the 1950s when the Greek Cypriot demand for union with Greece achieved its highest momentum."²⁴⁶ During this phase, seeing Turkey as an idealized²⁴⁷ motherland and the savior of Turkish Cypriots within all the insecurities that they had experienced as "the helpless remains of the collapsed Ottoman Empire, "were the main sources of ethnic pride for the Turkish Cypriots in response to the dialectical Other, which were the Greek Cypriots."²⁴⁸ Additionally, the partition of the island, *Taksim*, as a counter-ideology to *Enosis*, became the central ideology of

²⁴³ Ibid., 67.

²⁴⁴ Hannes Lacher and Erol Kaymak, "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus," *Mediterranean Politics* 10, no. 2 (2005): pp. 147-166, 150.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 160.

²⁴⁶ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "The Politics of Identity in the Turkish Cypriot Community: a Response to the Politics of Denial?," *Travaux De La Maison De L'Orient Méditerranéen* 37 (2003): pp. 197-204, 200.

²⁴⁷ Like the emergence of independent Greece effected and became a role model to the Greek Cypriot nationalism, the emergence of independent and modern Turkey was also idealized by Turkish Cypriots.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 199.

Turkish Cypriot leadership, which grounded itself upon the myth that two communities cannot live together.²⁴⁹

On the whole, it can be said that the nationalist legacy of each community framed in the opposite direction as symbolically antagonistic and mutually exclusive set the grounds of the ideological content of ethnic conflict, which later were spread the whole levels of public life as a dialectic of intolerance.²⁵⁰

In 1974 and afterward, "the Turkish Cypriot attachment to Turkey remained high, as Turkish 'intervention' transformed Turkish Cypriots from a marginalized minority to a secured people within a state."²⁵¹ On the other hand, after the partition of the island, conditions of the Turkish Cypriot community were not excellent with a deficient level of economic, bureaucratic, political, and social independence. Additionally, the open interference of Turkey into the Turkish Cypriot affairs, the demographical policies of Turkey to increase the Turkish population of the island in case of any federal solution, the growing fear among 'native' Turkish Cypriots that they may again be the minorities of the island but this time not against Greek Cypriots but settlers from Turkey, and the fact that the Turkish army exercise control in all spheres of the life²⁵² were other mind-bending subjects of the Turkish Cypriot community. Therefore, the meaning of 1974 and the establishment of TRNC started to be questioned and criticized, especially by the political left and some intellectual groups. It was, under those circumstances, a shift in the discourse of Turkish Cypriot nationalism began to emerge. This newly emerged discourse was Cypriotism.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., 199, 200.

²⁵⁰ Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "The Dialectic of Intolerance: Ideological Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict," 29.

²⁵¹ Neophytos G. Loizides, "Ethnic Nationalism and Adaptation in Cyprus," *International Studies Perspectives* 8, no. 2 (2007): pp. 172-189, 177.

²⁵² Niyazi Kızılyürek, "The Politics of Identity in the Turkish Cypriot Community : a Response to the Politics of Denial?," 203.

"It is under these circumstances that the Turkish Cypriots have started to identify themselves with Cyprus as their motherland and as Cypriots first and then Turks, something they would probably never have done before 1974."²⁵³ Differently put, since the 1950s, Turkish nationalism was described visibly with an ethnic-nationalist perspective of Turkishness, emphasizes the cultural and ethnic contiguity of mainland Turkey and Turks of Cyprus, then, it reproduced as a Turkish Cypriot identity,²⁵⁴ which emphasized spatio-temporal belongingness to Cyprus. "An increasing attachment to Cyprus as a form of political consciousness lay the very foundation of a new Turkish Cypriot patriotism, which finds itself in contradiction with the fusing Turkish nationalism."²⁵⁵

As mentioned below, the nationalism among Turkish Cypriots firstly embodied as blood and family ties with Turkey, and Anti-Greek resentment, then, it turned into an association with the land, notably associated with being born in Cyprus after the arrival of 'settler' Turkish people to the island. To be more precise, rising Cypriotism ideology among Turkish Cypriots, especially after the 1980s, embodied after the 1990s as a kind of native's nationalism and island patriotism against settler's 'bad effects' upon their cultural, social, and economic level of 'native' Turkish Cypriots.²⁵⁶ Another essential aspect of Cypriotism was its emphasis on the cultural, traditional, and geographical affiliation of Turkish and Greek Cypriots rather than seeing the latter as the

²⁵³ Ibid., 203.

²⁵⁴ Hannes Lacher and Erol Kaymak, "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus," 150.

²⁵⁵ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "The Politics of Identity in the Turkish Cypriot Community : A Response to the Politics of Denial?," 203.

²⁵⁶ It is crucial to note here that there were two turning points of Turkey's population policy regarding the Northern Part of Cyprus. The majority of the Turkish people who migrated to the Northern Part of Cyprus after 1974 were voluntary teachers, lawyers, and doctors to help the development of Turkish Cypriot society. However, those who were encouraged to migrate to the island afterward had a different profile from the previous ones. These people, who came to the island with the second wave of migration, were identified by the 'native' Turkish Cypriots, as uneducated, prone to crime, non-civilized, and low-cultured.

constitutive Other of the Self (former), a group that had nothing in common with the Self, and impossible to live together.

In sum, the emergence of ethnicity and nationalism was situational, as well as relational in the microcosmos of Cyprus.²⁵⁷ The effects and attitude of British colonial rule toward the traditionally coexisted communities, and

the instability of the post-colonial state fueled the ethnic conflict and tended to promote a heightened sense of the ethnic identities which in turn strengthened separate nationalist aspirations."²⁵⁸

In those circumstances, Turkish and Greek nationalisms, with their separate national orientations, led the ethnic conflict between them. Since then, with the changes of states' and political parties' official history narratives, ideologies, and international relations policies, the meaning of ethnicity and nationalism has also changed among the Turkish Cypriot community with/out the resemblance. Differently put, the relationship between Turkish and Greek Cypriots, and their attitudes toward the ethnic conflict and nationalism both have oscillated historically between "dialectics of intolerance" and commonalities of the two.

4.2 Politicization of Memory Revisited in Cyprus

It can be seen that the island had experienced many conflictual situations so far, and the future of it is still unresolved and in a state of uncertainty. Thus, Cyprus society is a post-conflict one, and its unique situation makes it more valuable in terms of the politicization of memory. Because politicization of memory is a process in between particular political practices of different times trying to shape the memory narratives of its subjects, and memory narratives constructed by subjects based on their own experiences and meaning makings. Thus, it is the interrelation of these two.²⁵⁹ In this

²⁵⁷ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "The Politics of Identity in the Turkish Cypriot Community : A Response to the Politics of Denial?," 203.

²⁵⁸ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "Modernity, Nationalism and the Perspectives of a Cypriot Union," 225.

²⁵⁹ Nergis Canefe, *Anavatan dan Yavruvatana: Milliyetçilik, Bellek Ve Aidiyet* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007), 321.

context, it is important to emphasize that the lines separating these two are not too visible. Following this, this sub-section will briefly mention the examples scrutinizing the politicization of memory in Cyprus.

Two separate official historical narratives often clash with each other in Cyprus. Yiannis Papadakis focuses on the issue by comparing the history schoolbooks of the Turkish and Greek Cypriots. He asserts that those two different schoolbooks could be considered as reflections of ethnonationalism, which neglect the historical existence and sufferings of the other and socio-cultural interactions, by focusing on the suffering of the nation.²⁶⁰ On the one hand, the Turkish Cypriot history textbooks represent the Self as Turks (of Cyprus), the significant other as Greek Cypriots, the period between 1960-1974 as a struggle of survival by the Turks of Cyprus against Greek Cypriot aggression and 1974 as a Happy Peace Operation.²⁶¹ On the other hand, the Greek Cypriot history textbooks represent the Self as Greeks of Cyprus, the significant other as Turkish Cypriots, 1974 as barbaric Turkish invasion, and neglect the period before 1974.²⁶² The meanings, interpretations, and memories given by the majority of the two communities to the events mentioned above that may be considered as milestones for the recent past of the island, are quite different, and the two separate official histories are influential in the differences.

Following this, Kızılyurek describes the official historiography of both sides as national memories where each side constructs and instrumentalizes memory by insisting on a mutual denial, rather than a crossing or exchanging their memories to

²⁶⁰ Yiannis Papadakis, "Narrative, Memory and History Education in Divided Cyprus: A Comparison of Schoolbooks on the 'History of Cyprus,'" *History and Memory* 20, no. 2 (2008): pp. 128-148, 128.

²⁶¹ Ibid., 137. It should be noted here that the content and approach of the Turkish Cypriot history textbooks changed after 2003 when the leftist Republican Turkish Party (CTP) was in power. CTP has changed the language of the books as Turkish Cypriots and/or Cypriots, rather than Turks of Cyprus. Thus, their approach also changed through the rigid distinction of us and them, self and the other, to more coexistence and cooperation.

²⁶² Ibid., 137.

create a common ground.²⁶³ Thereupon, the aforementioned selectiveness of memory refers to the instrumentalization of the past for the political aims of the present and future in Cyprus.²⁶⁴ He also underlines that the instrumentalization of the past in terms of political interests and orientations of the national narratives, based upon a symbolic reconstruction process where selective memories become functional for national consciousness.²⁶⁵

Proof to this, in the official Turkish Cypriot account of the history and the narratives of the majority of the Turkish Cypriot community, the first wave of violence on the island was primarily between the Greek Cypriots and the supporters of the EOKA. In contrast, the Turkish Cypriots did not have any involvement in the events. After that, the Greek Cypriots started attacking the Turkish Cypriots, who had become a minority of the island with the withdrawal of the Ottoman Empire and have been despised on the island since then, and in 1963 the acts of EOKA began to appear more violently with the demand for unification with Greece. If Turkey would not make the cross-border military operation, perhaps it would be the last of Turkish Cypriots living in the enclaves in the state of the embargo within a tiny part of the island. Besides, what happened on the island after 1974 has not been mentioned in detail, and it preferred to pass 1983 and 2003 by making temporal selective ruptures. On the other hand, according to the official historical narrative of the Republic of Cyprus and the majority of Greek Cypriot community, Turkish Cypriots have reinforced the ethnic violence on the island in support of TMT's claim to partition, and the actual conflict and violence in Cyprus began after Turkey invaded the island. Additionally, the violent incidents between 1963 and 1974 have not been addressed at length in this narrative, and they have been mentioned only as aggressive attitudes of the Turks.

²⁶³ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "National Memory and Turkish-Cypriot Textbooks," *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 21, no. 4 (1999): pp. 387-395, 390.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 394.

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 387.

Rebecca Bryant asserts that "in societies whose everyday is shaped by unresolved conflict, history with a capital H – events of the past, their meaning, their trajectory toward the future – acquires an excessive significance."²⁶⁶ She examines the popular memories of Turkish and Greek Cypriots through how they remake their memories and everyday realities retrospectively, and how they anticipate the future of the island.²⁶⁷ Hence, she asserts that Turkish Cypriots incline to put the past intercommunal conflict behind them, and Greek Cypriots incline to forget the past and to move on to the future.²⁶⁸ Differently put, the politicization of memory emerged mutually exclusively in both the official and popular Turkish and Greek Cypriot historiography²⁶⁹ in terms of what happened in the past and what should be in the future of the island.

As mentioned previously, many popular Greek Cypriot memories of the ethnic conflict tend to dwell upon at length what Turkish Cypriots have done during 1974; instead, popular memories of Turkish Cypriots tend to claim that they are the real²⁷⁰ victims of conflict-related violence since the midst of 1950s.²⁷¹ As a result, while the majority of the Turkish Cypriot community started the events they considered to be remembered in the history of ethnic conflict since the late 50s, the Greek Cypriots preferred to take into account 1974 as a milestone. This selectiveness and intentionality of their memories "led to the memory of the other side becoming "institutionalized" as a

²⁶⁶ Rebecca Bryant, "History's Reminders: On Time and Objects after Conflict in Cyprus," *American Ethnologist*, 41, no. 4 (2014): pp. 681-697, 695.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 681.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 681.

²⁶⁹ Rebecca Bryant, "Partitions of Memory: Wounds and Witnessing in Cyprus," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 54, no. 2 (2012): pp. 332-360, 333.

²⁷⁰ The great majority of the Turkish Cypriots admitted that between 1974 and 1983 the Greek Cypriots were exposed to "revenge killings" especially by the mujahids. However, when compared with their own experiences, they use the adjective 'real' to emphasize that they are still the group who had the most painful experiences.

²⁷¹ Rebecca Bryant, "Partitions of Memory: Wounds and Witnessing in Cyprus," 336.

political strategy."²⁷² This situation is massively crucial for the politicization of ordinary people's memories in Cyprus. Both sides use the strategy of talking about what they prefer to remember about the past. In doing so, they draw on the antagonistic dichotomies that create the perception of the Self and the Other and underline that they are noble victims. Thereby, individuals' subjective experiences of violence become political and politicized by both themselves and official historiography.

Another consequence of this situation is that subjective memories of both Turkish and Greek Cypriots become one of the social forces on historiography. In other words, their undeniable realities become a form of historical truth²⁷³ and a political way to say the other side 'here we are, and we are entitled to be.' In a way, ordinary people also apply the tactics of official historiography by recreating and reinterpreted their own subjective experiences of intercommunal violence retrospectively; thus, they also become a visible part of institutionalization and politicization of memory.

Following Bryant's attempt, Papadakis search for a space between what happened and which is said to have happened or "different views of history that individuals and agencies seek to fill with their stories of what happened in modern Cypriot history."²⁷⁴ He highlights that "memory and forgetting can be based on experience, but they can also be used strategically to give rise to different interpretations or stories of the past."²⁷⁵ He examines the history of Cyprus both on the official and popular levels. Following this, he affirms that commemorative rituals and the official narratives of the two sides seem to coincide with the experiences and future aspirations of the greater part of the two populations.²⁷⁶ Nevertheless, he also opens a room for different

²⁷² Ibid., 336.

²⁷³ Ibid., 340.

²⁷⁴ Yiannis Papadakis, "The Politics Of Memory And Forgetting," *Journal of Mediterrian Studies* 3, no. 1 (1983): pp. 139-154, 139.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 139.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 151.

memory narratives in the same society. For instance, he claims that age in terms of generations, makes a noteworthy difference between memory narratives of generations has lived memories and who has learned memories about ethnic conflict.²⁷⁷

In another article, Papadakis elaborates on differences in memory narratives in terms of political affiliation. He agrees with the idea that the ongoing divided situation of Cyprus creates different and conflicting official histories from both sides and memory narratives from the majority of the two communities. Nonetheless, he also asserts that there could be differences in memory narratives of the same society in terms of age, gender, and political affiliation. While comparing the memory narratives of right-wing and left-wing parties of the Turkish Cypriot community, Papadakis has concluded that right-wing parties tend to represent the Self as Turks, the Other as Greeks, the cause of the ethnic conflict as Greek expansionist historical aggression, and the future of the island as happy independence thanks to Turkey's military intervention at 1974.²⁷⁸ Unlike right-wing's memory narratives, left-wings tend to represent the Self as Cypriots, the other as Turkish and Greek Cypriot of the Right supported by so-called motherlands (Turkey and Greece), the cause of the ethnic conflict as the aggression of nationalisms in Cyprus and harmful interventions of motherlands, and the future of the island as ambiguous.²⁷⁹

Bowman points out how Cypriots interpret and give meaning to their experiences of ethnic conflict in their everyday lives. He suggests that how people decide what to do with their memories²⁸⁰ is one of the crucial points of how memories are both inherent,

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 145.

²⁷⁸ Yiannis Papadakis, "Nation, Narrative And Commemoration: Political Ritual In Divided Cyprus," *History and Anthropology* 14, no. 3 (2003): pp. 253-270, 262.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 262.

²⁸⁰ Jim Bowman, "Seeing What's Missing in Memories of Cyprus," *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice* 18 (2006): pp. 119-127, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402650500510776>, 119.

created, and contested on a popular and national level.²⁸¹ Thus, made interviews with activists, scholars, and others who are close to the bi-communal solution²⁸² toward Cyprus conflict to see how political function and instrumentality of memory in post-conflict societies could both incline to be in the same line with one-sided narratives of official historiographies or to be resilient to them. He illustrates that as some people remember violent events of the recent history of Cyprus, they tend to demonized and homogenized the "other side" by believing that the other is the perpetrator who can repeat the same violent acts against the real victims if they find a chance.²⁸³ Although, some choose to remember the past in terms of more multidirectional sense by highlighting that violence can come "at the hands of ethnic kin as well as ethnic other."²⁸⁴

On the whole, there are two separate official historiographies or national memories of the Turkish and Greek Cypriots. "In reality, there are multiple stories and perspectives, as intracommunal differences of opinion are often sharper than intercommunal."²⁸⁵ Differently put, the politicization of the memory does not appear only through the differences between conflicting groups or between nation-states and minority groups in terms of the narratives of the past and commemorative differences. In a way, these are easy and predictable representatives of the politicization of memory. However, when ethnic conflict or ethnonationalism is considered chiefly in post-conflict societies, the politicization of memory can also be studied over the differences between those who are considered to be on the "same side." In this context, despite the unitarist approach of this same sidedness, which is mainly set upon ethnicity, there may be

²⁸¹ Yiannis Papadakis, "The Politics Of Memory And Forgetting," 140.

²⁸² Jim Bowman, "Seeing What's Missing in Memories of Cyprus," 120.

²⁸³ Ibid., 119.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 123.

²⁸⁵ Nicos Trimikliniotis and Umut Bozkurt, "Introduction: Beyond a Divided Cyprus, a Society in a State of Transformation," 9.

differences in memory narratives due to changes in age, gender, ideology, and class among groups/individuals with the same ethnic origin. For instance, as emphasized a few times above, Turkish-Cypriot left has always opposed to the official Turkish-Cypriot account of history, namely national memory, with an identity movement based on Cypriotism through which selective memories and narratives are grounded upon peaceful coexistence of the Cypriot communities.²⁸⁶

A similar effort, namely, that the politicization of memory does not only appear in the narratives of large groups, but the smallest parts of the society and individuals are also one of the social forces on historiography, will be done in this thesis by attempting to see the similarities and differences in the remembrance narratives of individuals belonging to different generations of the same Turkish Cypriot families.

Last but not least, it is not difficult to give an answer to which of the memory narratives mentioned above are closest to 'reality' empirically. However, this study will try to be aware of the fact that if a study about historiography and memories in post-conflict societies will be based on the idea of empirical truth, it can reproduce antagonistic dichotomies such as 'guilty-not guilty,' 'real-non-real,' 'victim-perpetrator,' 'guest-owner,' 'majority-minority.' Instead, it will try to present what happened historically, that many of the memory narratives have 'truthfulness,' and that the memory narratives of the generations, born into different societies and experienced periods of social change, can both resemble and differentiate based on their own experiences, current life situations, and future aspirations. Therefore, this thesis will attempt to understand through which processes and experiences members of different generations of the same families have gained their memory narratives.

²⁸⁶ Niyazi Kızılyürek, "Turkish-Cypriot Left: A Historical Overview," in *Beyond A Divided Cyprus: A State And Society In Transformation* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 169-184, 173.

CHAPTER 5

UNDERSTANDING THE FIELD RESEARCH

This section will attempt to see how three generations of the same families remember and reinterpret the ethnic conflicts in Cyprus. As a result, it will also examine what kind of memory narratives they have developed regarding the past, present, and future of Cyprus.

5.1 Generational Remembering: Between Individual and Collective Meaning Making through Memory

This thesis dwells upon the conditions where experiences and meaning makings of individuals become political in post-conflict societies. Thus, this sub-section will analyze the meaning of generational remembering, which is believed that the interrelation of the individual and collective dimensions of memory, and subsequently, the politicization of memory is embodied and visible in everyday lives.

Before stepping into the meaning and function of generational remembering, it is necessary to underline the origin of generation phenomenon.

Mannheim began his efforts to define and understand the nature of generation as a sociological phenomenon by claiming that generation is based on the biological rhythm of birth and death.²⁸⁷ However, he was aware of the fact that this conceptualization is stable and linear, and consequently condemned to evaporate or

²⁸⁷ Karl Mannheim, "The Problem of Generations," in *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. Paul Kecskemeti, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), pp. 276-320, 289, 290.

melt into air as a result of various criticisms. Thereupon, he asserts that "between the natural or physical and mental spheres, there is a level of existence at which social forces operate."²⁸⁸ Therefore, he claims that the situations where the biological rhythm of birth and death gain societal significance and relevance must be discovered, and argues that generation must be understood as a distinct type of social location.²⁸⁹

According to Mannheim, members of a generation are positioned similarly if they are exposed to the same phase of the collective memory process. In other words, generation refers to a particular kind of similarity of location which comprises the same age groups exposed to the same historical-social-cultural process.²⁹⁰ Furthermore, the generational location or boundary of a generation can be decided according to formative adult years, which is between childhood and adolescence of individuals who are born within and exposed to the same historical and cultural context.²⁹¹

Nonetheless, it is crucial to note that "what does create a similar location is that they are in a position to experience the same events, and especially that these experiences impinge upon a similarly 'stratified' consciousness."²⁹² Thus, "No one, for example, would assert that there was a community of location between the young people of China and Germany about 1800."²⁹³ Thus, he made a sub-conceptualization to overcome the broadness of the concept of generation location and to make a more

²⁸⁸ Ibid., 284.

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 291.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., 292.

²⁹¹ For a detailed study on this assumption see Howard Schuman and Jacqueline Scott, "Generations and Collective Memories," *American Sociological Review* 54, no. 3 (1989): pp. 359-381.

²⁹² Ibid., 297, 298.

²⁹³ Ibid., 297, 298.

comprehensive social analysis²⁹⁴ about generations; therefore, 'generation as actuality' and 'generation unit' come to fore.

Rather than grounded by mere co-presence in the historical, social, and cultural region, generation actuality has a new nexus, which refers to the participation in the joint intentionality of a historical and social unit.²⁹⁵ When members of a generation create a solid bond between themselves and their intentional acts upon to the social, cultural, and political symptoms of a historical process which they have been exposed to, the generation as actuality is embodied.²⁹⁶ For instance, the young peasants and urban youths of the same historical period could not represent the same generation actuality because they were affected by different socialities and respond differently to them.²⁹⁷ Besides, "romantic-conservative youth, and liberal-rationalist group, belong to the same actual generation but form separate 'generation units' within it."²⁹⁸

The important point is here to underline how different generation units occur historically, how they reflect, operate, or receive their shapes in societies through the medium of social and political forces of power in memory. In other words,

their varying relevance (the particular way in which they can manifest themselves in this or that situation) can be clearly seen if we pay proper attention to the formative layer of social and cultural forces.²⁹⁹

²⁹⁴ Mannheim comments about the meaning of comprehensive sociological analysis by saying that "if we speak simply of 'generations' without any further differentiation, we risk jumbling together purely biological phenomena and others which are the product of social and cultural forces: thus we arrive at a sort of sociology of chronological tables, which uses its bird's-eye perspective to 'discover' fictitious generation movements to correspond to the crucial turning-points in historical chronology." (Mannheim, 1972, p. 311).

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 303.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 303.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 303.

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 304.

²⁹⁹ Ibid., 312.

In this context, the phenomenon of generational remembering comes to fore in which generational differences in post-conflict societies, subjective and structural interpretation of the past, present, and future of society, and how power relations work in terms of memory in the smallest detail in post-conflict societies are embodied.

Eyerman and Turner conceptualize generation with the influence of Mannheim and Bourdieu as "a cohort of persons passing through time who come to share a common habitus,³⁰⁰ a function of which is to provide them with a collective memory that serves to integrate the cohort over a finite period of time."³⁰¹ They are interested in the influences of the wartime experiences and significant traumatic events in the 20th century upon generational remembering in which dispositions and frames of habitus and remembering are functions both collectively and individually, thus socially and politically. They assert that even if generational remembering grounds itself upon the system of dispositions, it does not mean that perceptions and the meaning makings of the individuals about collective memory are the mere products of obedience to or manipulation of the structure. Somewhat, it is capable of being in a relationship argumentatively and interactively, rather than being in reactive contact with the structure of remembering like the presentist approach suggests, the imposed dispositions.

Although Verovsek is not primarily concerned with generational remembering, he argues that generational dynamics (similarities and differences) are essential in the

³⁰⁰ Habitus is a system of durable and transposable dispositions which have an endless capacity to engender thoughts, perceptions, expressions, actions of individuals by the historically and socially situated objective structures and conditions (Pierre Bourdieu, "Structures And The Habitus," in *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice, 28th ed. (New York City, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 72-95, 72, 95). Habitus is also a product and maker of history which produces individual and collective practices according to the objective structures and conditions of the system of dispositions. (Ibid., p. 82) However, it does not mean that individuals who share the same habitus are the mere product of obedience to the structures of it, rather they are capable to argumentatively react to the imposed dispositions even if they "internalize the immanent law of the structure in the form of habitus." (Pierre Bourdieu and Loic J. D. Wacquant, "The Purpose of Reflexive Sociology (The Chicago Workshop)," in *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (The University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 61-216, 140.)

³⁰¹ Ron Eyerman and Bryan S. Turner, "Outline of a Theory of Generations," *European Journal of Social Theory* 1, no. 1 (1998): pp. 91-106, 91.

politicization of memory in which the original experiences and memories of those experiences tend to diverge over time.³⁰² He agrees with Eyerman and Turner by asserting that despite the first generations' (of traumatic events) disposition to remember following dominant narratives of the past, each post-generation incline to reinterpret what happened and what is said to happen with their subjective experiences and meaning-makings. This situation caused another kind of mnemonic battle between different generations, where some of them incline to remember following official history, some concerning being totally against the official history, or some according to negotiation.³⁰³

The crucial point is here to underline once again the fact that remembering the past is not only about the retrospective reinterpretation of the past from present concerns, but also about the projection of the future following one's or specific groups' social and political wills. That is why remembering the past is a never-ending dialogue between past, present, and future. Following Bourdieu, a shared past, its survival in the present, and its tendency to perpetuate itself into the future³⁰⁴ is crucial for the constitution of generations and their memories.

Following this, Misztal conceptualizes generational remembering as the substantive feature of the habitus in which both the system of practice-generating structures and remembering is rooted, developed, passed down, and preserved in the uniqueness of the sociohistorical location of a particular generation.³⁰⁵ In this context, according to her, generation is the product of memory because memory is an intersubjective recollection of a past time which is gained in relation to other people; mnemonic socialization through which semipermeable feature of remembering becomes visible,

³⁰² Verovšek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," 538.

³⁰³ Ibid., 539.

³⁰⁴ Bourdieu, "Structures And The Habitus," 82.

³⁰⁵ Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, 90.

and learned, carried, and transferred through culture and identity.³⁰⁶ She highlights that generations and their generational memories are one of the social and political forces of power relations in memory in which collective, individual, social, and political experiences are embodied within the production of history, and each generation has considerable autonomy to reinterpret the history.³⁰⁷

These aforementioned arguments about generational remembering once again highlight the basic argumentation of this thesis; remembering is always in between the individual and collective, subjective and objective, and social and political because the system of dispositions embodied as generational remembering in which the selectiveness of remembering becomes visible, does not one-sidedly reflect upon remembering of individuals; instead they have a reciprocal relationship. Thus, active human agency is a crucial factor in generational remembering.

In the same way, Monika Palmberger highlights the reciprocal relationship between the system of dispositions and individuals in terms of generational remembering. She asserts that generations should be understood as a specific community of perception in which certain interpretative principles about the past, present, and future functions. Individuals could not be represented as passive consumers within structures; instead, they "play an active role in generating meaning from their experiences."³⁰⁸ "This means that individuals are narrators of history and also actors, and thus are not entirely free to choose since their narratives of the past are based to a certain degree on personal experiences and on wider public narratives they have been exposed to."³⁰⁹

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 88.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 88.

³⁰⁸ Monika Palmberger, *How Generations Remember: Conflicting Histories and Shared Memories in Post-War Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 10.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 12.

Thus, she introduces the concept of generational positioning which incorporates age, life situation in which individuals narrate their lives, rethink the past of a country and (re)envision the future of it, and positioning oneself in relation to the significant political, societal, and economic situations that a country has faced.³¹⁰ That is to say, Palmberger's idea of generational positioning asserts that "the experience of certain events alone, such as the war, does not signify a generation and generational remembering, rather the interpretative act of making sense of it, whereby individuals position themselves by following certain discursive tactics does."³¹¹

Welzer conceptualizes generational remembering as an "endless line of re-narration that are constantly reformatted according to generational needs and frames of interpretation."³¹² This situation upon up space for an endless negotiation between personal and shared, individual and collective, persistence and change, and subsequently between staying in the inherited pasts and orienting/projecting through the future while narratives about remembering the past are embodied. Hence, he asserts that "the narrative elements of the stories are accordingly shaped and adjusted, especially regarding their plots, their political and moral messages, their interpretations of the present and the norms of respective memory culture."³¹³

In sum, the limits, functions, effects, and boundaries of generational remembering ground itself upon two fundamental ideas. First, it grounds itself upon the act of giving meaning to the past retrospectively, rather than demarcating the borders of generations by the time of the original experience. Second, it also ground itself upon generational positioning in which interpretative act of making sense of the past, present, and future, and its narratives are embodied, rather than a generation as a mere cohort division.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 3.

³¹¹ Ibid., 9.

³¹² Harald Welzer, "Re-Narrations: How Pasts Change in Conversational Remembering," *Memory Studies* 3, no. 1 (2010): pp. 5-17, 16.

³¹³ Ibid., 6, 7.

5.2 First Generation Turkish Cypriots: Remembering for the Nation

The first generation of the same Turkish Cypriot families is the ones who had experienced the changing ground of power, governance, and way of categorizing population and ordinary people. As stated previously, the multitudes of the Ottoman millet system turned into a new kind of modality of subjectivity in the era of British colonial administration, thus, started to represent themselves with their ethnic identities. At the same time, that situation also had changed the positions of them. The multitudes who were occupying a place on the land, producing, paying their taxes, and who were not expected to do anything other than not disturbing the order of the empire, were now transformed into subjects whose economic, political, and biological productivity were concerned by the new regime by determining their numbers, boundaries and distinct features. Those subjects had begun to become a part of the political sphere that was also gradually changing and expanding so that the nation-state can build its legitimacy over these numbers and clear and distinct boundaries between groups.

The first generation of Turkish Cypriot families are the ones who were subject to ethnonationalism in Cyprus and rising nationalism in Turkey and Greece; thus, some of their elements, such as religion and language, became the basis of their ethnic identity, which represented the visible difference between them and Greek Cypriots. Consequently, they were the individuals who had experienced almost all the process of ethnic conflict at first hand.

The crucial point is here to emphasize that creating nations and ethnic identities is a never-ending and complicated process, which needs to be renewed through everlasting reinterpretations, rediscoveries, and reconstructions of each generation in terms of selected memories, myths, symbols, and values of the past.³¹⁴ It is an inevitable fact

³¹⁴ Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Blackwell Publishing, 1986), 206.

that "the needs and aspirations of dominant social groups and institutions"³¹⁵ within nation-states have affected the individual's memory narratives.

Nevertheless, fetishizing the state's role in an individual's intentional and selective act of memory, which is remembering, inclines to the mistake of claiming that people receive the official memory of nation-states passively. The part of the state policies in ordinary people's memory narratives is undeniable because nation-states need to retell the nations' tales regularly by each generation to set down the stories of the descendants into history and guarantee its immortality.³¹⁶ However, it is not the ultimate source of how individuals remember.

In other words, nation-states always try to affect individuals' narratives about the past as one of the most potent political forces of power in remembering; still, individuals actively reinterpret their memories by sometimes resembling the official memory of the state, occasionally differing. Consequently, they also become one of the political forces of power in remembering because they are needed by nation-states to ground the effectiveness and continuity of its legitimacy of historiography.

Considering the fact that Turkish speaking community of Cyprus had experienced different phases of memory politics and nationalism since the British period until today, we can say that the first generation of the Turkish Cypriot families is the one who was directly subjected to the policy of remembering the past and envisaging the future with ethnonationalistic narratives. In other words, this generation was considered as Turks of Cyprus, rather than Turkish Cypriots, by official narrative; thus, their memory narratives mostly coincide with this narrative, and they chose to remember for their nation.

The next section will attempt to illustrate how the first-generation Turkish Cypriots choose to remember the past ethnic conflict and make sense of the Cyprus problem

³¹⁵ Ibid., 206.

³¹⁶ Ibid., 208.

and the future of the island in terms of it through which specific memory narratives. It will claim that the first generation Turkish Cypriots incline to use their personal experiences and memories as a political tool to legitimize both their subjective interpretations and meaning makings about the past, present, and the future of Cyprus society, and TRNC's official history narrative.

5.2.1 Remembering the Victimization of Turkish Cypriots while Representing Greek Cypriots as Unreliable Perpetrators

As mentioned in the previous chapter, class dynamics could be considered as one of the reasons for the rising ethnonationalism in Cyprus, thus ethnic conflict. With the changing social, economic, administrative, and political dimensions of Cyprus society, the majority of the Turkish Cypriots started to feel like they are the underdogs, victims, unwanted, and innocents of the island while representing Greek Cypriots as persecutors and unreliable. This situation can be clearly seen in the memoirs of the first generation of Turkish Cypriots.

For instance, Hanife, 1949, nationalist separatist, gives a hint about the unequal economic situation between Turkish and Greek Cypriots and stresses the unreliability of Greek Cypriots by saying that

My father was a shepherd, and the Greek merchants would buy all his animals. We were so poor, but sometimes we would buy something from them. We used to trade, so we lived without fear until the 60s. Then *gavur* obsessed with Enosis. For example, we used to work with the Greeks together in the port. There were no problems between them and us, while they would go their jobs together in the harbor during the day, but Greeks would go to raid Turkish villages at night. That is to say; they were secretly organized from the inside, and we didn't know anything. Ever since the time of working together and trading in the port, they had been preparing for war against us: such an unwillingness to live together, my daughter.

Melda, 1952, separatist, who repeatedly mentions about her family's poverty also stresses Greek Cypriots' unwillingness of Turkish Cypriots' presence on the island;

One day my deceased father went to the Greek field to plow his vineyards. Do you know what the Greek owner of the vineyard did say to my father? He said that one day they would wake up and exile all the Turks from here. My father responded, 'If it is so, you have the intention to kill us, I am taking my ox and

go away from your field. 'Come on, uncle Cumali, don't do it, I was just joking,' he begged to my father to finish his vineyard, but my father never went there again. They always called the Turks to plow their fields and vineyards because Greek workers wanted more money than us. How can I tell you, for example, The Greeks would ask for two Turkish liras for the same work that we did. So, Greek owners knew that we were poor and that we had to do the job for one lira.

She continues by saying that how Greek Cypriots' plans about having the whole island by themselves made the situation more unbearable for Turkish Cypriots,

The Greeks always wanted to keep us low. They put up a side against us because they wished to Cyprus to always be theirs. They made their whole plans according to this. In my old village, they would not repair the roads, and they did not even let us do. Besides, they did not wire electricity to our village; it came to our village in 74, thanks to Turkey.

One of the things that surface in those examples is that the Turkish Cypriots are unaware of the Greek Cypriot plans for the future of the island without the presence of them. In other words, according to them, they continued their relations with Greek Cypriots naively and innocently without being aware of what is going on.

Eda stresses the victimization of the Turkish Cypriots by underscoring their naivete and not knowing anything about Greek Cypriot's sneaky plans about Turkish Cypriots 's memory that illustrates they cannot understand how the ethnic conflict started suddenly by Greek Cypriots is one of the best examples of this situation;

Well, most brutal things started at the time of EOKA in the 58s. They did not want us since the 58s until this time. EOKA war broke out in the 58s, and they first killed people among themselves, then they started attacking us. I told you, we didn't know anything about it, we were like a naive. For example, my husband worked with Greeks a lot, he was construction worker, and he worked for them a lot. There was no such thing, no such dispute between us back then. But how can we know their real plans, what would they feed on us from the employer, we did not know anyway. They harbored hostility, or there was something we did not realize that led the breaking out of this war. Nevertheless, they've always been angry with us; they wouldn't even look at our faces back then when we went to their homes to work. Since then, we have suffered from this persecution and untrustworthiness of the Greeks. They are all guilty. We didn't attack them; they started to attack us.

Apart from those who said that the Turkish Cypriots did not know anything about what was going on and that if the Greek Cypriots did not harm them, no problem would arise between them, some of the interviewees of this generation assert that there had

always been a subtle mutual averseness between the two communities. Kadriye, 1943, centralist, two-state solutionist, expresses her meaning-making about this situation by underscoring the fact that they know that the Turks and Greeks of Cyprus are different from each other and that no matter how close they are, they cannot trust each other completely.

There would always be commerce between us, but we always knew that they are Greeks, different from us, and would not like Turks, my daughter. You know, pig's skin wouldn't be a good leather, so *gavur* would not be a good friend. Despite knowing this, we were still neighbors, but we would always say they would not be our friends. They were worse in this regard. They used to curse us a lot, very much. They called us dog Turks, Sillo Turko. For example, we used to make our religious holidays, and they made their own Easter; we used to do our Muslim things, and they used to do their Christian things. And we would say they are Greeks and cannot be the same with our Turkish neighbors. Turks and Greeks are different. We have always been closer to our Turkish neighbors, and that despite how close we are our Greek neighbors, we knew that we could not trust them.

It is worth mentioning here that each participant of this generation called the Greek Cypriots as *gavur* and represents themselves as victims and Greek Cypriots as unreliable perpetrators. This becomes clear particularly, even the Turkish Cypriots, who lived in common villages, did business together, had familiar environments and conditions for reasons such as school and work, thus, had a few good experiences together before the ethnic conflicts broke out, prefer to remember the past by emphasizing the bad qualities of the Greek Cypriots and victimization of the Turkish Cypriots. Derya's indifference to the favor of the Greek Cypriots who warned them against the possibility of ethnic conflicts and perhaps saved their lives and disposition to homogenized the whole Greek Cypriots as the oppressors can be a good example. She tells that

My husband used to work in the South, my daughter. One day, the Greek who he was working for said to him that 'my friend, there is nothing bad for you here, but if you want, go, no matter what, these things can also be done to you, and I cannot protect you.' So I guess we ran away from our village a week or three days later. They wouldn't want us, my daughter. So they all started not wanting like this at all. Everyone was talking that they would come and kill us. They used to say we need to run away, get rid of it. We have always lived with these fears. Although there was no attack on our village, 4-5 Turk villages from the surrounding came to our village and settled down. I remember what they lived through from their eyes, from what they told us. They ran away from

Greeks; they were scared because they were few. They sheltered our village so Greeks could not kill themselves.

Thus, they state that all that they had gone through caused resentment towards the Greek Cypriots. Hanife expresses why she still feels such resentment to the Greek Cypriots with her memory from 1974;

These Greeks burned all our hospitals before 74. Oh, you see this house of mine when you came, the other big part of it, we made it a hospital, and one room became a delivery room. On the first day of the Peace Operation, we had four martyrs here. On the same day, four boys were also born; four martyrs, four newborn boys, what an incredible thing! I've had these pains a lot. So, ask me all of them, what does Greek Cypriot mean, what torment they inflicted on us, ask me. That's why I hate them a lot, and I want the youth not to forget that they did all the massacres anyway. We were just the victims. Nobody should forget that.

Later in her interview, Hanife said to me to turn off the tape recorder because she does not want what she will say to be recorded. After the tape recorder was shut down, she admitted that not only the Turkish Cypriots but also the Greek Cypriots were the victims of the war. She talked about how the Turkish soldiers raped a charming Greek girl on the street after four Turkish Cypriots who were martyred in 1974, that her clothes and herself were torn, and that she and a few of her neighbors gave her clothes while she was lying down unconsciously in the street. Two more incidents, like the situation I had with Hanife, took place during the interviews. They all did not want to express anything that could represent the Greek Cypriots as who also suffered during ethnic conflicts and victims. Instead, they acknowledged either when the tape recorder was turned off or implicitly that Greek Cypriots also had 'bad experiences' during 1974, by saying "they also suffered some pain," or "we got our revenge."

It is essential that three out of ten participants implicitly acknowledge that the Greek Cypriots also suffered and that none of the others resort to such a narrative while remembering the past. In other words, the majority of the participants tend to homogenize the Greek Cypriots as perpetrators and guilty while homogenizing themselves as victims and innocents. Thus, their resentment and state of distrust are reactive, legitimate, just, never changing, and continuous. For instance, Eda, 1945, nationalist separatist, also expresses her legitimate and just resentment through her

inferences about Greek Cypriots' being unreliable and suspicious with more recent memory which dated back to 2003,

For example, they came here to see their old houses after the openings of the doors.³¹⁷ I host them, wined and dined them. But for example, how many times they came to my house, I opened my doors wide to them so they could see their old houses. But they didn't do the same. They are also surprised when they arrive. Some of them said how beautiful you had made the house, you have changed it. Well, I did, of course, but they still don't believe that I, as a Turk, can make a good and successful thing. Do you understand my daughter, how they look down on us? Anyway, the last time when they were leaving, one of them said that he would come back and make travel plans for all of us. Then he neither came nor went again. I do not know what his intention was, but he did not come back. I think he was an old member of EOKA because we heard later that his brother was in the massacres of Maratha, Santalaris, and Aloda (Muratağa, Sandallar ve Atlılar). So, my daughter, Greeks are like this; they are unreliable. Look, we still do not know who he was, what he was, what his purpose was.

Derya, 1945, humanist, explains the legitimate ground of homogenizing the whole Greek Cypriots as unreliable by asserting that even some Greek Cypriots, whom they think they are close to or can get along with, cannot be trusted as follows;

My husband was from Pyrga, and his village remained in the South. We went to his village after the doors were opened. He hugged with some of his childhood friends; they cried and saddened to what happened to our beautiful island. Even some of his friends cried by saying that we wouldn't want this war. But we can't know what people really think and how they feel inside. He says something else, but he does another, you know my daughter. For example, a son of one of them came during the conversation; a little boy of 5 or 6 years old. He suddenly said in Greek, the dog Turk, Şillo Turko in Greek, and shouted to my husband, why did you come here? His father ran towards him and took him to shut up. Of course, my husband was quite surprised. He asked his friend, what do you teach children that he called me a dog? So, you talk about us in this way at home, and the child called me a dog? His friend said no, but my husband was insistent. He replied again, 'Then how did he know this? I wonder if the teachers prejudice them against us at school?' His friend said no, again. That is the story. They used to call us dog Turks, Şillo Turko. They wouldn't like us, they would see us like dogs, they would see like animals, do you

³¹⁷ All of the participants described the opening of the Ledra Place border as opening of 'the doors'. For this reason, it will be written as opening of the doors rather than opening of the borders to stay loyal to participants' preferred use.

understand, my daughter? They have always calculated sneakingly to get rid of us, to clean all the Şillo Turko from our island.

In a similar vein, Kadriye emphasizes on that mutual coexistence ended by the rising cruelty of Greek Cypriots upon Turkish Cypriots and says that

I was born in Polis, my daughter. It was a mixed village with the Greeks, and it was a very civilized village. We used to greet the Greeks, eat (sunflower) seeds together in the evenings, our neighborhood was quite lovely. For instance, Greeks used to come to my grandmother's house, saying 'sister, sister Emine.' We had a good life there back then, but unfortunately, there emerged a conflict with the Greeks at the end. More precisely, they started to attack us, my daughter. We did not do anything; we didn't have a gun. If the British catch weapons, its punishment was execution. You cannot count how many people they killed in Polis; they even killed their best friends just because they are Turkish. I know it is unbelievable, but it is what it is.

Müşfik, 1939, separatist, also agrees with Kadriye and depicts her willingness to make the memories of the times of coexistence invisible with her accusing attitude to Greek Cypriots in terms of emphasizing Greek Cypriots' never-ending unwillingness to share the island with the Turkish Cypriots,

We got involved before 63. There was also a neighborhood, and we used to sit and drink together. I also had Greek friends. When we went out to graze our goats and sheep, the girls, talking about her Greek Cypriot friends, would come and sit, and in the evening, everyone would return their homes. But do you know my daughter, when did the Greeks show us that they never wanted us in this island, and we will never live together again? Referendum time. They did not want to share with us what they have, and this island. So they don't want equality. They would have wanted to be our masters and managers. They only wanted us to live under them, rather than living like brothers. They don't like us. We were neighbors, we were together, but they would never want us to live with them snakingly. Good things happened together, but they are not important; the suffering we go through is essential. The war is not right, my daughter, but we did not start any of them. We didn't do anything, my daughter, we only responded to them and wanted to save our lives.

It can be said that all the ten participants of this generation have the same willingness to make the memories of the times of coexistence invisible. This willingness grounds and legitimizes itself upon the narrative of portraying all Greek Cypriots as perpetrators by homogenizing them. Meanwhile, the homogenizing of Greek Cypriots by the participants of this generation go hand in hand with the practice of stereotyping, which also "linked to the notions of inclusion and exclusion, ideas about coexistence and separation, and categorical distinctions about ourselves (the in-group) and others

(the out-group).”³¹⁸ To be specific, without any distinction in terms of if they do have memories of coexistence or not, the participants of this generation tend to homogenize and stereotyping the whole Greek Cypriots and ignore the times of coexistence or emphasize on that there always had been a subtle mutual averseness between the two communities; they know that the Turks and Greeks of Cyprus are different from each other and that no matter how close they are, they cannot trust each other completely.

Furthermore, the participants of this generation's willingness to make memories of their time together invisible are sometimes reflected in their warning advice to their grandchildren to protect them from the unreliable 'nature' of Greek Cypriots. Melda, 1952, separatist, expresses her wish not only to warn her grandchild about the unreliability of Greek Cypriots but also to prevent her from participating in any joint event with Greek Cypriots.

What am I telling you, my daughter, we were neighbors, we knew each other, still look at what they did to us? My grandchildren lived apart from them, and they didn't even see any Greeks before the doors were opened. Think about it, if some of them get angry with my grandchildren one day, who knows what they can do. I don't let my grandchildren go to such mixed activities with Greeks; I do not allow my daughter, I do not!

Tahsin, 1941, federalist, agrees with Melda and even says he advise his grandson to use a few tactics that he used to implemented to protect himself from them,

I sometimes try them when we go to the South. My wife is from a mixed village, so she knows the Greeks. For example, she pretends not to understand what the Greeks are talking about; nevertheless, we pay attention to what they are talking about. If they say something wrong about Turks or us, then I'll make a scene. I would say that are you an EOKA member or what? Why did you tell these things to me? Go to Hell! You still deal with us.' Now we charge it to Murat that does not trust Greek Cypriots because you never know what the man will do. He is friends with you, but you don't know what he did later. Look what they did to us. They shot us from behind, isn't it, my daughter?

The situation is quite complicated for the Turkish Cypriots who did not live in mixed villages, had little interaction with Greek Cypriots, or saw a Greek Cypriot for the first

³¹⁸ Maria Hadjipavlou, “Inter-Ethnic Stereotypes, Neighbourliness, Separation: Paradoxes And Challenges In Cyprus,” *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 13, no. 2 (2003): pp. 281-318, 282.

time after the doors opened because the memory narratives of them developed on the victimization of Turkish Cypriots and unreliability of Greek Cypriots based on myths.

Three of the six participants who fit this profile mentioned the same story about Greek Cypriots. Hanife tells the story of stepping on the shadow of someone,³¹⁹ which has become mythical from ear to ear among Turkish Cypriots who have little contact with Greek Cypriots, neither in the past nor in the present:

Now look, a Turkish neighbor and a Greek neighbor were friends that what they ate and drink didn't go apart. They raised their children together, and so on. When his neighbor was on his deathbed, and he said to ours that he would confess something to you before he dies. 'We were so good, we were neighbors, we had no problem, but you would go ahead, and I would come after you, I couldn't do anything to you, but I would always step on your shadow, he said. This is how we are told about the unreliability of Greek Cypriots, and it is known as such among us. Greeks could not be our friends ever.

Tahsin, used almost the same story to emphasize the unreliability of the Greek Cypriots. He asserts that

Look, this is the story of one of ours. The man said that they were so much like brothers. Nobody would do anything to each other because they loved each other so much. One day, the Greek called the man and said, 'brother,' he said. 'I loved you so much,' but he said, 'still I would step on your shadow. I stepped on your shadow as I couldn't do anything to you.' He said I would step on your shadow, not you. That's why my daughter, pig's skin wouldn't be a good leather, so gavur would not be a good friend. No way because they are very unreliable.

The crucial point is here to underline the effectiveness of these stories, that is uncertain, upon the remembrance narratives of individuals about the unreliability of Greek Cypriots. Argenti and Schramm assert that even false memories that are resulting from uncertain stories are considered as real ones by their narrators with their real emotive and political salience with which these memories can be endowed and deployed.³²⁰ Therefore, even if half of the participants did not live with the Greek Cypriots or had one-to-one personal experiences and memories of ethnic conflict, they ground their

³¹⁹ Stepping on the shadow of someone is an idiom used in the sense of cunningness, doing something behind someone's back snakingly, and unreliability.

³²⁰ Nicolas Argenti and Katharina Schramm, "Introduction: Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission," 2.

similar memory narratives with participants who have lived in shared villages with Greek Cypriots or had war memories in person upon uncertain stories like 'stepping on the shadow of someone.'

On the whole, The Turkish Cypriots were in a passive position in the narratives of the participants so far, which emphasized the bad characteristics of the Greek Cypriots and the emergence of ethnic conflict on the island as a result of their antagonistic attitudes towards Turkish Cypriots. That is to say, Turkish Cypriots were portrayed as those who were unaware of the plans made by Greek Cypriots, unwanted, humiliated, and desperate because of their material conditions on the island, rather Greek Cypriots as unreliable perpetrators.

5.2.2 Remembering the Process: Transforming from Victims to Heroes

This sub-section will basically describe how the memory narratives of the participants of this generation changed from reactivity to the activeness. In other words, this changing attitude ground itself upon the idea that how Turkish Cypriots responded heroically to the cruelty of Greek Cypriots and became heroes of their brand-new heroic history with the help of a Turkey despite Greek Cypriots' constant victimization of them.

Kadriye emphasizes how proud she is for being a Turkish Cypriot because they resisted against the cruelty of Greek Cypriots like heroes while also regarding the naivete of the Turkish Cypriots,

Being a Turkish Cypriot is an excellent, very honorable thing because we, the Turkish Cypriots, endured and resisted my daughter. We were so few with our three or five mujahids in Cyprus back then, but we still held out. There were eighty thousand Turks, but the Greeks were three hundred thousand. We have fought with our mujahedeen against Greeks; we did not surrender and fought.

Melda describes in a more detailed way how Turkish Cypriots became heroes by fighting against the antagonistic act of Greek Cypriots which were mostly referred to the act of killing the Turkish Cypriots, and says that

That is to say; we killed the Greeks too. It was no bad to kill us back then, but did it becomes wrong when we killed? They would cut off people's feet after

they killed them so they could not be seen from the cars. They would bring them and throw them into the stream. But they don't tell what happened, they only prefer to tell what we did to them in 1974. Yes, we also killed them, but we have to, we have to fight against them. By doing so, they could not achieve their ambition to have the island for themselves ultimately and to expel the Turks from the island, and we became the heroes of our nation, you know, my daughter.

It can be said that transforming from victims to heroes also implies that transforming from murdered ones into 'reactive' murderer ones because they had to. In this sense, they legitimize what they did to Greek Cypriots as an act of self-defense; namely, killing someone becomes heroic when Turkish Cypriots do it, but it becomes cruel action that to be fought in return when Greek Cypriots do it.

The common point of all participants in this changing remembering narrative is representing Turkey and military intervention made by Turkey in 1974 as the saviors of Turkish Cypriots. For instance, Kadriye underlines the fact that Turkish Cypriots' courage to fight is a reciprocal relationship with their hope and longing for Turkey to come to help them,

We started to fight against Greek Cypriots by ourselves, but we were also aware of the material conditions that could make us weak against them, so we expect Turkey to come, we believed in Turkey. Then, we did not leave our hometown, Cyprus, together with Turkey, and we are very proud that we fought like heroes.

Hanife, 1949, nationalist and separatist, extends the narratives about Turkish Cypriot's hope and longing for Turkey to come to help them by again underscoring the persecutions of the Greek Cypriots, and says that

We waited a long time for the Turkish soldiers to arrive in 1974. Perhaps they would not imagine what cruelty we are suffering, raping our girls, burning houses. When they saw these, they believed that Turkish Cypriots were persecuted so much. Then the Turkish soldiers also get blinded by anger, burned, and destroyed everything. In a way, we were asked to account for what they did from 1963 to 1974. But war is war, my daughter. War is bad. But if someone attacks you, would you stand and wait? You wouldn't expect, would you?

From a similar point, Kadriye stresses her gratitude to Turkey, while also emphasizing on both her distrust to the Greek Cypriots and the difference between her life before and after 1974,

We have no trust in the Greeks. We have not heard a gunshot after 74. Long live, Turkey! After the Greeks, Turkey made us very comfortable. We are very pleased with Turkey. That is to say, and we Turks make an epic history then. No one expected this much from us, including me. We never say yes to the Greek administration again.

At this point, it is important to emphasize how exactly the process mentioned at the beginning of this section is depicted. This process is described in a very linear and chronological way. The military intervention of Turkey in 1974 is depicted as a reference point or a milestone for the new history of Turkish Cypriots. “Within this context, the Turkish invasion of 1974 is remembered as a “peace operation” that prevented Turkish Cypriots from being killed by right-wing forces that temporarily took power; it also ended over a decade of life under virtual siege.”³²¹ In other words, Turkey's intervention to the island as a savior had turned already started reactive but failed to come to a conclusion struggle of Turkish Cypriots into a victory on behalf of Turkish Cypriots. Thus, the victory of 1974 was regarded as the milestone of history, in which Turkish Cypriots began to write from scratch as a winner, not as an oppressed, in their remembrance narratives.

Eda in the following words emphasizes her gratitude to Turkey by clearly comparing the conditions of the Turkish Cypriots before and after 1974,

Well, if the border is removed, either we will eat them, or they will eat us, I don't know, I will be safer separately. If the border is removed, the war will come out again. Turkey came and rescued us. If Turkey did not come, they would kill us all. If he hadn't bombed him, if he hadn't done these, we would all have gone. They were going to dishonor women, and they were going to kill the young people, we don't know what our end would be. What did we have in the past? We lived in misery. Now we have everything; our water, our electricity, our homes. These are enough for us. Let us stay here, and they're there. That is good.

The participants, who began to describe 1974 as a turning point or a milestone, thus, dividing the history into before and after 1974, also state that it will not be possible to live together with Greek Cypriots again thanks to this newly written heroic history of

³²¹ Jim Bowman, “Seeing What’s Missing in Memories of Cyprus,” 124.

them and that they will not need to live together because Turks are strong and self-sufficient now. To be specific, even though participants of this generation is stricter than other participants in terms of believing the need to remember the past and retell what the Turkish Cypriots had experienced to their grandchildren, they also emphasize that there is no need to stay in the past because the Turkish Cypriots gloriously sowed the seeds of their history in 1974. Besides, they assert that they do not need the Greek Cypriots in their new history because they believe that their security is more important than living together, and they are self-sufficient. For instance, Tahsin emphasizes that Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots can no longer live together and that all Turkish Cypriots want to live on their own because they are now self-sufficient;

They never accepted us. The Greek Cypriots want everything this island has just for themselves. Because we were a minority, and they wouldn't want to share the island with us. They wanted to share it with Greece. Now leaders are meeting again in Germany, but nothing will come out of these meetings. I promise you if they wish to, they can take more land for themselves, but everyone should stay on their side. Let us roast our lungs with our fat, let them do whatever they want, so they leave us alone.

5.3 Remembering to Forget the Past and to Justify Their Belief in the Need to Live Separately in the Future

As can be seen from the previous sub-section, Turkey's military operation to the island is also considered as a milestone for the future of the Turkish Cypriots. Consequently, memory narratives of this generation begin to emphasize another feature of remembering with this milestone. To put differently, rather than only reinterpreting the past retrospectively by taking 1974 as a reference point, memory narratives of the participants are also interested in future aspirations about living separately with Greek Cypriots by also taking the victory of 1974 as a turning point for their future. , they make an interrelation between what they had experienced in the hot conflict period and how they make sense of that experiences retrospectively to justify their belief in the need to live separately.

In addition to this, their belief in the need to live separately in the future coincide with their aims of remembering. Considering these, when they were asked about whether

they prefer to have a conversation with their descendants about what had experienced as a Turkish Cypriots regarding the ethnic conflict, understandable responses were made to justify their future aspirations. For instance, Melda sets her tone straight about what she thinks about remembering the past. She clearly points out that whenever she can find a chance to tell her grandchildren about what they had experienced, she would gladly do it:

Sometimes when the family came together, I told them my stories. My grandchildren say 'I will write a book with your memories grandmother.' I always tell them what I had been through.

Nonetheless, she also stresses that the Turkish Cypriots should remember to forget the devastating past before 1974,

I tell my memories to my grandchildren frequently but to tell them there is no way back. I mean what we suffered was enough for us; we wouldn't want to go back. I want my grandchildren to know what we have experienced in the past, but I also want to forget the past—no need to be in the past, my daughter. We rewrote our history with the Peace Operation. It is better to proceed from there.

Eda, who was born and raised in the Southern Part of Cyprus with the Greek Cypriots, indicates that she is a nationalist-separatist now because she can never trust the Greek Cypriots again after what she experienced and saw in the time of ethnic conflict. Besides, Eda boldly prefers to speak on behalf of all Turkish Cypriots. Thus, she says that

I want everyone to know that the Turk has no friends, but enemies. So, we cannot erase this from our minds after all that happened. Let's go and make peace with them and hug them or something; I personally do not want to. I'm happier on this side. I know that if we live again together, I'm going to live there in fear, so I'm more comfortable here.

Considering the answers given by the interviewees on this subject, it can be said that whether or not people belonging to this generation among the interviewees have had past experience of living together and they had personally clashed with the Greek Cypriots during the period of active conflict, they both argue that trying to live together in the future is dangerous and unlikely for them. As a result, they state that both groups should continue to live in separate ways even if the border disappeared. For example, Melda asserts that

No, we know its pain, no, they shouldn't let us unite. Partition is right for all of us. We don't want them. What do we do by living together? So what we

suffered so far is enough for us. You know that my father used to plow in the fields from morning to night. A stick in one hand, a sling in the other, he would come and go on their grounds. He would go home at night and stay awake to guard us against the Greeks. Turkey came and has made peace for us. We don't want anything else.

Tahsin's words, who has always voted for the CTP and calls himself a federalist, supports the above arguments,

Those who did not see those times of war say peace for Cyprus. They say, let's live together as Greeks and Turks, let's work together, let us go and work there and vice versa, etc. They say Cyprus should be mixed because they did not see what we experienced. We don't want it because we saw it. Why have we been stuck on that side for years, living under an embargo? If I could not escape, if I stayed on that side, they would have killed me. I mean, they weren't our enemies either, but we started to sense that they were going to do something to us. Is there such a friendship, such a brotherhood, my daughter? They began to come together, to come to our side more and to watch around. It turned out they were getting ready to kill us. I do not want to live together. For me, this is the peace that we live right now. Nobody teases anyone; everyone is on their side, and peaceful now. They are not friendly. We have no friends but us on this island. Would a nation that does not live have a history? We were able to survive and get rid of them so that we could write our own history in 1974. I don't want my daughter; I don't.

As a final example of this discussion, it is crucial to note that two people from this generation represent themselves as humanists so that their tone about how they represent the Greek Cypriots is partially different from other participants. However, it is worth mentioning that their meaning makings about what they had experienced in terms of remembering the past and future of the island resembles with other ones. For instance, Derya signifies that

I always tell my grandchildren. I say, please don't hold a grudge against them, but do not forget that we are Turks and what we have experienced, and always consider the interests of Turks. I don't tell the things like we were friends, we lived together, etc. Why should I confuse my grandchildren's mind? Not necessary. If you live what I live, you will never want these people, my daughter. The children were left without a father; it was not easy, right? However, I always say them to remember for the Turks, for our nation, not for a grudge. I remember, but not out of hatred. For our own nation, and for not to forget what the Turkish Cypriot is. This is important; my daughter, this is important. I explain everything like a Turkish Cyprus, you understand? I will tell you about our pain; it is essential to say to them. I don't know if it is from the brain, but I am more inclined to remember bad things about Greeks.

5.4 Second Generation Turkish Cypriots: Remembering Their Ruptured Lives and Losing Hope for the Future

The second generation participating in this thesis doesn't have primary memory about 1963 due to their age. Nevertheless, most of them have distinct memories about the period between the 1970s and 1983 in which they were in their early childhood and adolescence. Since the importance of this period in the history of the Turkish Cypriots is inevitable regarding the fact that the Turkish Cypriot community lived through the process of drastic political, social, economic, and demographic transformations with events such as the military intervention of Turkey in 1974, the actual division of the island into two, and the establishment of TRNC in 1983, it can be said that those transformations effected mostly the memory narratives of this generation. In other words, those drastic changes and events reflected upon the lives and memory narratives of this generation as a rupture and “as a severe disruption to their lives”³²² in terms of how their childhood and adolescence were wasted. Thus, when they asked about their memories about the past in terms of ethnic conflict, they intended to mention the period between 1974 - 1983 and 1983 – 2004, and how these periods had ruptured their lives.

Hamza, 1963, nationalist separatist, describes how difficult and fragmented his childhood and the years that followed were for him filled with feelings of sadness and pessimism. He states that

My father was martyred in 1963, he was taken from the road, and his grave was not found for 52 years. Later, upon the confession of a Greek, they were found in a pit in Karaoğlanoğlu with his friend and cars. 52 years later! I was 3, my sister was 1.5, and my mother was 24 years old when my father died at the age of 28. This is how I started my life; at war. Continuous conflict; 1963-64, 1966-67, followed by 74, but we have never lived through those times without a guarantee of peace or a future. We lived in tents for 11 years. We were half hungry and half full, a generation fed by various international aid such as the Red Crescent or Red Cross, our so-called home was a tent or a sheet house with mud-brick walls. Thousands of people lived like this for years. My childhood

³²² Monika Palmberger, “Ruptured Pasts and Captured Futures: Life Narratives in Postwar Mostar,” *Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 66 (2013): pp. 14-24, 19.

passed under those circumstances and trenches. Very heavy prices were paid, and serious pain was suffered; it was a serious wing.

Göksel, 1966, social democrat federalist, also describes how ruptured the life of his generation is clearly,

I belong to a generation whose whole life coincided with the post-war period. So, as I said to you before, 1974, 1983, and the referendum deeply affected my life. Why? 40-45 years have passed, we still could not come up with a solution. Politicians who always base our daily life, our policies, and our lives on the idea that the Greeks are the evils and what they did to us before 1974 was terrible, has always been on our agenda. They have tried to impose these on us, and we naturally have taken them, we have absorbed many of them. Lots of unworthy or bad events happened to us since our childhood. The reason for what happened to us has continuously been changing for me; the Greeks, our own leaders, Turkey, England, and Greece. It was said that what was done has always been for our safety, or maybe that's how they tried to justify their policies. Our lives are already shattered, and never will be a better situation.

His words could be considered as a very crystal-clear representation of how the ethnic conflict and the political events that took place afterward affected their lives as a rupture. At the same time, the fact that their lives are in a state of constant rupture and therefore never got in a good way, as they say, has made them hesitant about what kind of a remembering narrative they should develop about the Cyprus ethnic conflict.

Melek, 1967, centralist, two-state solutionist, opens explicitly up the situation that Goksel speaks about not being able to live their childhood due to ethnic conflict and the political and social changes that followed. She remembers a primary school memory by emphasizing that her generation did not have a classic childhood life because of the war. She narrates her memory as such,

We studied the 1st and the 2nd grade in the same year. So it was a time when not much was taught in schools because all the teachers were mujahids so that they would serve until the morning. Sometimes they would come to class in the mornings, write the multiplication table on the board and say that learn it yourself, and leave. For example, our female teachers used to help the soldiers at work and sew gloves for the mujahids. Then things broke out, and I was removed from the school. Our whole lives passed with fear and uncertainty, always running around. I feel like our life wasted like this. In other words, a small and unobtrusive society; always closed, like a prisoner, detached from the world, abandoned. We grew up like that. How old am I now, my life still passes in uncertainty because we have not found any solution yet.

One of the distinctive features of above-mentioned memory narratives is that no matter what they are talking about, and no matter how they occasionally change their tones about the subjects, which later on it will be explained by their situation of being in limbo, one thing they are all sure is that their lives were ruptured, and they could not find a chance to survive this situation by this time and do not have a hope for the future.

Göksel clearly explains this situation of being always in the mood of rupture by emphasizing how his early childhood is ruptured, and then his life never survived as such,

The oldest and unforgettable memory of mine is about 1974. I remember when Makarios was overthrown on July 15, we fled outside our village to find a safe place. This is something that cannot be erased from my memory, the fear I had that day. My mother, father, sister, and I went to hide at the root of a tree outside our village. Everything started with the fear of that day. It has continued with fear, uncertainty, disappointment, and despair because nothing has changed, and we continued to be torn by the political events. The last disappointment of mine in this context was the referendum. Then, my whole hope has gone.

Hamza expresses his feeling of losing hope by emphasizing that he even cannot decide who he is and where he belongs to,

I have no hope for the future. I promise you; I waited for 45 years with hope in case better things will happen. My life is over, my children are grown up, maybe I will have grandchildren, but I don't have a feeling of hope right now; there is no reason yet to happen. Two world wars are over, millions of people died, atomic bombs were dropped, the deal table was settled, and it was all over. Everyone looked ahead and walked through their future; everyone gained a status. Forty-five years passed over the Cyprus issue, and we still don't know who we are. We are not citizens of Turkey or Cyprus, but in fact, we carry both citizenships in a limited manner. The treatment to me is not the same as the treatment to the 'real' citizens of these two. Since I am a citizen of the Republic of Cyprus, we were a common republic in 60 years, but the primary owners of the citizenship of the Republic of Cyprus are now the Greeks in official practice, I am also a 'parasite' citizen in there who can only benefit from freedom of travel, not even from international aids and fundings. This is such a state of limbo that we, the Turkish Cypriots, have a presence in the world, yes the world know that we exist, but that's all.

It is evident that the participants of this generation tend to create their memory narratives about the past, present, and future of the island by emphasizing that how their lives continuously have been ruptured until today. As can be seen from the above narratives, this tendency is expressed in a discourse in which they stress that they have

lost hope for themselves and their futures. For instance, Kadir, 1969, federalist, stresses his losing hope for the future by reinterpreting the effects of ethnic conflict and economic embargos in his life as a rupture,

I always think about what this island, my life, the life of my children and relatives would have look like if there had been no war. My children would not dream of living in another country if there were no embargoes, unemployment, and uncertainties here today. My brothers would not immigrate to England. If Varosha had been open today, we would have made trillions from that land. For example, I work at the port. We have very little work with low salaries due to the embargo, but the Greeks are not like that. Three and a half million tourists come to the other side of Famagusta port every year. Look, three and a half million! The hotels and beaches we have are more beautiful, but we have an embargo, they do not. Thus, tourists prefer to go there. If there were no war, maybe we would have developed more. We would improve a lot. You know, they say, every war, every military coup takes a country back twenty years. We experienced it exactly. I don't want anything for my own broken life anymore. I want my children not to be thrown away throughout this uncertainty.

The critical point to be emphasized at this point is that their memory narratives start to differ from their parent, albeit by being indecisive. As mentioned earlier, their families were very clear about who the Turks of Cyprus is, which troubles what they had experienced and survived, and to whom they need to be grateful. However, the participants of this generation state that they are not sure about almost any of the issues that their families are sure of because of the fact that their entire lives are ruptured, and as a result, they live with never-ending disappointments and despair. This situation causes the differentiation upon memory narratives of them and their families in terms of the cause of the Cyprus problem, who is responsible for the ethnic conflict, and the future of the island.

5.4.1 Being in Limbo

This section will focus on how the Turkish Cypriots, who are members of the second generation of their families, represent that they are in limbo by their chosen memory narratives. To be specific, these memory narratives are characterized by two distinct narratives that are not knowing who should be blamed and emphasizing the roles of other factors in ethnic conflict while humanizing the Greek Cypriots.

5.4.1.1 Who Should be Blamed to?

Hatice, 1972, humanist, clearly states that she is in limbo in terms of who is to blame for the cause of ethnic conflict. She states that,

How can I tell you, my feelings are very complicated. Who is guilty, who is the victim, who is responsible, what I remember or don't remember are all mixed up. Terrible things happened. For example, Turkish children were going out, and their families would warn them to don't speak Turkish and be quiet. Children were afraid to play outside. We were stuck in a closed place, and we could not go out. There were Turkish people who were killed alive. There were mass graves; some of them have only just been discovered. We have experienced all of these. Of course, I would like these experiences of mine to be known by my children. On the other hand, I don't want any kind of war or even a fireworks explosion here anymore. I still have fear and anxiety about if something will happen when we cross the border. On the other hand, I do not want to feel a grudge against anyone because we felt hatred, we hoped, but nothing has changed either way. Thus, I would like to look ahead, but I'm afraid on the one hand.

Hatice clearly states that she can't decide who is guilty and who is not, and who is responsible for the emergence of the ethnic conflict on the island. By doing so, she also admits that she cannot create a proper remembering narrative because she states that she doesn't even know what she must remember and forget. She does not hesitate to describe what happened during the period of active ethnic conflict in describing her indecision or the state of limbo; however, she does not portray Greek Cypriots as enemies to blame as her parents do. She underlines that not portraying Greek Cypriots as enemies is also a very conscious choice, by stating that she no longer wants to see more conflict on the island. In other words, no matter how much bad experiences of ethnic conflict with Greek Cypriots she has, she prefers not to blame Greek Cypriots or portray them as ultimate enemies of Turkish Cypriots when she retrospectively and intentionally remembers the past and creates her narrative of the past because she doesn't want her life to break down and ruptured anymore.

In a similar vein with Hatice, Melek appeals to elementary school memory to indicate that she has been in limbo between her own subjective meaning makings and nationalist discourse propagated to them at school,

Every year, our schools would take us to visit the Museum of Barbarism. It was different from how it looks like today. At that time, traces of blood, bloody

clothes, bullet marks on the walls, and brain parts of the people were everywhere. It was a very horrible experience for me to visit there. I remember the first visit of mine, and I was so scared. When I think about those visits retrospectively, it's actually not appropriate for a child of that age to see something terrible like that. We grew up playing what happened in there in every 1963 commemorations. You know, the child hugged his mother, his grandmother hugged the children, they trembled. When I was in elementary school, I used to think about Bath Massacre a lot when I slept. Maybe my mother wouldn't even know that I used to think about by myself at night. Anyway, I would say to myself that the Greek soldier went into a house, looked and saw the Turkish uniform hanging on the wall, he got scared and shot at the moving things under the sheet. I mean, I would say he didn't kill them knowing that there were children. Those were the times there was no other subject in the country; Turks say a Turk is worth the world, Greeks say something else. Thus, I thought that way secretly because I felt these pressures very much above me in my childhood. My parents told a lot about the tortures they saw from the Greeks. I have been very influenced by what I was told. For example, I think like this, but if I hear something about those times, I will cry again and again.

It would not be wrong to say that all of the participants, who are members of the second generation of their families, formed a remembering narrative similar to those of Melek and Selma. In other words, the other eight participants also stated that their parents and the education they received at school pictured Greek Cypriots as unreliable others and responsible for what happened on the island. And as a result, they added that they lived a large part of their lives with a fear of Greek Cypriots and portraying Greek Cypriots as non-human creatures that can do harm to them as their families did, but they state that they don't portray Greek Cypriots as they did before.

In addition to the above-mentioned discussion, another point that should be emphasized is that even if they give up to portray the Greek Cypriots as enemies and responsible for what happened on the island, they stated that the state of limbo that they have been in since their childhood still left them indecisive about the future of the island and what to think about their future relations with Greek Cypriots. Selma, for example, states how she is still undecided about both their future relations with Greek Cypriots and thus the future of the island, as such

Since our village is a Turkish one, so it was kept on guard so that the Greeks would not come and enter. For example, my father used to be on guard duty as a mujahid after a certain hour in the night. During my childhood, I did not see my father at night. There has never been a Greek attack on our village, but when we saw our fathers going to the military at night, we would think that we

had an enemy. In other words, we created the image of an enemy in our tiny brains. I used to think of the Greeks as if they are thorny things, not human beings, like green monsters. But now, I don't see the Greeks as our enemies. Of course, I cannot forget my childhood memories, the fact that our fathers were not at home any night, the fear of an enemy which we even do not know and see. So, I don't know if we can live together or be friends again, but I know that I did not see them as our enemies.

On the whole, it is evident that the participants of the second generation have primary war memories, and they do not hesitate to talk about the evil things that the Greek Cypriots have done to them while describing these memories. However, they also state that they do not want to see a war on the island again. For this reason, note that they prefer to use less generalizing and bad-minded narratives about both the Greek Cypriots and their past experiences. Thus, they do not think it helps them to propagate strict and antagonistic rhetoric about Greek Cypriots like their parents preferred to portray them as their ultimate and constant enemies. As a result, they intentionally and selectively ground their memory narratives and representation of Greek Cypriots on the tactic of not to blame the Greek Cypriots, but to remember what they did to them and the Turkish Cypriots in general.

5.4.1.2 Humanizing the Greek Cypriots while Emphasizing the Roles of Other Factors in Ethnic Conflict

Participants of the second generation's differentiation in remembering and portraying all Greek Cypriots as unreliable and responsible for what happened, as their parents did, has another important consequence. To put differently, they stressed that the Greek Cypriots could not be the only ones to blame, or at least, they cannot be the killers of Turkish Cypriots with as monstrous feelings as their families describe them. Besides, while they are following this narrative, they prefer to underline that other factors are also effective in what happened in Cyprus.

For instance, Ali, 1963, separatist conservative, underscores that even though the policies and the actions of the Greek Cypriots have been dangerous and devastating for the Turkish Cypriots, he does not want to blame them at all because he considers them as the ones who were also influenced by policies of elites, as such,

The Greek Cypriots want all Cyprus, they want all Turks to leave the island, they want the Turkish soldiers to go. But I don't blame them; they are also brainwashed in that direction. Their politicians, Greece, and the church influenced their thoughts a lot. They are like puppets.

In a similar vein, Göksel, 1966, social democrat federalist, underlines the influence of other factors on ethnic conflict and reciprocal antagonistic attitudes of Turkish and Greek Cypriots

I do not want to blame all the Greeks. I understand why my mother, father, and grandparents doing this. They have seen a great war and suffered a lot. I even suffered a lot, but the thing that they cannot see is that there are a lot of losses from both sides. We have to admit that just as Greek Cypriots were affected by nationalist movements during the British period, Turks were also affected by nationalist movements later on. It must be said that one side was affected by Greece; the other side was affected by Turkey. I mean, if America, Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey wouldn't have been tried to influence here, we would not have come to this point.

The crucial point that can be drawn from their narratives is that the Greek Cypriots are no longer being portrayed as brutal, monstrous, or unreliable inhumane creatures. In a sense, unlike their families, they preferred to portray the Greek Cypriots as more humane, who could make mistakes, and some are good and some bad. That is to say, portrayed as inhumane by the parents of this generation, Greek Cypriots are beginning to be humanized by selective and intentional memory narratives by them. For instance, Hatice emphasizes that she thinks all Greek Cypriots should not be remembered as inhumane monsters and enemies by speaking of a Greek Cypriot taxi driver who helped them during 1974:

The Greeks have both good and bad ones. Our people killed them too, so they did. You cannot hear from my mouth that the Greek Cypriots are unreliable, or that they are our enemies. There are both good and bad for me. Maybe my mother said so; I don't know. But be sure, she says so because she suffered a lot of. For example, after the events started, my father told my mum and me to go to the Northern part because he was working in the South. As I told you, he was a taxi driver. He agreed with the Greek taxi driver, and that man brought us here illegally. In other words, there were both those who helped us at those times and those who did evil. For example, we can never forget that children and young Turkish men were buried alive by the Greeks. But the rulers started all these events, and the whole people suffered.

At this point, it may be useful to go back to how this thesis conceptualizes remembering. As mentioned earlier, memory has never been just about the past.

Remembering as an intentional act of memory is a process that is also affected by today's living conditions and future concerns. As a combination of all these, people build their memory narratives that express what and how they remember. Following this, all participants of this generation stated that they preferred to change their perceptions about the Greek Cypriots to improve their present life situations and to live in a better future. This tactic could be easily seen from the narrative of Melek. She states that

That's why I want both communities to have equal rights. I want all the rights and aids to be divided into two parts, not only given to the Southern part. I also wish that there are no commercial embargoes. Just as the one who wants to start a business can easily do it on the Greek side, let it be the same on this side. Besides, we need to negotiate peacefully with Greek Cypriots, as we did in 2003. We cannot get anywhere by continually telling and remembering that the Greek Cypriots are unreliable; they are our enemies; we should not forget what they did in the time of war.

Melek continues her words by stating that although the Turkish Cypriots tactically change their memory narratives about and portraying of Greek Cypriots, the biggest obstacle to attain the future they are longing is the policies of Turkey after 1983,

But the condition for all these to happen that Turkey to release us. I do not want to live under the administration of Turkey. This island belongs to us; a war was fought for this cause by our ancestors. Please do not get me wrong, Turkey has been supporting us, it saved our elders, but now they hold it against us. A time when I came on holiday to Turkey, someone said to me that 'our government gives more money to baby land Cyprus than its citizens.' However, the truth is not so. The money that Turkey gets from the airplanes over Cyprus is more than the money that they have to send us.

These words of Melek are vital as they can be considered as an introduction to the next subsection because one of the issues that dominated the memory narratives of this generation is the policies imposed by Turkey on the island after 1983. It should be emphasized that remembering functions with reference points. Individuals or groups prefer to remember by referring to events that they think have had the most impact on their lives or their communities by portraying those events as a milestone for both their personal history and the history of their society. While this situation causes the first generation to portray 1974 as the salvation point in their history, it causes the second generation to portray 1983 and beyond as the reference point, which is the reason to blame for everything that happened in Cyprus. The next sub-section will try to

demonstrate how the respondents of the second generation tactically reshape their memory narrative about ethnic conflict and portraying of Greek Cypriots by using the policies of Turkey after 1983 as a reference point.

5.4.2 Finding a Reference Point to Blame: Policies of Turkey after 1983

Hatice clearly states that how she had consciously changed her thoughts on the lack of a solution for the Cyprus problem and the role of Greek Cypriots in the deadlock, thus, how she had also consciously changed the portraying of Greek Cypriots in general, as follows,

As I said, after 1974, all of us adored the Turkish soldiers and Turkey. If you look at the names of the children who were born at that time, their names are Bülent, Ecevit, and Mehmet. We used to think that there would be an agreement after 1974, that the Greeks also learned their lessons, and that we will live safe and sound because we were divided into two regions. We would imagine that we would sit comfortably under the security of our soldiers, rather than the fake security of the peace force and that an agreement would be made between the two sides. It did not. Years have passed, we are tired of being humiliated by everyone. Today, all our money is coming from Turkey; we are literally fed by you, and the process of turning from a producer to a consumer is a very humiliating one. But, we do not want money from Turkey, we want to build our own economy. None of us see Greek Cypriots as enemies anymore because we actually have a bigger problem now. If Turkey let us free, we can do it, we can live with Greek Cypriots without conflict because now we understand that they are not our enemies and because we have a bigger problem now.

As can be seen, Hatice states that she first thought of 1974 as the liberation of Turkish Cypriots as her parents did, but what happened afterward falsified this idea. However, she says she previously described Greek Cypriots as "someone made a mistake and must learn from these mistakes." However, she later states that she gives up to portray Greek Cypriots as guilty after her disappointing experiences and her desire to live in a better future. In other words, she points out that the policies of Turkey after 1983 on the island is the reason why Turkish Cypriots live in such bad conditions, and, as a result of this, she states that she abandoned this narrative of portraying Greek Cypriots as enemies or the ultimate reason for the ethnic conflict because she thought this narrative would not be of any use for her future.

In a similar vein, Göksel clearly states that how his generation has been affected by the policies of Turkey after 1983 is quite the same with how their families had been affected by the actions of Greek Cypriots in the 1960s,

I do not have a one-to-one memory that I can tell you by saying that the Greek Cypriots did this to me because I am a Turkish Cypriot. I was not born and raised in a mixed village anyway. But, right now, I see that myself, my identity, my future is in danger. I think Turkey is the reason, not the Greeks. I can say that now I experience the fears of my elders that they had experienced in the 1960s differently. So, I think we, the Turkish Cypriots, are disappearing more and more, disappearing as a society, and the situation is now beyond danger.

Turkish Cypriots' status of turning from producers to consumers by Turkey's policies implemented after 1983, that Hatice mentioned, could better be understood by Kadir's words about Turkey's neoliberal policies on the Northern Part of Cyprus after 1983. He states that

It is not because of the Greeks that we are in such a bad situation. If you ask my mother, we have become like this because of the conflicts started by the Greeks after the 1960s. I mean, I understand my mother's concerns, what she had been through. I also had experienced some of them. But it is not like that for me. Ozal is the ringleader. He came to this island to send a lot of newfangled prisons, the notorious killers to Cyprus. For example, our underground waters were very productive, very lively once. Then Ozal charged the people coming from Turkey who could not understand anything about agriculture to take care of our agriculture. They started greenhouse cultivation, and the island's water ran out, and they have finished citrus on the island. What happened then? Turkey began selling citrus to us. We had cultivated the best wheat and potato in the world. Now today, none is produced; nothing. Why? Özal had all the factories closed one by one. He said 'what are you going to do with factories; we will send everything you need.' So, what happened to the people who could not find a workplace? All became civil servants, and Turkey sent all the salaries of them. While our factories are still open, Turkey did not buy any goods from us, although Turkey is the only open door for us because we could not sell what we produce elsewhere. Thus, our potatoes would remain in the fields, the best potato in the world. Go to the Turkish grocery store in the UK today; the most expensive potato is Cyprus potato. Let me give you another example. Our people had to sell one decare of land to a million TL. They sold all of their assets and went to another country to live under more equal conditions. Now, people who have emigrated from Turkey sit in those places.

And Kadir continues his words as follows,

You say, what do you remember. I know you asked it for ethnic conflict, our relations with the Greek Cypriots, etc. But, I cannot help myself to remember this, to tell everyone about this injustice. I remember when I poured my citrus into the stream, I cannot forget that. But if you want me to say something about

the Greeks, I said above, the Greeks are not our enemies. Maybe if we had stopped seeing them as enemies from the very beginning, we wouldn't be in this situation now. I don't want anything for myself and I have no hope for the future anymore, but I want my child to live in a good future. We can only achieve this future, where we can be free again, by accepting an agreement with the Greek Cypriots. I know that you're going to put these words down on paper for your homework, please see if I said a bad word about Greek Cypriots, or even if we have bad memories of the conflict, did I blame them?

It is believed that it is necessary to underline again how this thesis conceptualizes memory and remembering. As stated before, remembering as an intentional act is always grounded upon in between past, present life situations, and future aspirations. As a combination of all these, people create memory narratives that express what and how they remember. When considered from this angle, the tendency of this generation to bring the issue to 1983 and beyond, even when asked about ethnic conflict, is quite understandable. In other words, it is quite reasonable why, when talking about ethnic conflict, they do not only mention the Greek Cypriots, and even prefer not to portray them as enemies when they do. That is to say, the social, cultural, and economic changes that the Northern Part of the island went through after 1983, in a way, caused their reference point to change when they remember the past. In this regard, it can be said that their narratives about the Cyprus problem, including their memory narratives about ethnic conflict, are dominated by the policies of Turkey after 1983. In other words, because remembering is a retrospective act and this generation has a severe inconvenience about their present life situations, it is quite understandable that why they continuously tend to connect their memory narratives to the policies of Turkey.

In support of the above discussion, Mahmut states that even if he has a memory of how badly Greek Cypriot children treated them, he no longer bothered with Greek Cypriots or see them as enemies because he thinks their current problems with Turkey is more significant than the problems with Greek Cypriots:

I told you before that my village was mixed. Even when we were playing football, we are 15 and 16 years old back then, when the Greek children score a goal, they used to say that we will send you from the island. We couldn't answer, but we would only respond with a joke. They were strong because they were the majority. But I saw the same children, my neighbors, on the barricades in 1974. That's when I shouted in their language, 'Come, come, now send us off the island!' But these times are over now, it was a war, and it's over. Maybe we can't live together again, but we can't live by making each other hostile.

And if you ask if today is better than yesterday, I would say no. We are still under embargo; we always adhere to Turkey. We have no money, no job opportunities, nothing. We have to maintain our lives with the money Turkey sends us. For example, after the establishment of the TRNC, maybe even ten years or so, we used the stamps of federated state on the customs stamps in order to make international sales. Then with the pressure of Turkey and our strictly nationalist politicians, our stamps have changed into a new one with a TRNC emblem on it, and then our economy could not recover again. We can no longer sell halloumi. Today, the south side earns millions of money annually just from imports of halloumi. We can't do it.

5.5 Third Generation Turkish Cypriots: Construction of the Post-Memory upon Anticipated Future

It should be noted that the participants of the third generation do not have any primary memories about the times of active ethnic conflict, Turkey's military intervention in 1974, and the establishment of TRNC. The earliest memories of them, which is relatable to the ethnic conflict, coincide with the time when the 'doors were opened' in 2003. In other words, they are the young people who did not "witness" the ethnic conflict in Cyprus and the long period after; instead, they represent the grandchildren of survivors as witnesses of what happened. Nevertheless, these facts do not mean that they cannot construct their own memory narratives about ethnic conflict and afterward because "memory can be transmitted to those who were not actually there to live an event."³²³ In this sense, they could be considered as the generation of post-memory, who basically construct their memory narratives in the interrelation of the narratives conveyed to them by previous generations of their family memory, what they learned at school, and social environment.

Marianne Hirsch conceptualizes the generation of post-memory as "the relationship of the second generation to powerful, often traumatic, experiences that preceded their births but that were nevertheless transmitted to them so deeply as to seem to constitute

³²³ Marianne Hirsch, "The Generation of Postmemory," *Poetics Today* 29, no. 1 (2008): pp. 103-128, 106.

memories in their own right.”³²⁴ Thus, the post-memory narratives do not primarily mediate through the recall of the primary memories, instead by the reconstruction, projection, and imaginative investment.³²⁵ In this regard, through what their parents prefer to tell them, how they interpret these stories, what they remembered from their parent's memories, their thoughts about the history education they got at school, I try to understand their post-memory narratives.

The following sections will examine how the Turkish Cypriots, who belong to the third generation of their families, construct their post-memory narratives about ethnic conflict, and what specific issues they prefer to address when creating those memories. In doing so, it will be argued that their post-memory narratives are entirely shaped by their future aspirations and their attempt to shape the future of the Turkish Cypriot youth.

5.5.1 Between Family and Chosen Memory

As mentioned above, family, education, and social environment are considered as one of the primary social frameworks of post-memory narratives. In this sense, it has been understood that the participants of the third generation, was primarily influenced by the memories learned and listened to from their families while constructing their own post-memory narratives. However, only two participants stated that history education also affected their post-memory narratives.

All of the participants talked extensively about how and why their post-memory narratives differed from what they learned in their families and school education about ethnic conflict. In other words, they actively create their own post-memory narratives by interpreting the stories that they've learned from their families and school education.

³²⁴ Ibid., 103.

³²⁵ Ibid., 107.

Aslı, 1991, unitarist, describes how she totally influenced by her family's memory narrative until a certain age and how meeting a Greek Cypriot youth changed her thoughts about what she learned from her family, thus, her post-memory narrative, as follows,

In my family, my father is very nationalist. I grew up with all kinds of nationalist words you can think of until the age of 21. I was also that much nationalist. Maybe, That's why I've chosen to listen to the stories of one side. I mean, my father always told us stories from the perspective of the Turkish Cypriots. He always told us the importance of the homeland and the TRNC. I had not met any Greek people until the age of 21, and I had never heard the other's opinion, I did not know what they would say about us. Then I went to a language school in England in the summer. I learned that one of my classmates is a Greek Cypriot. Meeting her has changed my life a lot. The conversations we had impressed me very much. Sometimes I would describe the same event differently; sometimes, she did. That's when I started to write different stories about the Greek Cypriots. I changed my old self by changing both my own story and my perspective on what happened.

Beyza, 1995, humanist, explains how her post-memory narrative has changed from that of her family in very clear sentences. In a way, she stresses the constituent feature of the post-memory, which is being reconstructive, projective, and imaginative, as follows

For example, you talked to my grandmother, I am sure she told you like Turkish Cypriots are the only victims of this story, but I believe that nothing is one-sided. Both sides took steps to protect their interests, and they became enthusiastic about their interests blindly. Turkish Cypriots were influenced by Turkey, they were influenced by Greece. But of course, they don't want to admit this, they continue the same nationalist narratives. For a long time, my family was the ones that affect my thoughts the most, but then, we slowly started to question what was told to us with my friends. Later, I built myself a language that was not led by bad words, violence, and hostility. That's why I'm telling you what I remember and think about this conflict in this language.

In a similar vein, Hazal, 1990, social democrat unitarist, explains how she established her own post-memory narrative through an active process of filtering and selection, as follows,

My grandmother and grandfather are strict in this regard. They always say they are oppressed, which is true indeed. They have always told me that they worked for them because they were poor, and Greek Cypriots humiliated them. They are furious about this. We were educated with even more nationalist education at school. I would think the Greek side was such a different world, and it would look like a monster; I wondered if they would kill us when they saw us. Later,

my thoughts changed with the influence of the books I read as a result of my own curiosity. I can say that I have combined all of these, filtered them all, and acquired my thoughts with my effort.

The sentences used by Asli, Beyza, and Hazal when they explained that how they actively construct their post-memory narratives are important because each participant thinks that their families' memory narratives are more nationalist (all but two participants used this adjective) and rigid, and therefore impeding the future they wanted to see on the island.

The words and phrases used by Asli, Beyza, and Hazal, while they are explaining that how they actively construct their post-memory narratives are important because each participant thinks that their families' memory narratives are nationalist (all but two participants used this adjective) and rigid, and they both incline to express this situation in a similar way. To be specific, they state that they find their families' narratives nationalist because of the fact that those narratives are grounded upon one-sidedness, antagonism, heroism, and implementation of the importance of Turkish nation and national history, and hostility, and portraying Greek Cypriots ultimate enemies and perpetrators. Because of that, it can be clearly seen that they do not just accept the stories and memory narratives of their families; rather, they choose to challenge those narratives and construct their own ones. The next sub-section will focus on how they construct their post-memory narratives by emphasizing the need to reflecting on history in a multifaceted way.

5.5.1.1 Multi-perspectivity on Ethnic Conflict

As noted before, an act of reflecting on history is inevitably selective. In other words, "any single event enters history with some of its constituting parts missing; something is always left out while something else is recorded."³²⁶ That is why this state of

³²⁶ Michel Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 49.

selectiveness oscillates between "what happened and that which is said to have happened."³²⁷

The participants of this generation underline this situation by emphasizing the idea that they choose to be in between what happened and what is to have happened. In other words, while the memory of their grandparents insists on representing themselves as what happened, the participants of this generation are also aware of the fact that Greek Cypriots also assert that their memories represent what happened. Merve illustrates this situation by remembering a primary memory as follows,

For example, our college was next to the closed Varosha area. The view of our classes was Varosha, and we knew that the Greeks lived there before. And I used to pass through there on my way to school with the school bus. I would see the holes in those buildings, the remains of guns, the marks of war, etc. Therefore, when I looked at the past next to me, I would internally think that what happened could not be one-sided, and there were some inconsistent or missing parts in what was told to us. From then on, I began to understand that what happened can never be determined from a single perspective. We should emphasize that both sides lost their loved ones, that Greek women were also raped, and that some people from both sides are still missing.

In a similar vein, Mehmet stresses how he discovered that an act of reflecting on history is inevitably selective, thus, oscillates in between what happened and which is said to happen by again remembering a primary memory of him with Greek Cypriots. As a result of the situation he noticed, he talks about his thought on how to and through which perspective remember the past:

I attended a camp in the United States in 2011, and it was a camp in which both communities participated. There we played a game called the history schedule. We substituted for each other and wrote a historical event that happened in the past on each card. We drew a line, we placed the Greeks on the right and the Turks on the left. And I realize that in general, Turkish Cypriot children talked about what happened from 1571 when the Ottomans came to the island and until the Peace Operation in 1974. In other words, they talked about what happened during the Ottoman period, the British period, and the persecution of 63. And after 74, we jumped to 2004 and came to the referendum time as if nothing had happened in-between. The Greek children, on the other hand, started from the Byzantine period, finished in the Ottoman Empire, then started from 74 by emphasizing the persecution of Turkish Cypriots and soldiers, and

³²⁷ Ibid., 2.

brought it to today. For them, it was as if the Turkish Cypriot people did not live until 1974, there were no historical milestones or worth to be mentioned events in the 60s and 70s, and they are being oppressed began in the 74th when the Turkish military arrived on the island. I was very impressed that day. I began to think that every coin has two sides and that both communities suffered. After that day, I always told everyone what I think about what Cyprus had experienced in this way. I understood a little more what has been told to us until this time has always been told in the form of propaganda, in a selective way. And it is also the same for the Southern Part, of course. Not only did our education system do this, but also our families. You have heard the words such as Greeks are pigs; Greeks could not be our friends, Greeks are murderers, etc. Yet, how should we describe what happened? By saying that there was a war, there was a social conflict, and two communities were clashed with each other according to the political conjuncture of that time. It should be told that both sides murder each other, politicians provoke societies, and mutual discrimination is experienced. Let's explain it this way, so that past mistakes do not happen again.

Another thing that can be said for the participants of this generation, thanks to Mehmet's quotation, is that they are questioning many historical narratives, including the memory narratives of their families, official memory of TRNC, and TMT while creating their thoughts and post-memory narratives on the Cyprus ethnic conflict. In other words, their understanding of reconciliation became more politically clear. They argued that reconciliation should be based on a policy that would serve the "interest" of the two groups on the island, rather than merely as a means to improve only the lives of Turkish Cypriot youths.

For instance, Deniz stresses what the participants belong to this generation understand from reconciliation, and through which selective narrative that they underscore, as follows,

I think that everything that happened should not be told with heroic and antagonistic ideas because I believe that what happened is not exactly coincide with what we are shown in the history books. There is some truth in what both sides tell, but both sides manipulate what happened and tell them as they want to tell. For example, TMT has always been said to us as the heroes who defend us. But when I researched and read about it myself, I realized that it was an organization that was not in a very defensive mind and carried out many operations within itself to kill each other. For example, let me give another example to be extreme. We are not told that the Orthodox church permitted abortion for one year after 1974. It was the first time that Doğuş Derya talked about this in the parliament, and I still cannot forget the moment I listened to that speech. This was such an event almost unseen in the history of the

Orthodox church. The reason was that Turkish soldiers raped Greek women. Anyway, that's why I always say that every party has different stories, concerns, and demands. Therefore, when I describe what happened, I always describe it with various examples so that we can find a solution where everyone living on this island can meet at least in common.

In a similar vein, Hüsnü, 1997, separatist, asserts that

Only one side is always guilty of what we are told at school. They act as if ours never killed them. Of course, they started the events, but was it not a fault of ours either? This does not seem realistic to me. Very different people have had an influence on my thoughts in that way. TMT or Turks even shot each other. I have always collected these by listening to stories of different people.

As mentioned previously, the first and second generations of this thesis preferred to construct their memory narratives over different milestones. For example, participants belonging to the first generation considered 1963 and 1974 as milestones for their narratives, while the second generation considered 1983 as a milestone. In addition to this, the participant of the third generation represents the opening of the border in 2003 as the turning point of their post-memories. For instance, Merve, 1987, unitarist, clearly stresses the process of how her post-memory narratives had been transformed by emphasizing the constituent role of referendum discussions and seeing the Southern Part of the island for the first time, as follows,

I was very young when they started telling stories about this conflict. I knew that there were people in my family who were in the TMT, or who have witnessed the killing of Greeks, hiding them, and even being thrown into wells. They would always say that the invasion is good, the Turkish soldier is good; otherwise, we cannot do anything against Greeks, or that we will not grow up or we cannot see these days. The image of Greeks was always like this for me in my childhood times; I thought that they are black-skinned monsters, and I was terrified of them. Then I wondered and started to read about what happened. I began to read thoroughly during the Annan Plan time when I was in high school. Because you will say yes or no for something, in order to be able to make a clear decision about it, I thought that I should decide myself rather than directly internalize how the past was told to me. That's when I said that I had to learn what happened in an unbiased and impartial way. That's why I started to look at different sources, and in a way, I chose what I will tell you here today because if I had still chosen their narratives, I would say to you something completely different today.

In a similar vein, Murat, 1991, humanist, explains why the opening of the border is considered as a turning point for his generation, thus, their post-memory narratives, as follows,

Everything has started to change for my generation with the opening of doors. Because it was the first time we saw a living Greek Cypriot, and what we saw did not match what our families had told us until then because they mostly are dwelled upon the negative thoughts about Greeks. I can say that our generation started to come out of this influence, whatever had been affected until then, especially after the doors were opened. For instance, realizing that there was another world like that was very different. You are 12 years old, you are curious but also afraid. Everything I knew had been turned upside down. In a way, it was a milestone for us. After that, we started to write our own history; we became lovers, some of us study there, some of us socialized.

As can be deduced from the above narratives, it is obvious that the experiences they gained when the period of 2003, was effective in the construction of their memory narratives apart from the narratives of their families. At the same time, the ways in which they criticize their families' narratives were also explained earlier. In other words, they answered very clearly how and what questions. However, another question that has not been emphasized yet and is quite important is the question of why; why they choose to create their own post-memory narratives upon the opposite of their families' narratives? It is very important to answer this question because, as seen in previous generations, memory narratives are created by making a certain choice and selectivity. In order to answer this question, it will be sufficient to look at how the young people whose narratives are mentioned above continue their sentences. For instance, Aslı states that

Now I only write friendship stories while telling my opinion about the past and the future. For this reason, I do not think, remember, and say any bad things about the Greek Cypriots as my father and grandparents did. When I started to meet with different opinions about the Cyprus conflict, I began to write my own history. Can I tell? Do you know why I do this the most? For my own future. My father always said that he did not live his own childhood and that he was always despairing because of what he went through. I always tell him, let us live our future at least. Do not affect our future with the mistakes you made in the past, let us live in peace and equal conditions.

Beyza agrees with Aslı and says that

I take every step I take for my future. It is actually strategic, but of course, these are also my own thoughts. I want to live in a better future. I'm looking here, isolated and we have nothing. I look there, they have everything. I want to live the same way as they live. And I know that I can only achieve this by establishing a more moderate language for what happened.

In a similar vein, Hazal states that

I realize that it is my choice to change my narrative, filter them, and make them like this. In fact, let me say, whatever young people you talk to on the island, left-wing, right-wing, or nothing-alike, they will all say the same thing because now young people do not want to live in this unrecognized state and situation. We want to live in another future, you know. Everyone wants a solution differently, but everyone wants a solution among the youth. Therefore, we speak moderately about the Greeks, we do not blame them all.

Madeleine Leonard asserts that societies tend to link the future of the society with the future of the young generation, and this situation may force the youngest generation of the society to feel like they must remember or forget the past in line with their parents' and grandparents' narratives and stories of the past.³²⁸ Young people, who are the third generation of their family, have made it clear that this was also the case for them at first. However, they state that they do not want what happened in the past to affect them anymore. Since they want to live in a future different from those of their families, they assert that their parents must give them the right to speak freely by going through their meaning-making processes regarding the Cyprus problem. In doing so, they clearly state that they construct their memory narratives by considering the future aspirations of them as a reference point. In other words, they form a narrative about the past, what happened, and the Greek Cypriots according to the future they imagine.

The next section will focus on how the third generation constructs its post-memory narratives by taking their future aspirations as their reference point.

5.5.2 Coming to Terms with the Past while Choosing the Anticipated Future as Reference Point of Remembering

As noted previously, the participants of this thesis, who belong to the first and second generations of their families, respond to the question of why you choose to remember in quite different ways. First-generation states that they prefer to remember for their nation, Turks of Cyprus, which refers that remembering the antagonistic attitudes of

³²⁸ Madeleine Leonard, "Echoes from the Past: Intergenerational Memories in Cyprus," *Children & Society*, 2012, pp. 1-16, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2012.00445.x>, 5.

Greek Cypriots, thus, victimization of their nation, and how the Turks of Cyprus finally turned into heroes who wrote their history with the help of Turkey. The second-generation states that they primarily do not prefer to remember the past because it only reminded them of their ruptured lives; nevertheless, they do it as a tactic to get rid of their present life situations and live in better conditions in the future.

It is understood that the generation participating in this thesis and belonging to the third generation, formed a post-memory narrative in line with their future aspirations. This shows that their memory narratives, in fact, tremendously is inclined to shape by the concerns and dreams of the future, rather than in between the past, present, and future. It can be said that Hazal's words, 1990, social democrat unitarist, about how effective the relationship between the past and the future is in people's memory narratives will explain this situation better.

I want to be able to see my future anymore. You ask me about the past, but I inevitably talk about the future because I don't think these two can be separated. Because, unfortunately, our past determines our future on this island, but I think we can change that. Nevertheless, if we cannot clear the past, we cannot establish peace in the future. If we cannot come to terms with our past, if we cannot close our past, if we carry hatred, if we just want to remember the bad memories of war, if we do not believe in reconciliation, we cannot reach a good solution anyway. I believe that there will be a solution, but I think we should evaluate this process, examine it thoroughly so that we can clear the past and look ahead. Otherwise, I think we will disappear.

Edis's way of describing the future he wants to see in Cyprus is in line with the description of almost all the participants of this generation. They tend to describe their future aspirations by comparing their present life situations with Greek Cypriot youths' lives. He, 1994, social democrat unitarist, describes their aspired future, as such,

Frankly, I am hopeful for the future. Because right now, the last generation is left, which actively experience the war. It's been forty years and more. Our generation, born at the end of this forty-odd year, are people who have not seen war and want to open up to the world. You cannot enter these people's minds in any way with the idea of war, because the gates are already open, we can now go to the Greek side, we can see the life in there. We can see how an internationally recognized state looks like and compare it to what we have experienced here in an unrecognized one. This situation causes us to look at the past and the future differently from other generations of our family. And I am sure that in the future, nobody will be able to prevent the state that we will establish and have a common life.

Mehmet, 1991, student, federalist who underscores the necessity of a solution that will satisfy both Turkish and Greek Cypriots, illustrates the reason why he chooses to construct his post-memory narrative about Cyprus ethnic conflict and its solution by taking his political ideology and future aspirations as a reference point with a memory from the time how he experienced his first encounter with a Greek Cypriot family when the doors were opened, as such,

My aunt's house was a Greek house. One day we were at my aunt's house during the Ramadan, and sometimes the Greeks also come to this side in our holidays because on holidays, there is a celebration atmosphere, there is not much traffic, the streets are empty; thus they come to this site. I think it was the first time they arrived in the northern part after the doors were opened. We were maybe 15 people at home, and they were 4 or 5 people, nuclear family members. They hesitated to come to our door first, looked from a distance to inside of our home without saying anything. It was apparent that they were terrified. The woman was going to cry, she could not cry, but you understand, she was so sad. At first, we could not understand what was happening, but we said to ourselves that there is no use fearing the inevitable, let's get out and ask who they are. If both could not overcome our fears and talk that day, we would still be afraid of each other today. I tell everyone about this memory because I think the Cyprus problem is like that. We should not have always underlined our fears and traumas with each other. Okay, it is not easy to erase those, but, if we cannot leave the past behind, if we cannot take a step, we will continue to stick to 40, and 45 years ago, we cannot establish our future.

It can be said that Mehmet's intentionality to select this memory grounds itself upon the idea that instead of emphasizing the fear and perhaps hostility that Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots feel for each other due to the ethnic conflict in the past, they should accept each other's pain and fears, and move towards building the new future. In a similar vein, Aslı, 1993, unitarist, clearly demonstrates the difference between her generation and their ancestors in terms of what they understand from remembering the past and why they choose to remember the past, as such,

I think we should leave behind what happened and look ahead. Of course, let's not forget what happened in the past so that we cannot experience horrible things again. But not to forget does not mean stuck in those times, even after how many years passed. So, my father still stuck to those times; he still lives in there, not today. He says I could not live my childhood; they wasted my young years, etc. They need to be aware that the war is over, and they cannot take back their childhood, or whatever. Sometimes I say to him that why would you try to waste my future too because of the fact that you couldn't live your childhood?

The point that needs to be emphasized here is that this generation, like other generations belonging to their families, emphasizes the need to remember the past. However, they differ from their families in what to do with the past to be remembered or why the past should be remembered. In other words, unlike their families, they believe that remembering is necessary to be able to come to terms with the past³²⁹ and to build a fairer future for Turkish Cypriot youth. For instance, Beyza, 1995, humanist, expresses her agreement in the narrative which emphasizes that we must remember so that they can live in a better future, as such,

I do not want to be disrespectful to the people living that period. For example, my grandmother kissed the ground when the war was over; the pipes rang, and the Turks were told that they came. She is someone who has seen terrible things. We cannot tell these people about peace, and we cannot persuade them. But, I also think that talking about past unfortunate events all the time will even twisting the knife in the wound of her. And I think we can't look ahead by doing so. Cyprus is not the only post-conflict society in the world, and we have to overcome such ideas. For example, I am not less sorry for the suffering of the south; thus, my sadness for both sides is equal. Of course, minorities can suffer more, and this is always the case in the world. So, what shall we do? Should we keep this going? No, I don't think so. If we want peace, at least if we want young people to have a good future, we must not continue this, and we must look ahead.

Deniz, 1990, anti-militarist, multiculturalist and unitarist, expresses what this generation understand from coming to terms with the past, and the purpose of remembering as such,

I think it might be wrong to forget if there is social trauma. I think coming to terms with the past is required for our society because Cypriot people had experienced plenty of massacres, wars, and many other horrible things, but no one still wants to apologize for their own part in the ethnic conflict. So, I think everyone should apologize for the mistakes they made in spite of the possibility that everything they previously thought they knew could turn precisely the opposite. Only in this way can we have a peaceful future.

Murat, 1991, humanist and multiculturalist, stressed what he understands from coming to terms with the past as follows,

³²⁹ This term is one of the terms that entered the post-Holocaust memory studies literature. It is translated into Turkish as *geçmişle yüzleşmek*.

The massacre is a massacre; people died; it is true. But if we continue to say how these people died and how we suffered, I think there is a problem here. I think this attitude is the product of ideologies trying to benefit from people's pain. That's why I believe that we shouldn't emphasize the old times constantly. Let's build the new, build our future; let's analyze what happened in the past with the current. I would like to do this mostly for Turkish Cypriot youth. We have to say that we have a word on the stage of history. Older people should also support us in this regard so that our hope for the future does not diminish day by day.

Two important points can be drawn from these quotations. First, what they understand from coming to terms with the past refers to the reinterpretation of what happened in the past 'objectively.' In other words, rather than portraying only themselves as a group that has experienced events that are still difficult to remember, it is to admit that Greek Cypriots also have pains and memories similar to them. Second, coming to terms with the past emphasizes a solution-oriented stance to live in peace in the future, unlike memory narratives that tend to create antagonistic dichotomies such as being victim and perpetrator.

5.5.2.1 Emphasizing on Cypriotism for Reconciliation and the Future of Young Turkish Cypriots

This sub-section will proceed through the above mentioned second feature of coming to terms with the past. It will try to show that they prefer to ground their post-memory narratives on Cypriotism as they want to see a future in Cyprus where reconciliation and a more prosperous future for Turkish Cypriot youth will prevail.

As mentioned before, the question of what one can and should do with what happened in the past is still a very controversial and challenging one in Cyprus. To understand at length how this generation incline to answer this question through what kind of post-memory narratives, they were asked the question of what would you think should be written on a history book about Cyprus? All the participants stated that they wanted to explain that Turkish and Greek Cypriots lived together as Cypriots before the ethnic conflict started, rather than emphasizing the suffering of both sides and antagonistic

attitudes to each other. Below are a few examples that best illustrate their common responses when asked why emphasizing Cypriotism is vital to them.

Aslı clearly stresses that her emphasis on Cypriotness is the only thing her generation can hold on to because they want to live in a better future, as follows,

Being a Cypriot means loving Cyprus. It means living on this island, and loving and striving for this island. When Turkishness comes into Cypriotness, nothing much changes for me. Being Turkish only means I speak Turkish, or it somehow shows my connection with Turkey. In other words, being a Turkish Cypriot also means living here and loving Cyprus. Greek Cypriot means the same; it is actually a society whose only difference from us is its language and religion. We actually have no difference. I wanted to participate in this study because I love Cyprus, and of course, because I wanted to hear what we young people think. To tell you the truth, we, Turkish Cypriot youth, are both hopeful and not. We don't know what and whom to hold on to. We can not hold on to Turkey; it sees us as handmaidens. We cannot hold on to what our families say because their thoughts remain nationalist under today's conditions. So, what do we hold on to? We hold on to dialogue; we hold on to Cypriotism and the possibility of equal rights, equal life, and coexistence. When someone asks me what I think about what happened, that's what I say. As young people, we have no other choice but to hold onto Cypriotism.

Merve, also explains why mainly Turkish Cypriot youth need to emphasize Cypriotness as follows,

I mean, we live in another time, we almost entered the space age, but Turkish Cypriots are still unrecognized. I would like our families to think a little bit about young people because these segregations did not get us anywhere. We need to step outside of this situation, and I think we need to remember again that we are Cypriots. In other words, I believe that we should emphasize Cypriotness against the nationalist feelings that caused our separation in the time that we are Turks, and they are Greeks.

In a similar vein, Mehmet explains what he understands from the meaning of Cypriotism as follows,

This is not an organic conflict. That is why I believe in united Cyprus and Cypriotism so wholeheartedly and sincerely. Because you know, in our nature, there was no conflict, this is a learned behavior. Therefore, since it is a learned behavior, I believe there is a cure for it. We can only come to terms with the past by talking about our common entertainment culture, family life, our perspective on religion, and our Mediterranean style eating and drinking culture. We, young people, would love to reconciliation because we move to the south, and we see what kind of life is there. What do Greek Cypriot young people have? What opportunities do they have? Here I studied in good schools, maybe I am much more diligent, but I do not have the same opportunities.

Deniz answers as follows when asked what it prefers to remember about the past and how,

I prefer to tell the good sides of the past. So, for example, our grandparents lived together before the conflict, I mention those stories. I talk about Cypriotness, in a word. Instead of saying that we are entirely different by underscoring that our ethnic origin, language, and religion are different, I talk about being an islander. I want to talk about the characteristics of our cultures, of our being the Mediterranean, for example, our eating and living habits. I also talk about my own experiences with Greek Cypriots by emphasizing the fact that I lived with them and even shared the same house, and everything was amicable, and there was no problem. I want to mention that we have happy and enjoyable memories when we live together, and we share positive feelings. I believe that in this way, I make us fewer victims of the need for the power of the rulers and their tricks to hold power. Because, until this time, the only winners of constantly digging out the past by only emphasizing the memories of war and telling the Greeks as enemies were those who had the power.

After that, when Deniz was asked again about from whom it heard that everything was perfect and beautiful in the times Turkish and Greek Cypriots were lived together in the past, it gives the following answer,

I guess some of them are made up of me. I mean, I think I wanted to convince myself that this is the case because I am defending reconciliation for the future of us, the youths. Even if it was hard to hear stories of coexistence from my grandmother, I read some stories. If we look at the reality of these memories of living together, that is, when we look at history again critically, we never actually see that Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots live in such a rosy and intertwined manner. In other words, they always lived in a relationship that diverged at a certain point. For instance, even in the ‘mixed’ neighborhoods, they did not live side by side. Their territories were demarcated without a visible border, but there were borders, you know. Despite this, they got along with each other without fighting, but not many of them have an intimate relationship. In other words, it was a community that was not thoroughly intertwined but could live together.

“As numerous scholars have shown, in many instances, the memory of what is missed and longed for is substantially different from what actually existed in the past.”³³⁰ This situation could be considered as quite the same in the post-memory narratives of the

³³⁰ Haldis Haukanes and Susanna Trnka, “Memory, Imagination, and Belonging across Generations: Perspectives from Postsocialist Europe and Beyond,” *Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 66 (2013): pp. 3-13, 4.

third generation while they are emphasizing the Cypriotism for reconciliation and the future of Young Turkish Cypriots. When the participants of this generation were asked about how they knew about the meaning of Cypriotness or the times when Cypriotism was stressed only, their answers are critical to see how they intentionally construct their post-memory narratives retrospectively to build the future according to their wishes. They were all clear about the content of the future they aspired, where there are more opportunities for them and they have equal conditions with Greek Cypriot youth; thus, they intentionally and purposively create their post-memory narratives upon nostalgia to the past, *Cypriotness*, even though they could not be sure how they came up with this idea. To put differently, they chose to believe something unknown for them and longing for the past to create their memory narratives by their own future aspirations. They were all clear about what to choose from the past through the process of interpretation, perception, and meaning-making, thus, intentionally choose to create their post-memory narratives based upon a myth (for them), as their grandparents did about the unreliability of the Greek Cypriots before.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The primary purpose of this thesis is to understand the dynamics of the politicization of remembering the past with a particular focus on memory narratives of three different generations of Turkish Cypriot families. In other words, to see how memory narratives' selectiveness, semi-permeability, and being always in between individual-structural and what happened and which is said to have happened function in individual memory narratives, thirty semi-structured interviews were made with ten Turkish Cypriot families. Thus, differences and similarities in memory narratives based on temporal, subjective, social, and political reasoning were emphasized. By doing so, how historical-political periods that individuals of different generations have lived through affected the memory narratives were also asserted because of this fact that these generations are the constitutive subjects of different historical-political periods, causing changes in their reference points of remembering. For example, the participants who are members of the first generation of their families choose 1963 and 1974 as the reference points to use when they remember the past, while the second generation prefers to consider 1983 and the policies of Turkey as their reference point of remembering, and the opening of the borders in 2003 is the event that the third generation cited as a reference point.

The practice of generating ideas about the past has not been stuck in the written and intellectual space only as an intellectual activity. In other words, historiography is not only an intellectual act but also a practice that has social and political consequences. Especially with the establishment of nation-states, states have established their political, legal, geographical, cultural, social, and economic legitimacy on the homogenization of any group that can be regarded as 'enemy' with official historiography. Considering the countries that have experienced ethnic conflicts in

their history, establishing their legitimacy and/or victimization through historiography has been not only a practice that nation-states are accustomed to but also a practice of minority groups. At this point, it can be stated that the state of seeing historiography as the sole provider of the legitimacy of one's existence and political aims is not only a feature of nation-states. To be specific, the participants of this generation also use the method of official historiography by homogenizing and representing Greek Cypriots as constitutive other of them.

Considering the fact that Turkish Cypriots had experienced different phases of memory politics and nationalism since the British period until today, we can say that the first generation of the Turkish Cypriot families is the ones who were directly subjected to the policy of remembering the past and envisaging the future with ethnonationalistic narratives. In other words, this generation was considered as Turks of Cyprus, rather than Turkish Cypriots, by official narrative, and their memory narratives are coinciding with this narrative; thus, they intentionally chose to remember for their nation. Besides, the participants of the first generation, who describes 1974 as a turning point or a milestone for their lives, thus, dividing their memory narratives into before and after 1974.

In the pre-1974 memory narratives of the first generation, the Turkish Cypriots were in a passive and reactive position, which emphasized the bad characteristics of the Greek Cypriots and the emergence of ethnic conflict on the island as a result of their antagonistic attitudes towards Turkish Cypriots. To be specific, Turkish Cypriots were portrayed as those who unwanted, humiliated, and desperate because of their material conditions on the island, and unaware of the plans made by Greek Cypriots, thus portraying Greek Cypriots as unreliable perpetrators. In a sense, they tend to construct their memory narratives upon the sufferings of the Turkish nations on the island, how they suffered together, and this is what unifies them against the Greek Cypriots. However, their memory narratives about after 1974, is totally different. This time, those narratives based on the unreliability and oppressions of Greek Cypriots were grounded upon the glory of Turkey's military intervention in 1974. In other words, they state that they do not need to live together again with Greek Cypriots because the Turks of Cyprus are strong and self-sufficient now. In a sense, to have a common

glorious victory in the past and will in the present, which is living without Greek Cypriots, is the common point in their memory narratives.

The crucial point in here is that even though some of them had possessed some good memories with the Greek Cypriots, they had a distinct distrust against them, and consequently, they inclined to homogenize all the Greek Cypriots as something other than what Turks of Cyprus represent, such as unreliability, persecution, and arrogance. To put differently, without any distinction in terms of if they do have memories of coexistence or not, the participants of this generation tend to homogenize and stereotype the whole Greek Cypriots and ignore the times of coexistence or emphasize that there always had been a subtle mutual averseness between the two communities.. Besides, they assert that they do not need the Greek Cypriots in their new history, whose seeds were gloriously sowed in 1974, because their security is more important than living together, and they are self-sufficient now.

This attitude of the first generation is crucial to understand how this thesis conceptualizes remembering and politicization of it. It is the actor in the present that gives meaning to the past and make sense of it retrospectively, and this interpretation tends to include future aspirations. Besides, despite the fact that it is the individual who remembers, and her construction of meanings through memory can only come from her selective and intentional act which questions and judges the past, present, and future of society, remembering the past is not just an individual and power-free act.³³¹ Participants of this generation tend to remember the past by making all Greek Cypriots enemies because their expectation from the present and the future is to prove that they cannot live together with the Greek Cypriots. Thus, they reconstruct their memories of the past, sometimes by exaggerating their ethnic conflict experiences, sometimes stating that they prefer to forget the good memories of the times lived together, or sometimes forgetting the memories of both sides helping each other during the active ethnic conflict, to prove their political aim.

³³¹ Misztal, "Memory and the Construction of Temporality, Meaning and Attachment," 46.

Memories are also become political acts as being always in between the different individual and structural memory narratives such as national historiography, a family memory, and history education. That is why how historical-political periods that individuals of different generations have lived through affected the memory narratives of the participants were also asserted because of the fact that these generations are the constitutive subjects of different historical-political periods. The participant of the third generation represents the opening of the border in 2003 as the turning point of their post-memories, thus, as a reference point of their post-memory narratives. Because they were primarily influenced by the memories learned and listened to from their families while constructing their own post-memory narratives. In other words, they actively create their own post-memory narratives by interpreting the stories that they've learned from their families and school education within the influence of the atmosphere of 2003. To be more precise, the rising of the Cypriotism ideology, especially after the 1980s with its emphasis on the cultural, traditional, and geographical affiliation of Turkish and Greek Cypriots rather than seeing the latter as the constitutive other of the self (former), a group that had nothing in common with the self, and impossible to live together, influenced their memory narratives. They noted that seeing the other part of the island and the Greek Cypriots, and how they lived differently from them, completely changed the post-memory narratives of this generation. That is, they politically created their post-memory narratives about what happened in the past through the future they want to see on the island for young Turkish Cypriots. In this narrative that they preferred to build on the past by looking to their future expectations, they emphasized that 'if Turk and Greek lived together in peace in past times, then, we can also live in the future' although nobody from their families preferred to make such an emphasis. In other words, they built their post-memory narratives about the past on the basis that they can all live together as Cypriots without necessarily emphasizing Turkishness and Greekness. Unlike their grandparents, they assert that one should understand the past from the perspective of both sides, and Cypriots should make sense of the past beyond creating goods and evils.

At this point, it is crucial to see that despite the strict differences in the memory narratives and methodology of these two generations, their method as using the past and memory narratives as their political tools to legitimize their meaning makings about ethnic conflict and future expectations is what is common for them. They prefer to remember the past for their future expectations, and by doing so, they make, consciously or not, more visible the fact that remembering as an intentional, social, and political act of memory is a selective and semi-permeable act, and always in between past (experiences), present life situations, and future aspirations.

It wasn't easy to see how the memory narratives of the second generation have become politicized. However, at this point, the feature of remembering being based on reference points helped me. In other words, they assert that Turkey's neoliberal policies imposed on the island after 1983 caused them to live the worst periods of their lives in every sense. Thus, they recreate and politicized their memory narratives upon this idea. In other words, the participants of this generation created narratives of remembrance of the past by emphasizing their dissatisfaction with the life they lived, especially the fact that they had to live in an unrecognized state and the economic embargos of Turkey. In other words, in the memory narratives of this generation, the oscillated needle of remembrance which, politicized between the past, present, and future, has spent the most time in the present.

As a consequence of that, the Greek Cypriots are no longer being portrayed as brutal, monstrous, or unreliable inhumane creatures within their memory narratives. In a sense, unlike their parents, they preferred to portray the Greek Cypriots as more humane, who could make mistakes, and some are good and some bad. That is to say, Greek Cypriots are beginning to be humanized by selective and intentional memory narratives by them, and they also tactically reshape their memory narrative about ethnic conflict and portraying of Greek Cypriots by using the policies of Turkey after 1983 as a reference point.

The aforementioned arguments about the generational remembering once again highlight the basic argumentation of this thesis; remembering is always in between the individual and collective, subjective and objective, and social and political because the

system of dispositions embodied as generational remembering in which the selectiveness of remembering becomes visible, does not one-sidedly reflect upon remembering of individuals; instead they have a reciprocal relationship. Thus, active human agency is a crucial factor in generational remembering because, through this active human agency, generational positioning through the interpretative act of making sense of the past, present, and future of the island can be seen.

Memory has never been just about the past and power free act. To put it differently, remembering as an intentional act of memory is a process that is also affected by today's living conditions and future concerns. As a combination of all these, people build their memory narratives that express what and how they remember. Following this, all participants of these generations stated that they preferred to build their memory narratives about the ethnic conflict and perceptions about the Greek Cypriots according to their present life situations and political aims toward the future of the island. In a sense, they all use the past and their memory narratives as their political tool to legitimize their thoughts on the past, present, and future of the ethnic conflict and Cyprus society. Thus, all the participants show once again that memory is a continuous state of becoming; it becomes political within this becoming process while being in relation to the power relations within the production of history. In a way, the participants who belonged to different generations of their families say that 'we exist and playing an active role in historiography,' while creating another kind of mnemonic battle between generations, where some of them incline to remember following official history, some concerning being totally against the official history, or some according to negotiation.³³²

Finally, there are a few limitations of the thesis that should be emphasized. Throughout this thesis, the differences and similarities between generational remembering and memory narratives are highlighted. In doing so, it has been argued that generations do not only consist of a cohort or age, but also they are formed by how they remember

³³² Verovsek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," 539.

the past and how they position themselves in terms of their memory narratives. However, some of the modalities developed as a subset of generational memory narratives could not be fully underlined. For example, there may be nuances among people with similar generational positions according to gender, class, and political ideologies. In other words, it should be underlined that even though the memory narratives of the same generations are similar in the overall, there may always be differences within this similarity. However, as emphasized in the methodology chapter, the main concern guiding this thesis is not to reach a general conclusion that would represent the thoughts and, subsequently, the demands of all Turkish Cypriot families and their descendants in the Northern Part of Cyprus. Instead, it can be stated that what kind of various meanings and narratives exist within different generations of the families about past ethnic conflicts and what kind of remembering interpretations they have occurred is one of the main purposes of this thesis. Therefore, this thesis studies the interrelation of similarities, differences, and specificities in narratives of three different generations of each family rather than generalizations of their narratives. Especially, inductive reasoning or generalization such as 'all the Turkish Cypriots who had experienced the active ethnic conflict times on the island think like this or in the same way' would not be made because people develop ways to maintain or reproduce a sense of reality based on systems of meaning that they create in the course of social interactions with others. These social interactions are specific, temporal, and always in becoming process like their memories and memory narratives.

REFERENCES

- Anthias, Floya, and Ron Ayres. "Ethnicity and Class in Cyprus." *Race & Class* 25, no. 1 (1983): 59–76.
- Argenti, Nicolas, and Katharina Schramm. "Introduction: Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission." Essay. In *Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*, edited by Nicolas Argenti and Katharina Schramm, 1–39. Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Blaikie, Norman. *Designing Social Research: the Logic of Anticipation*. Polity Press, 2000.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Wacquant Loïc J. D. "The Purpose of Reflexive Sociology (The Chicago Workshop)." Essay. In *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, 61–216. The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Structures And The Habitus." Essay. In *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, translated by Richard Nice, 28th ed., 72–95. New York City, New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2013.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Understanding." Essay. In *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, edited by Pierre Bourdieu, 607–27. Stanford,, California: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Bowman, Jim. "Seeing What's Missing in Memories of Cyprus." *Peace Review* 18, no. 1 (2006): 119–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402650500510776>.

Bozkurt, Umut, and Nicolas Trimikliniotis. “Rethinking the Postcolonial Cypriot Statehood: The Cyprus Problem, Class Struggles, and Ethnic Conflict.” Essay. In *Beyond A Divided Cyprus: A State And Society In Transformation*, 47–66. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Bozkurt, Umut, and Nicos Trimikliniotis . “Introduction: Beyond a Divided Cyprus, a Society in a State of Transformation .” Essay. In *Beyond a Divided Cyprus, a Society in a State of Transformation* , edited by Umut Bozkurt and Nicos Trimikliniotis , 1st ed., 1–21. Place of publication not identified: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Bryant , Rebecca. “History’s Reminders: On Time and Objects after Conflict in Cyprus.” *American Ethnologist* 41, no. 4 (2014): 681–97.

Bryant, Rebecca. “Partitions of Memory: Wounds and Witnessing in Cyprus.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 54, no. 2 (2012): 332–60.

Bryant, Rebecca. “Writing the Catastrophe: Nostalgia and Its Histories in Cyprus.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 26, no. 2 (2008): 399–422.

Canefe, Nergis. *Anavatandan Yavruvatana: Milliyetçilik, Bellek Ve Aidiyet* . İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniv., 2007.

Canefe, Nergis. “Kaç Kıbrıs? Nicosia/Lefkoşa/Lefkoşe'nin Kıbrıs Türk Tarihindeki Hikayesi.” In *Anavatandan Yavruvatana Milliyetçilik, Bellek Ve Aidiyet*, edited by Nergis Canefe, 315–36. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007.

Carr, David. *Time, Narrative, and History*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Carr, Edward Hallett. *What Is History?* Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Casey, Edward S. *Remembering: a Phenomenological Study*. 2nd ed. Indiana University Press, 2000.

Cassia, Paul Sant. *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*. New York City, New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.

Certeau, Michel de. *The Writing of History*. Translated by Tom Conley. New York, New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Christodoulou, Nicoletta. "Contested Language, Memory, and Oral History as Curriculum Questions: A Tale from Cyprus." *European Journal of Curriculum Studies* 2, no. 2 (2015): 324–45.

Christofis, Nikos, and Thekla Kyritsi. Introduction. In *Cypriot Nationalisms in Context: History, Identity, and Politics*, edited by Nikos Christofis and Thekla Kyritsi, 1–22. Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (1997): 1386–1403. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2171069>.

Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. "Introduction The Discipline And Practice Of Qualitative Research." Essay. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, 1–33. Sage Publications, 2005.

Eagleton, Terry. *The Idea of Culture*. Blackwell Publishing, 2000.

Eisner, Elliot W. "What Makes a Study Qualitative?" Essay. In *The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice*, 27–43. New York City, New York: Teachers College Press, 2017.

Erll, Astri. "Locating Family in Cultural Memory Studies." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 42, no. 3 (2011): 303–18.

Eyerman, Ron, and Bryan S. Turner. "Outline of a Theory of Generations." *European Journal of Social Theory* 1, no. 1 (1998): 91–106.

Goff, Jacques Le. *History and Memory*. New York City, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Hadjipavlou, Maria. "Inter-Ethnic Stereotypes, Neighbourliness, Separation: Paradoxes And Challenges In Cyprus." *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 13, no. 2 (2003): 281–318.

Hadjipavlou, Maria. "No Permission to Cross: Cypriot Women's Dialogue across the Divide." *Gender, Place & Culture* 13, no. 4 (2006): 329–51.

Halbwachs, Maurice, and Lewis A. Coser. "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877-1945." Essay. In *On Collective Memory*, 1–34. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Translated by Lewis A. Coser. 1st ed. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Collective Memory*. Harper & Row, 1980.

Haukanes, Haldis, and Susanna Trnka. "Memory, Imagination, and Belonging across Generations." *Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 66 (2013): 3–13.

Haukanes, Haldis, and Susanna Trnka. "Memory, Imagination, and Belonging across Generations: Perspectives from Postsocialist Europe and Beyond." *Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 66 (2013): 3–13.

Hirsch, Eric, and Charles Stewart. "Introduction: Ethnographies of Historicity." *History and Anthropology* 16, no. 3 (2005): 261–74.

Hirsch, Marianne. "The Generation of Postmemory." *Poetics Today* 29, no. 1 (2008): 103–28.

Hirsch, Marianne. "The Generation of Postmemory." *Poetics Today* 29, no. 1 (2008): 103–28.

Hutton, Patrick H. *The Memory Phenomenon in Contemporary Historical Writing: How the Interest in Memory Has Influenced Our Understanding of History*. 1st ed. Burlington, Vermont: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Kansteiner, Wolf. "Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies." *History and Theory* 41, no. 2 (2002): 179–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0018-2656.00198>.

Keightley, Emily. "Remembering Research: Memory and Methodology in the Social Sciences." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 13, no. 1 (2009): 55–70.

Keightley, Emily. "Section Five: Linking with the Past: Engaging with Memory." Essay. In *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, edited by Michael ed. Pickering, 175–93. Edinburgh University Press, 2008.

Ker-Lindsay, James. *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*. New York City, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Kertzer, David I. "Generation as a Sociological Problem." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9, no. 1 (1983): 125–49. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.001013>.

Kidron, Carol A. "Toward an Ethnography of Silence: The Lived Presence of the Past in the Everyday Life of Holocaust Trauma Survivors and Their Descendants in Israel." *Current Anthropology* 50, no. 1 (2009): 5–27.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M. "The Dialectic of Intolerance: Ideological Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict." *The Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* VI, no. 4 (1979): 5–31.

Kızılyürek Niyazi. *Bir hınç Ve şiddet Tarihi: Kıbrıs'ta statü Kavgası Ve Etnik çatışma*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2016.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi. "Modernity, Nationalism and the Perspectives of a Cypriot Union." *CEMOTI, Cahiers D'Études Sur La Méditerranée Orientale Et Le Monde Turco-Iranien* 34, no. 1 (2002): 211–32.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi. "National Memory and Turkish-Cypriot Textbooks." *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 21, no. 4 (1999): 387–95.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi. "The Politics of Identity in the Turkish Cypriot Community: a Response to the Politics of Denial?," *Travaux De La Maison De L'Orient Méditerranéen* 37 (2003): 197–2004.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi. "Turkish-Cypriot Left: A Historical Overview." Essay. In *Beyond A Divided Cyprus: A State And Society In Transformation*, 169–84. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Lacher, Hannes, and Erol Kaymak. "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus." *Mediterranean Politics* 10, no. 2 (2005): 147–66.

Leonard, Madeleine. "Echoes from the Past: Intergenerational Memories in Cyprus." *Children & Society*, 2012, 1–11.

Leonard, Madeleine. "Echoes from the Past: Intergenerational Memories in Cyprus." *Children & Society*, 2012, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2012.00445.x>.

Loizides, Neophytos G. "Ethnic Nationalism and Adaptation in Cyprus." *International Studies Perspectives* 8, no. 2 (2007): 172–89.

Maltby, Sarah. "Remembering the Falklands War: Subjectivity and Identification." *International Journal of Communication* 10 (2016): 1–29.

Mannheim, Karl. "The Problem of Generations." Essay. In *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by Paul Kecskemeti, 276–320. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.

Marvasti, Amir B. *Qualitative Research In Sociology*. Sage Publications, 2004.

Mason, Jennifer. *Qualitative Researching*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications, 2002.

Middleton, David, Derek Edwards, and Barry Schwartz. Essay. In *Collective Remembering Inquiries in Social Construction*, 81–107. London: Sage Publications, 1990.

Misztal, Barbara A. *Theories of Social Remembering*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2003.

Misztal, Barbara. “Memory and the Construction of Temporality, Meaning and Attachment.” *Polish Sociological Review* 149 (2005): 31–48.

Molden, Berthold. “Resistant Pasts versus Mnemonic Hegemony: On the Power Relations of Collective Memory.” *Memory Studies* 9, no. 2 (2015): 125–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698015596014>.

Morag, Nadav. “Cyprus And The Clash Of Greek And Turkish Nationalisms.” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 10, no. 4 (2004): 595–624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110490900368>.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 7th ed. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2014.

Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. New York City, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Olick, Jeffrey K. “Collective Memory: The Two Cultures.” *Sociological Theory* 17, no. 3 (1999): 333–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00083>.

Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins. “Social Memory Studies: From ‘Collective Memory’ to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 24, no. 1 (1998): 105–40. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.105>.

Palmberger, Monika. *How Generations Remember: Conflicting Histories and Shared Memories in Post-War Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Palmberger, Monika. "Ruptured Pasts and Captured Futures: Life Narratives in Postwar Mostar." *Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 2013, no. 66 (2013): 14–24.

Papadakis, Yiannis. "The Politics of Memory and Forgetting." *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 3, no. 1 (1983): 139–54.

Papadakis, Yiannis, and Rebecca Bryant, eds. *Cyprus and the Politics of Memory: History, Community and Conflict*. I. B. Tauris & Company, Limited, 2012.

Papadakis, Yiannis. "Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process." *American Ethnologist* 25, no. 2 (1998): 149–65.

Papadakis, Yiannis. "Locating the Cyprus Problem: Ethnic Conflict and the Politics of Space." *Macalester International* 15 (2005): 81–98.

Papadakis, Yiannis. "Narrative, Memory and History Education in Divided Cyprus: A Comparison of Schoolbooks on the 'History of Cyprus'." *History and Memory* 20, no. 2 (2008): 128–48.

Papadakis, Yiannis. "Nation, Narrative And Commemoration: Political Ritual In Divided Cyprus." *History and Anthropology* 14, no. 3 (2003): 253–70.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0275720032000136642>.

Papadakis, Yiannis. "The National Struggle Museums of a Divided City." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17, no. 3 (1994): 400–419.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1994.9993833>.

Burke, Peter. "History as Social Memory." In *Varieties of Cultural History*, 43–60. Cornell University Press, 1997.

Pietkiewicz, Igor, and Jonathan Alan Smith. "A Practical Guide to Using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis in Qualitative Research Psychology." *Czasopismo Psychologiczne Psychological Journal* 20, no. 1 (2014): 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.14691/cppj.20.1.7>.

Pine, Frances. "Probing the Past and Imagining the Future." *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 2013, no. 66 (2013): 69–72.
<https://doi.org/10.3167/fcd.2013.660107>.

Popular Memory Group. "Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method." Essay. In *Making Histories: Studies in History-Writing and Politics*, edited by Richard Johnson, 205–53. London: Routledge, 2007.

Rosenthal, Gabriele. "The Narrated Life Story: On the Interrelation Between Experience, Memory and Narration." *Narrative, Memory & Knowledge: Representations, Aesthetics, Contexts*, 2006, 1–16.

Ryder, Norman B. "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change." *American Sociological Review* 30, no. 6 (1965): 843–61.

Schuman, Howard, and Jacqueline Scott. "Generations and Collective Memories." *American Sociological Review* 54, no. 3 (1989): 359–81.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Blackwell Publishing, 1986.

Souter, David. "An Island Apart: A Review of the Cyprus Problem." *Third World Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1984): 657–74.

Trouillot, Michel Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. 1st ed. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

Verovšek, Peter J. "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: the Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4, no. 3 (2016): 529–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2016.1167094>.

Walker, Robert, and Sue Jones. "Depth Interviewing." Essay. In *Applied Qualitative Research*, 45–56. Aldershot: Gower, 1985.

Welzer, Harald. "Re-Narrations: How Pasts Change in Conversational Remembering." *Memory Studies* 3, no. 1 (2010): 5–17.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. "Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past." *Qualitative Sociology* 19, no. 3 (1996): 283–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02393273>.

Zerubavel, Yael. "The Dynamics Of Collective Remembering." Essay. In *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, 3–13. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

APPENDICES

A. KIBRIS ARAŞTIRMASI SORULARI / CYPRUS RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A. Giriş- Tanışma Soruları

1. Sizi biraz tanıyabilir miyiz? Yaşınız, doğum yeriniz?
2. Nerelisiniz?
3. Hep Kıbrıs'ta mı yaşadınız? Hep, bugünkü Kıbrıs'ta Kuzey Bölgesi olarak geçen yerde mi yaşadınız?
4. Annenizin ve babanızın doğum yeri
5. Herhangi bir siyasi partiye, derneğe, vakfa, sivil toplum örgütüne vs. üyeliğiniz var mı? Var ise hangisi-hangileri?
6. Yok ise, üye olabilirim diye düşündünüz mü?

B. (Kendi veya Ailesinin) Göç Hikayesine Dair Sorular

7. Ailenizin (ve/veya sizin) 74'teki zorunlu göç hikayesini kısaca anlatır mısınız?
8. Sizin için ev ne demek? Veya ev dediğimde neler aklınıza geliyor?
9. Şu an yaşadığınız yerde evinizde gibi hissediyor musunuz?

C. Geçmiş, Gelecek ve Tarih Algısına Dair Sorular (Giriş Soruları)

10. Geçmiş denildiğinde aklınıza gelen ilk 3 şey nedir?
11. Bu şeylerden-kelimelerden ne anlıyorsunuz? Kısaca açıklayabilir misiniz?

12. 1960 ile 1974 arasında geçen zamanı anlatmanızı istesem nasıl anlatırsınız?
13. Kıbrıs'la ilgili bir tarih kitabı yazmak istiyoruz diye size gelseler, nasıl yazılması gerektiğini, nelerden bahsedilmesi gerektiğini düşünürsünüz?
14. Gelecek denildiğinde aklınıza gelen ilk 3 şey nedir?
15. Bu şeylerden-kelimelerden ne anlıyorsunuz? Kısaca açıklayabilir misiniz?
16. Kıbrıs'ta görmek istediğiniz geleceği tarif edebilir Misiniz? Nasıl bir gelecek hayali kuruyorsunuz?
17. Kıbrıs'ta yaşanan etnik çatışmalara dair iki farklı resmi tarih anlatısı var. Biri Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti'nden gelen, diğeri ise Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti'nden gelen. Bu resmi tarih anlatılarına dair ne söylemek istersiniz?
18. Siyasi parti liderlerinin, başbakan veya cumhurbaşkanlarının Kıbrıs sorununa dair bu zamana kadar verdikleri demeçlerden hatırladıklarınız var mı?

D. Hatırlama / Geçmiş Anlamlandırmaya Dair Sorular

19. Çocukluğunuzu tarif etmenizi istesem neler söylemek istersiniz?
20. İlk politik anınız nedir? O anı hatırlamaya çalışsanız nasıl tasvir edersiniz?
21. Ailenizin size Kıbrıs tarihiyle ilgili anlattıklarını merak ediyorum (Görüşmeyi yapan kişiye (kendime) not: Önceden kardeşlik söylemi?, hatırlamamaya/ unutmaya Çalışma? Kıbrıslı Türk- Kıbrıslı Rumların arasındaki ilişkileri neyin bozduğuna dair fikir, değişen, bozulan kültürel özelliklerden bahsederler miydi? şeklinde açmasını sağlayabilirsin soruyu eğer çok genel cevaplar gelirse)
22. Siz peki çocuklarınıza veya torunlarınıza bu olaylardan hangilerini anlattınız, hangilerinin anlatılması gerektiğini düşünüyorsunuz? (Son kuşağa, anlatılması gerektiğini düşünüyor musunuz, anlatırsınız mısınız bir gün çocuklarınız veya torunlarınız olduğunda, şeklinde soracaksınız)

23. Siz peki kendiniz özellikle araştırıp okudunuz mu Kıbrıs yakın tarihine dair? Evet ise hangi kitapları okudunuz? En önemli gördüğünüz Birkaçından kısaca bahseder misiniz?

24. Eğitim hayatınızı düşünseniz, tarih dersleriniz nasıl geçerdi, hangi konulardan bahsedilirdi?

25. Kıbrıs tarihinde 1900'lerden bugüne kadar olan zamanı düşündüğünüzde toplumsal dönüm noktası (en önemli olarak gördüğünüz şeklinde de sorabilirsin) olarak gördüğünüz en önemli 10 olayı sıralar mısınız? Bu olayları kimden, ne zaman ve nasıl öğrendiniz?

(Buradaki amacım bu üç farklı kuşağın tarihi nasıl öğrendiklerini, yorumladıklarını ve bu sırada kendi kişisel hafızalarının da nasıl şekillendiğini görmek.)

26. Bu olaylardan hangilerini çocuklarınıza ve/veya torunlarınıza anlatmanız gerektiğini düşündünüz veya anlattınız? Bu olaylar arasında kesinlikle hatırlanmalı, unutulmamalı dedikleriniz hangileri? (Bu soruyu bazı durumlarda, savaş anılarınızla ilgili çocuklarınız ve torunlarınızla konuşur musunuz? Diye revize edebilirsiniz).

E. Ayrımcılık ve Öteki Algısına Dair Sorular

27. Gündelik hayatınızda Kıbrıslı Türkler Dışında Kıbrıs'ta yaşayan gruplar için kullandığınız özel adlandırmalar var mı? var ise, nelerdir?

28. Bu adlandırmaları kimden öğrendiniz? Ne sıklıkla kullanırsınız?

29. Sık sık konuştuğunuz, görüştüğünüz veya birbirinizden haber aldığınız Türk olmayan bir arkadaşınız var mı? Var ise, ne sıklıkla görüşürsünüz, nerede buluşursunuz, buluştuğunuzda neler yaparsınız? Yok ise, hiç oldu mu? Olmadı ise, neden sizce?

30. Sizce ayrımcılık nedir?

31. Hiç ayrımcılığa uğradınız mı? Evet ise, anlatır mısınız?

32. Birinin ayrımcılığa uğramasına neden olduğunuz oldu mu? Evet ise, anlatır mısınız?

33. Sizce Kıbrıslı olmak ne demektir? Peki, Kıbrıslı Türk ne demektir?

34. 2003'te kapıların açılmasına dair hatırladıklarınız nelerdir? Kapılar ilk açıldığında (2003) Güney'e geçtiniz mi? Sonrasında hiç yeniden gittiniz mi veya ne sıklıkla gidiyorsunuz Güney'e? Neden? Ne hissediyorsunuz (her gittiğinizde) oradayken?

35. Yeşil Hat ile ilgili ne düşünüyorsunuz?

F. Geçmişle Yüzleşme, Geleceğe Yönelmeye Dair Sorular

36. Geçmişte yaşanan çatışmaların olduğu bir gerçek. Bu gerçek ile ne yapılabilir sizce? (Bir şey yapılmalı mı? Hatırlanmalı mı Yoksa geride mi bırakılmalı?)

37. Yaşanan etnik çatışmaların unutulmaması gerektiğini düşünüyor musunuz? Neden?

38. Unutulması gerektiğini düşünüyorsanız, Neden?

39. Hatırlamak denince aklınıza gelen ilk 3 kavramı sıralar mısınız? Ne ifade ediyor bu kavramlar sizin için?

40. Peki aynı soruyu unutmak için sorsam?

41. Güney ile bir arada yaşamla ilgili ne söylemek istersiniz?

42. İki toplum arasında barışın sağlanması gerektiğini düşünüyor musunuz? Neden?

43. Evet ise, peki Kıbrıs'ta kalıcı barış nasıl mümkün olabilir?

A. Introduction – Warm up Question

1. Could you share some informations about yourself? Your age, your birthplace?

2. Where are you from?
3. Have you always lived in Kıbrıs? Have you always lived in what is now called Northern Part of Cyprus?
4. The birthplace of your mother and father
5. Do you have a membership to any political party, association, foundation, non-governmental organization etc. If yes, please share?
6. If not, have you ever thought I could become a member?

B. Questions About the Migration Story (Herself or Her Family)

7. Could you briefly tell your family's (and/ or yours) (forced) migration story in 1974?
8. What does home mean to you? Or what comes to your mind when I say home?
9. Do you feel like at home where you live right now?

C. Questions about the Perceptions upon the Past, the Future, and History (Introductory Questions)

10. What comes to your mind when I say past? Could you list the first three?
11. What do you understand from those words- things? Can you explain briefly?
12. How would you tell me If I asked you for the time between 1960 and 1974?
13. If someone come to you with a purpose in writing a history book on Cyprus, what would you tell them? What do you think should be written in that book? What should be mentioned?
14. What comes to your mind when I say the future? Can you list the first three?
15. What do you understand from those words- things? Can you explain briefly?

16. Can you describe the future that you want to see in Cyprus? What are your future intentions for Cyprus?

17. There are two different official history narratives about ethnic conflicts in Cyprus. While one of them is from the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, the other is from the Republic of Cyprus. What would you like to say about these contradicting official history narratives?

18. Do you remember any of the statements of political party leaders, prime ministers, or presidents about the Cyprus problem so far?

D. Questions about Remembering and Making Sense of the Past

19. What would you like to say if I asked you to describe your childhood?

20. What is your first political memory? How would you describe that memory if you try to remember?

21. I wonder what your parents were telling you about the history of Cyprus? (Note to the interviewer (to myself): Try to help them to narrow down their general answers with such questions: We were brothers discourse? Trying to forget, not to remember past? Any idea of what could be the reason behind the ethnic conflict? Would they talk about changing and disrupted cultural characteristics?)

22. Well, which of these events did you tell your children or grandchildren, which do you think should be told? (To the last generation: do you think it should be explained one day when you have children or grandchildren)

23. Did you specifically read anything about the recent history of Cyprus? If yes, which books did you read? Could you name a few you see the most important?

24. How was your history lessons? Which topics mentioned in the lessons?

25. When you think about the time between the 1900s to today in the history of Cyprus, could you list the ten most important events (I can also ask what you see as

the most important) that you see as a turning point in society? How/ from whom/ when did you learn them?

(My aim here is how three different generations learn, interpret the history and at the same time how their memory shape.)

26. Do you think which of these events should be told to the next generations? Among these events, what are the things that you say should definitely be remembered and not to be forgotten? (You can revise this question in some cases, saying, Do you talk to your children and grandchildren about your war memories?).

E. Questions about the Discrimination and the Perception of Other

27. In your daily conversations, do you ever use any unique naming for the people living in Cyprus other than Turkish Cypriots? If yes, what are they?

28. From whom you learned these names? How often you use them?

29. Do you have a non-Turkish friend that you talk to or hear from each other often? If yes, how often do you see each other, where you usually meet, and what you prefer to do when you two together? If no, have you ever had? If you haven't had a non-Turkish friend, what could be the reason for it?

30. How would you define discrimination?

31. Have you ever experienced discrimination? If yes, could you please explain?

32. Have you ever caused discrimination against someone? If yes, could you explain?

33. What do you think of being a Cypriot? Well, what does Turkish Cypriot mean?

34. What do you remember about 2003? Did you cross to the South when the doors were first opened? Did you go there again or how often do you go there? Why? What do you feel (whenever you go there) while you are there?

35. What do you think about the Green Line?

F. Come to Terms With the Past, and Questions about the Future

36. It is a fact that there have been conflicts in the past. What do you think can be done with this fact? (Anything should be done? Should we remember or left it behind us?)
37. Do you think that those ethnic conflicts should not be forgotten? Why?
38. If you think they should be forgotten, Why?
39. Can you list the top 3 concepts when you think of remembering? What do they (concepts) mean to you?
40. Well, what if I asked the same question for forgetting?
41. What would you like to say about living together with the South?
42. Do you think that peace should be achieved among the two communities? Why?
43. If yes, how perpetual peace can be possible in Cyprus?

B. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 413

12 Aralık 2019

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Reşide Ömür BİRLER

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız Beyza Hatun KIZILTEPE'nin "Geçmiş, Şimdi ve Gelecek Arasında Hafızanın Politikleşmesi: Kıbrıslı Türkler Arasında Kuşaklararası ve Sosyal Hatırlatma" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve 393 ODTU 2019 protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız

Doç. Dr. Mine MISIRLISOY

Başkan

Prof. Dr. Tolga CAN

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Emre TURGUT

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Müge GÜNDÜZ

Üye

Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Şerife SEVİNÇ

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Süreyya Özcan KABASAKAL

Üye

C. TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

Sosyal bilimler literatrnde hafıza kavramına olan ilgi, 1960’lardan itibaren grnr hale gelmiřtir. Bu grnr hale gelme durumu, zellikle atıřma yařamıř toplumlara, coęrafyalara veya dnemlere odaklanarak tarih yazımı tartıřmaları ierisinde olmuřtur. nk gemiř zerine retrospektif bir řekilde dřnme ve fikir retme gemiř ile ilgili syleyecek sz veya derdi olan toplulukların ihtiyaı olmaya bařlamıřtır.

Bařlangıta, hafıza ve hatırlama kavramı, ulus devlet resmi tarih anlatısının dıřında kalan, sessizleřtirilmiř ve grmezden gelinmiř gruplara odaklanmıřtır. Bir bakıma, tarih yazımının veya tarihin st anlatılarının yukarıdan ařaęıya haline karřılık veren olarak ortaya ıkan hafıza kavramı, ařaęıdan ve reaktif bir řekilde temsil edilmesiyle tarih yazımı tartıřmalarının ierisine girmiřtir. Ancak, geleneksel tarih yazımına ve ulus devletlerin dřmancıl ikilikler yaratmaya meyilli olan resmi tarih anlatılarına karřıt bir politik pozisyona sahip olmasına raęmen hafıza ve tarih yazımı kavramları bazı ortak noktalara da sahiptir. rneęin, her ikisi de anımsatıcı / hafızayla ilgili pratiklerdir, gemiři ona karřı olan merakları ierisinde hammadde olarak kullanılır, sosyal ve politik bakımdan toplumlarda etkilidirler, ve tm bunların sonucunda karřılıklı olarak birbirlerini etkilerler. Daha net olmak gerekirse, gemiři hatırlamak ya da onun hakkında ařaęıdan doęru yazmak, aslında karřısında olduęu yukarıdan ařaęıya yazılan tarih yazımı ve meta anlatılarla benzeri bir eęilim gsterebilir. rneęin etnik atıřmalar yařamıř lkelerin tarihine bakıldıęında, varlıęını, dřncelerini, veya yorumlamalarını tarih yazımı zerinden meřrulařtırmak sadece ulus devletlerin alıřık olduęu bir pratik deęil, aynı zamanda azınlık gruplarının da pratięi olabilmıřtır. Ancak bu gruplar, toplumlarının gemiř, řimdi, ve geleceklerine dair politik iddialarını ulus devletlerin tarih yazımı sylemlerini takip ederek deęil hafıza siyasetiyle yaptıklarını sylerler. Ancak hafıza siyasetinin de

benzeri bir metot kullandığının, yukarıda bahsedildiği gibi benzeri metotlara sahip olduğunun altı çizilmelidir. Ve bu benzeri metot, toplumun geçmişi, bugünü ve geleceği hakkındaki yorumlamaları meşrulaştırmak için geçmişi ve tarih yazımını politik bir araç olarak kullanmak pratiği üzerine kurulmuştur denilebilir. Buradan hareketle varılabilecek çıkarımlar biri de, siyaset, politik olan ve iktidar ilişkilerinin hafıza ve hatırlama içerisindeki rolü, öncelikle resmî tarih yazımına karşıt ve dualistik olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Ancak daha sonrasında hegemonik bir mücadele alanı gibi yani lineer bir şekilde değil de toplumun tüm üyelerine merkezden ve çevreden de dokunan karışık sarmallar şeklinde çalıştığı iddia edilmeye başlanmıştır. Başka bir deyişle, gruplar veya bireyler hatırlama güçlerini veya hafızalarını kaybetmeyerek tarih yazımına dair hegemonik mücadele alanında kendi hatırlama anlatıları dahilinde hamle yapan aktörler haline gelirler. Bu nedenle, hafıza, amaca yönelik seçici geçirgen bir sosyal eylem olmaya başlar. Toplumsal olanın içerisinde bireysel anlam yaratma süzgecinden geçirilerek oluşturulur, ve bu nedenle de politik bir eylemdir. Bu politik eylemin zemini de geçmişte ne olduğu ile ne olduğu iddiasının kurulduğu hatırlama anlatısı arasında kurulur.

Bunu takiben, geçmiş üzerine düşünme ve yazma pratiğinin yalnızca bir zihinsel etkinlik olarak yazılı ve düşünsel alana sıkışıp kalmadığı söylenebilir. Geçmiş üzerine düşünmek sadece entelektüel bir faaliyet değil, sosyal ve politik sonuçları olan bir eylemdir. Geçmiş her zaman tartışmalı / çekişmeli bir alandır ve sadece ulus devletler, çoğunluk veya azınlık grupları onu bir araç olarak kullanmakla kalmaz, aynı zamanda, özellikle çatışma sonrası toplumlarda, her birey onu geçmiş, şimdiki zaman ve gelecek hakkında anlam oluşturma pratiklerinde politik bir araç olarak kullanma eğilimindedir.

Bu noktada, sosyal tarihçi Peter Burke,

geçmiş hatırlamak ya da onun hakkında yazmak bir dönem iddia edildiği gibi 'masum' eylemler olarak görülemez. Artık ne hatıralar ne de tarihler- *burada kastedilen tarih yazımıdır*- objektiftir. İki durumda da, bilinçli ya da bilinçsiz seçim yaptığımızın, yorumladığımızın ve tahrip ettiğimiz farkına varmayı öğreniyoruz. İki durumda da bu seçim, yorumlama ve tahrip etme, ve

toplumsallığa şartlanmıştır. Tarih yazımı ve hatıralar sadece bireylerin işi değildir³³³

der. Tarih yazımının ve hatırlamanın sürekli devam eden bir yeniden inşa etme hali olduğu düşünülürse, kimin hangi tarihsel olgu ve olaylar üzerine bahsedilmesi gerektiğine veya gerekmediğine karar vermesi, ve bu karar verme süreci sonucunda hafızaya anlatılarının oluşturulması politiktir.

Bu çalışma, Kıbrıslı Türk aileleri arasında kuşaklar arası hatırlamaya özel olarak odaklanarak geçmiş, şimdiki zaman ve gelecek arasında hafızanın nasıl politikleştiğine odaklanmıştır. Bu tezin temel amacı, Kıbrıs'ta hatırlamanın politikleşmesinin dinamiklerini, özellikle Kıbrıslı Türk ailelerin üç farklı kuşağının hafıza anlatılarına odaklanarak anlamak olmuştur. Başka bir deyişle, Kıbrıslı Türk ailelerin farklı kuşaklarının geçmişi nasıl hatırlamayı seçtiklerini, geçmişte yaşanan etnik çatışmalar hakkında ne düşündüklerini ve Kıbrıs'ta nasıl bir gelecek görmek istediklerini anlamak ve analiz etmek bu tezin temel amacı olmuştur. Bunu yaparak, bu üç kuşağın hafıza anlatılarının oluşum ve seçilme dinamikleri / ilkeleri vurgulanmıştır çünkü hafıza anlatılarının sürekli olarak yeniden ürettiği geçmiş yaratımları parçalı, istikrarsız, genellikle çekişmeli ve tüm bu nedenlerle de mücadele alanı olmaya eğilimlidir.

Kıbrıs, yukarıda bahsedilen tartışmalarla ilgili soruları araştırmak için uygun bir tarihe sahip denilebilir çünkü Kıbrıs adasında 1950'lerden beri çözülmemiş bir çatışma hali devam etmektedir. Bugün hâlâ Avrupa'nın bölünmüş son başkenti olan Lefkoşa'da, Kıbrıslı Rumlar'dan ayrılan Kıbrıslı Türkler arasında etnik çatışmanın nedeni ve çözümüne dair sayısız hafıza anlatısı vardır. Örneğin, bireyler aynı geçmişe ait farklı anlatıları adada görmek istedikleri geleceğe dair siyasi arzularına, kuşaklarına, cinsiyetlerine vb. göre ortaya çıkarabilirler. Bu tez, tüm yaşamlarını Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta geçirmiş, benzer aile yapıları ve sınıf konumlarına sahip farklı ailelerin, etnik çatışma

³³³ Peter Burke, "History as Social Memory," in *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cornell University Press, 1997), pp. 43-60, 44, 46.

dönemini ve sonrasını geriye dönük olarak nasıl hatırlamayı tercih ettiklerini ve Kıbrıs sorununun çözümü açısından nasıl bir gelecek hayal ettiklerini anlamaya çalışmıştır. Böylelikle, farklı nesillerin hafıza anlatımlarındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkların bu tezin ana vaatlerini daha görünür hale getirdiği de ileri sürülmüştür; hafızanın politikleşmesi, hatırlamanın karmaşık dinamiklerinin geçmiş, şimdiki zaman ve gelecek arasında somutlaştığı ve sürekli devam eden bir oluşum sürecidir. Dolayısıyla, bu tez, bu oluşum sürecini, sıradan insanların hafızalarının veya hatırlama eylemlerinin, özellikle çatışma sonrası toplumlarda politikleşmesi olarak kavramsallaştırırken bireylerin öznel anlam oluşturmalarını, adanın geçmişi, bugünü ve geleceği hakkındaki hafıza anlatılarını meşrulaştırmak için siyasi araçları olarak nasıl kullandıkları üzerinde durarak desteklemiştir.

Bu tezin temel amacı olan geçmişi hatırlamanın politikleşmesinin dinamiklerinin, özellikle Kıbrıslı Türk ailelerin üç farklı kuşağının hafıza anlatılarına odaklanarak anlamaya çalışmanın belirli bir nedeni vardır. Kuşak ve kuşaksal hatırlamayı oluşturan temel, yalnızca bir olayı aynı dönemde tecrübe etmiş olmak veya aynı yaş grubuna ait bireyler olmak üzerine kurulmaz. Bireylerin, yaşadıkları dönemlere ve belirli tarihsel olaylara dair benzeri söylemsel taktikleri izleyerek oluşturdıkları hatırlama anlatılarının benzerliği üzerine de kurulur. Ve bu sosyal süreç içerisinde yani kuşaklar arasındaki hatırlama anlatıları arasındaki benzerlikler ve farklılıkların olduğu noktalarda hatırlamanın seçici geçirgen özelliği ve bunun sonucu olarak da politik bir eylem haline gelmesi, ve kuşaksal hatırlama ve bu hatırlama anlatılarına göre belirli politik pozisyonlara sahip olmaya başlamaları daha da görünür olur.

Hafızanın seçiciliği, yarı geçirgenliği, ve her zaman bireysel ile yapısal olan ve olan ve olduğu söylenen arasında oluşunun bireysel hatırlama anlatılarında nasıl işlediğini görmek için on Kıbrıslı Türk aile ile otuz yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme yapılmıştır. Böylelikle zamansal, öznel, sosyal ve politik muhakemeye dayalı hafıza anlatımlarındaki farklılıklar ve benzerlikler vurgulanmıştır. Böylelikle, farklı kuşaklara mensup bireylerin yaşadıkları tarihsel-politik dönemlerin hafıza anlatılarını nasıl etkilediği üzerinde de durulmuştur çünkü bu kuşakların farklı tarihsel-politik

dönemlerin kurucu özneleri olmaları hatırlama anlatılarını oluştururken seçtikleri referans noktalarında değişikliklere neden olmuştur. Örneğin, ailelerinin ilk kuşağına mensup katılımcılar geçmişini hatırlarken kurdukları hafıza anlatılarında referans noktası olarak 1963 ve 1974'ü seçerken, ikinci kuşak hatırlamada referans noktası olarak 1983'ü ve Türkiye'nin sonrasında adada uyguladığı neoliberal politikaları referans noktası olarak almayı tercih etmiştir. 2003 yılında sınırların açılması ise üçüncü kuşağın referans noktası olarak göstermeyi tercih ettiği olay olmuştur.

Geçmişle ilgili fikir üretme pratiği, yalnızca entelektüel bir faaliyet olarak yazılı ve düşünsel alanda sıkışıp kalmamıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, tarih yazımı sadece entelektüel bir eylem değil, aynı zamanda sosyal ve politik sonuçları olan bir pratiktir. Özellikle ulus devletlerin kurulmasıyla devletler, resmi tarih yazımı ile 'düşman' olarak nitelendirilebilecek herhangi bir grubun homojenleşmesi üzerine siyasi, hukuki, coğrafi, kültürel, sosyal ve ekonomik meşruiyetlerini kurmuşlardır. Tarihlerinde etnik çatışmalar yaşamış ülkeler göz önüne alındığında, tarih yazımı yoluyla meşruiyetlerini ve/veya mağduriyetlerini tesis etmek, sadece ulus devletlerin alışkın olduğu bir pratik değil, aynı zamanda azınlık gruplarının da pratiği olmuştur. Bu noktada, tarih yazımının kişinin, grupların, veya şeylerin varoluşunun ve politik amaçlarının meşruiyetinin yegane sağlayıcısı olarak görme durumunun, sadece ulus-devletlerin bir özelliği olmadığı söylenebilir.

Spesifik olmak gerekirse, ailelerinin ilk kuşağına mensup olan katılımcıların da Kıbrıslı Rumları homojenleştirerek ve kurucu öteki olarak temsil ederek resmi tarih yazımı yöntemini ve söylemini kullandıkları görülmüştür. Kıbrıslı Türklerin İngiliz sömürge döneminden günümüze kadar farklı hafıza siyaseti ve milliyetçilik evrelerini tecrübeledikleri göz önünde bulundurulursa, Kıbrıslı Türk ailelerin ilk kuşağının yani 1950'lerden itibaren görünür olmaya başlayan aktif çatışmaları birebir tecrübelemiş bu kuşağın, etno-milliyetçi anlatılara dayalı geçmişini hatırlama ve anlamlandırma politikalarına doğrudan maruz kalan kuşak olduğu söylenebilir. Diğer bir deyişle, bu kuşak resmi tarih anlatısı ve hatırlama politikalarında Kıbrıslı Türklerden ziyade Kıbrıs Türkleri olarak resmediliyordu ve onların hafıza anlatılarının

da bu anlatı ile örtüşmesi bekleniyordu. Bu araştırmanın katılımcısı olan ve ailelerinin ilk kuşağına mensup olan kişilerin de bu beklentiye veya çağrıya karşılık vererek hatırlama anlatılarını Kıbrıslı Türk toplumunda siyasi elitler tarafından 1950 ile 1983 arasında baskın hale getirilmeye çalışılan tarih söylemiyle örtüşerek oluşturdukları görülmüştür. Bir bakıma, bu kuşağı mensup katılımcılar amaçlarına yönelik olarak milletleri ve ulusları için hatırlamayı seçmişlerdir. Ayrıca 1974'ü yaşamları için bir dönüm noktası olarak tanımlayan birinci kuşak katılımcıları, hatırlama anlatılarını da bu duruma göre 1974 öncesi ve sonrası olarak ikiye ayırmışlardır.

Birinci kuşağı mensup katılımcıların 1974 öncesi hafıza anlatılarında Kıbrıslı Türkler'in pasif ve tepkisel bir konumda oluşunun, Kıbrıslı Rumların homojen bir şekilde temsil ettiği kötü özellikler ve Kıbrıslı Türklere karşı düşmanca tavırlarının bir sonucu olarak adada etnik çatışmaların ortaya çıktığı fikri vurgulanarak altı çizilmiştir. Daha spesifik olmak gerekirse, bu hafıza anlatılarında, Kıbrıslı Türkler adadaki maddi koşullarının (sınıfsal, demografik, ve üretim araçlarını ellerinde bulundurma açısından azınlıkta kalmalarının etnik azınlık olmalarını da etkilemesi durumu) da desteklemesiyle istenmeyen, aşağılanan ve çaresiz olanlar olarak resmedilmişlerdir. Bununla birlikte Kıbrıslı Rumlar tarafından gizlice yapılan planlardan habersiz oldukları, bu planların Kıbrıslı Türklerin hayatına mal olduğu vurgulanmıştır ve dolayısıyla Kıbrıslı Rumların etnik çatışmaların nedeni olan güvenilmez failer olarak homojenleştirilerek resmedilmesi ailelerinin ilk kuşağına mensup olan bu katılımcıların ortaklaştıkları nokta olmuştur. Bir anlamda hatırlama anlatılarını Türk milletine mensup olan Kıbrıslı Türklerin adada toplu bir şekilde neler çektiği üzerine inşa etme eğilimindedirler ve onları Kıbrıslı Rumlara karşı birleştirenin de bu olduğunu düşünmektedirler. Ancak, 1974 sonrasına ilişkin hafıza anlatıları tamamen farklıdır. Bu kez öncesinde Kıbrıslı Rumların güvenilmezliği ve baskılarına dayanan hatırlama anlatıları, Türkiye'nin 1974 askeri müdahalesinin şanına, Kıbrıslı Türklerin kurtuluş günü olmasına, ve bu kurtuluş günü sayesinde yazılan yeni tarihlerinin başlangıcına dayanmaya başlamıştır. Bu düşüncelerinin sonucu olarak da Kıbrıslı Türkler artık güçlü ve kendi kendine yeterli olduğu için Kıbrıslı Rumlar ile tekrar bir arada yaşamalarına gerek olmadığı kanısına vardıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Bir anlamda,

Kıbrıslı Rumlar olmadan yaşanacak bir geçmiş olması, geçmişte ortak olarak kazanılmış şanlı bir zaferin olması, ve bu zaferin şu anda Kıbrıslı Türklerin de irade sahibi olmalarına katkı sağlaması hafıza anlatılarının ortak noktasıdır. Bu ortak nokta aynı zamanda adanın geleceğine dair düşüncelerini de meşrulaştırmak için kullandıkları politik bir iddia haline gelmiştir de denilebilir.

Buradaki önemli nokta, ailelerinin ilk kuşağına mensup olan katılımcılar arasında Kıbrıslı Rumlarla kendi tabirleriyle olumlu sayılabilecek hatıraları (komşuluk, aynı işyerinde çalışma ve herhangi bir sorun yaşamama, etnik çatışmaların en aktif olarak yaşandığı 1960'larda yardımlaşma vb.) olanlar da olmasına rağmen hafıza anlatılarında Kıbrıslı Rumlara karşı belirgin bir güvensizlikleri olduğunu vurgulamayı tercih etmiş olmalarıdır. Bunun sonucu olarak da Kıbrıslı Rumları Kıbrıs Türklerinin temsil ettiği erdemli ve gurur duyulması tüm özelliklerden farklı olarak güvenilmez, zulmeden ve kibirli olarak homojenleştirme eğilimine gitmeleridir. Bu nokta tam da, ne olursa olsun ulusları için hatırlamaları gerektiğini düşündüklerinin görülebilmesi açısından önemlidir. Bir başka şekilde ifade etmek gerekirse, bir arada yaşamaya dair hatıralara sahip olup olmadıkları konusunda herhangi bir ayrım yapmadan, bu kuşağın katılımcıları bir arada yaşama zamanlarını görmezden gelerek veya her zaman Kıbrıslı Türkler ve Rumlar arasında görünmez de olsa karşılıklı bir hazetmeme halinin olduğunu belirterek Kıbrıslı Rumları hafıza anlatılarında homojenleştirme ve stereotipleştirmeyi tercih etmişlerdir. Ayrıca, kendi tabirleriyle tohumları 1974'te ekilen yeni tarihlerinde Kıbrıslı Rumlara ihtiyaç duymadıklarını çünkü güvenliklerinin birlikte yaşamaktan daha önemli olduğunu ve artık kendi kendilerine yeter olduklarının da altını çizerek bugünden geriye dönük olarak hem geçmiş hafıza anlatılarını hem de gelecek tahayyüllerini yukarıda bahsi geçen düşünceler üzerine kurduklarını göstermişlerdir.

Ailelerinin ilk kuşağına mensup katılımcıların bu tutumu, bu tezin hatırlamayı ve hafızanın politikleşmesini nasıl kavramsallaştırdığını anlamak için oldukça önemlidir. Şimdiki zamandaki birey, geçmişe geriye dönük olarak bugünkü hayat koşullarını da düşünerek anlam verir, ve bu anlam verme eylemi gelecek hayallerini de içermektedir.

eğilimindedir. Ayrıca, hatırlayan birey olmasına ve hatıralar yoluyla anlamın inşası ancak toplumun geçmişi, bugünü, ve geleceğini sorgulayan ve yargılayan seçici ve tasarlanmış / yönelimsel eyleminden kaynaklansa da, geçmiş hatırlamak ve bunun sonucunda hafıza anlatılarını oluşturmak sadece bireysel, politik olmayan, ve güç ilişkilerinden azade bir eylem değildir. Bu neslin katılımcıları, Kıbrıslı Rumları homojenleştirerek ve düşmanlaştırarak geçmiş hatırlama eğilimindedir çünkü şimdiden ve gelecekte beklenenleri Kıbrıslı Rumlar ile birlikte yaşayamayacaklarını kanıtlamaktır. Bu nedenle, geçmiş hatıralarını bahsedilen politik amaçlarını kanıtlamak için, bazen etnik çatışma deneyimlerini abartarak, bazen birlikte yaşadıkları zamanların güzel anılarını unutmayı tercih ettiklerini belirterek, bazen de aktif etnik çatışma sırasında birbirlerine yardım ettikleri gerçeğini unutarak yeniden inşa etmişlerdir.

Hatırlama, ayrıca, resmi tarih yazımı, aile hafızası ve tarih eğitimi gibi farklı bireysel ve yapısal hafıza anlatıları arasında olduğu için de politik bir eylem haline gelir. Bu nedenle, farklı kuşaklardan bireylerin yaşadıkları tarihsel-politik dönemlerin katılımcıların hafıza anlatılarını ne kadar etkilediğinin de üzerinde durulmuştur çünkü bu kuşaklar farklı iktidarlar tarafından belirli tarihsel-politik dönemlerin kurucu özneleri olarak görülmüş ve bu dönemlerin baskın ideolojilerine, tarih yazımına, ve tarih anlatısına uygun şekilde kendi hatırlama anlatılarını yeniden şekillendirmeleri beklenmiştir. Ailelerinin üçüncü kuşağına mensup olan katılımcılar, Kıbrıs'ın kuzeyi ve güneyi arasındaki sınırlardan Lefkoşa merkezde olanının 2003 yılında açılmasını, post-hafızalarının dönüm noktası, dolayısıyla post-hafıza anlatılarının temel referans noktası olarak aldıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Kendi post-hafıza anlatılarını oluştururken öncelikle çekirdek ailelerinden dinledikleri hatıralardan ve öğrendiklerinden etkilenmişlerdir. Ancak ailelerinden ve bazen de okuldaki tarih derslerinden öğrendiklerini, 2003 yılında sınırın açılması ve Annan Planı referandumuyla adada Kıbrıslı Türkler arasında görünür bir şekilde hakim olan umut, bir arada yaşam, ve barışçıl bir çözüm düşüncelerinin vurgulandığı toplumsal atmosferin etkisiyle aktif bir şekilde yorumlayarak ve revize ederek kendi post-hafıza anlatılarını yaratmışlardır. Daha net bir şekilde belirtmek gerekirse, Kıbrıslı Rumları Kıbrıslı Türklerin kurucu

ötekisi olarak gören, bu iki toplumun hiçbir ortak özelliği olmadığını, ve bunun sonucu olarak da birlikte yaşamalarının imkansız olduğunu iddia eden ideolojilerin aksine Kıbrıslı Türk ve Rumların kültürel, geleneksel ve coğrafi yakınlığına vurgu yapan Kıbrıslılık ideolojisinin 1980'lerden sonra Kıbrıslı Türk toplumu arasında baskın olmaya başlaması, 1980 sonrasında doğan ve dolayısıyla ailelerinin üçüncü kuşağına mensup olan katılımcıların hafıza anlatılarını oldukça etkilemiştir. Bununla birlikte, adanın güneyini, Kıbrıslı Rumları, ve kendilerinden farklı yaşam standartlarını görmeyen post-hafıza anlatılarını tamamen değiştirdiğini belirtmişlerdir.

Yani, ailelerinin üçüncü kuşağına mensup olan genç Kıbrıslı Türkler, adada kendileri için görmek istedikleri gelecek hayaline göre geçmişte olup bitenlerle ilgili post-hafıza anlatılarını oldukça seçici, maksatlı, ve bu nedenle de politik bir şekilde yaratmışlardır. Gelecek beklentilerini referans noktası olarak geçmiş nasıl hatırladıklarını yeniden inşa etmeyi tercih ettikleri bu anlatılarda, 'Geçmişte Türk ve Yunan bir arada barış içinde yaşamıştı, öyleyse gelecekte de yaşayabilirler' vurgunu yapmışlardır ki ailelerinden neredeyse hiç kimse (bir arada yaşamı tecrübe etmiş olanlar bile) böylesi bir vurguyu yapmayı tercih etmemiştir. Diğer bir deyişle, geçmişe dair post hafıza anlatılarını, Türklüğe ve Rumluğa vurgu yapmadan, Kıbrıslı olarak hep birlikte yaşayabilecekleri temelinde oluşturmuşlardır. Büyükanne ve büyükbabalarının aksine geçmişi her iki tarafın perspektifinden anlamak gerektiğini, düşmanlık yaratan anlatıların daha fazla Kıbrıs'ta hakim olmasını istemediklerini çünkü bu durumun özellikle Kıbrıslı Türk gençlerin geleceğini riske attığını, ve Kıbrıslıların iyiler ve kötüler olarak iki gruba ayrılmadan veya bu şekilde birbirlerine zıt olan ikilikler yaratmadan geçmişi anlamlandırması gerektiğini savunmuşlardır.

Bu noktada, bu iki kuşağın hafıza anlatıları ve metodolojilerindeki katı farklılıklara rağmen, metotlarının oldukça benzer olduğunu görmek önemlidir. İki ayrı kuşağı mensup olan katılımcılar, hafıza anlatılarını, etnik çatışma dönemine dair düşüncelerini ve gelecek beklentilerini meşrulaştırmak için politik araçları olarak kullanmayı tercih etmişlerdir. Özellikle ailelerinin üçüncü kuşağına mensup olan katılımcılar, geçmişi gelecek beklentilerinin gerçekleşmesine katkı sağlaması için

hatırlamayı tercih ettiklerini belirtmişlerdir ve bunu bazen bilinçli bazen de bilinçsiz şekilde yaparak hatırlamanın maksatlı, seçici geçirgen, ve her zaman geçmiş (tecrübeler), şimdiki hayat koşulları, ve gelecek hayalleri arasındaki sürekli oluşum halinde olan sosyal ve politik bir eylem olduğunun altını bir kez daha çizmişlerdir.

İkinci kuşağın hafıza anlatılarının nasıl politikleştiğini görmek kolay olmamıştır ancak bu noktada da hatırlamanın referans noktalarını kullanmaya meyletmesi özelliği bana yardımcı oldu diyebilirim. Türkiye'nin 1983 sonrasında adada uyguladığı neoliberal politikaların her anlamda hayatlarının en kötü dönemlerini yaşamalarına neden olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Ve bu nedenle, hafıza anlatılarını politikleştirerek yeniden bu düşünce üzerinde kurmuşlardır. Diğer bir deyişle, bu kuşağın katılımcıları yaşadıkları hayattan, özellikle de tanınmayan bir devletin vatandaşı olarak yaşamaya devam ettikleri gerçeğinden ve Türkiye'nin adada uyguladığı ekonomik ambargolardan duydukları memnuniyetsizliği vurgulayarak geçmişini hatırlama anlatılarını yaratmışlardır. Bunun sonucu olarak da, ailelerinin ikinci kuşağına mensup olan katılımcıların geçmiş, şimdi ve gelecek arasında salınarak politikleşen hatırlama anlatılarının ibresi, en çok zamanı diğer iki kuşakla kıyaslanırsa şimdiki zamanda yani şimdideki yaşam koşullarının ve bu koşulların oluşma nedenlerinin üzerinde durarak geçirmişlerdir.

Bunun bir sonucu olarak, Kıbrıslı Rumlar bu kuşağın hafıza anlatılarında artık acımasız, korkulası veya güvenilmez insanlık dışı yaratıklar olarak tasvir edilmemeye başlanmıştır. Bir bakıma ebeveynlerinden farklı olarak Kıbrıslı Rumları daha insancıl, hata yapabilen, bazıları iyi, bazıları kötü olarak hafıza anlatılarında tasvir etmeyi tercih etmişlerdir. Yani Kıbrıslı Rumlar, bu kuşağın seçici ve amaca yönelik hafıza anlatılarında insanileştirilmeye, her şeyin suçlusu olarak tasvir edilmemeye, ve homojenleştirilerek tamamen düşmanlaştırılmamaya başlanmıştır. Yani, 1983 sonrasında Türkiye'nin adadaki neoliberal politikalarını Kıbrıslı Türklerin bugünkü yaşam koşullarının kötü olmasının temel nedeni olarak görerek hafıza anlatılarının referans noktası olarak kullanmaları, etnik çatışma ve Kıbrıslı Rumların tasviriyle ilgili

hafıza anlatılarını taktiksel olarak yeniden şekillendirmeyi tercih etmelerine neden olmuştur.

Kuşaksal hatırlamaya ilişkin yukarıda bahsedilen argümanlar, bu tezin temel argümantasyonunu bir kez daha vurgulamaktadır; hatırlama her zaman bireysel ile kollektif, öznel ve nesnel, ve sosyal ve politik arasındadır çünkü hatırlamanın seçiciliğinin görünür hale geldiği kuşaksal hatırlama olarak somutlaşan eğilimler sistemi, bireylerin hatırlama anlatıları üzerinde tek taraflı olarak işlemez; bunun yerine karşılıklı bir ilişkileri vardır. Bu nedenle, aktif aktör, kuşaksal hatırlamada çok önemli bir faktördür çünkü bu aktif aktörün adanın geçmişini, bugünü ve geleceğini anlamlandırırken yarattığı hatırlama anlatıları aracılığıyla kişilerin hafıza anlatılarını yaratırken aynı zamanda kuşaksal olarak da nasıl politik pozisyonlar aldıkları görülebilir. Bir başka deyişle, bu araştırmanın katılımcısı olan kişilerin aynı kuşaklara mensup olduğu fikri sadece yaşlarına göre bölünlenme anlayışı üzerine kurulmamıştır. Buna ek olarak geçmiş hatırlarken benzeri bir politik pozisyonda durarak benzeri hatırlama anlatıları oluşturmaları anlayışı üzerine de kurulmuştur denilebilir.

Bir kez daha hatırlatmak gerekirse, çatışma sonrası toplumlarda hafıza ve hatırlama hiçbir zaman sadece geçmişle ilgili olmamıştır. Başka bir deyişle, amaca yönelik bir hafıza eylemi olarak hatırlamak, günümüzün yaşam koşullarından ve geleceğe dair hayallerden de etkilenen bir süreçtir ve bu nedenle de toplumlarının geçmişi, bugünü, ve geleceğine dair politik iddialarının arasında sallanıp durur. Tüm bunların bir kombinasyonu olarak, insanlar neyi nasıl hatırladıklarını ifade eden hafıza anlatılarını oluştururlar. Bunu takiben, bu kuşakların tüm katılımcıları, etnik çatışma ve Kıbrıslı Rumlar hakkındaki algılarına ilişkin hafıza anlatılarını mevcut yaşam durumlarına ve adanın geleceğine yönelik siyasi hedeflerine göre oluşturmayı tercih ettiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bir bakıma hepsi, etnik çatışmanın ve Kıbrıs toplumunun geçmişi, bugünü ve geleceği hakkındaki düşüncelerini meşrulaştırmak için siyasi araç olarak geçmiş ve hafıza anlatılarını kullanmışlardır. Böylece, tüm katılımcılar bir kez daha hafızanın sürekli bir oluş hali olduğunu göstermişlerdir; tarihin ve tarih yazımının üretimi içindeki iktidar ilişkileriyle ilişki içinde olarak politik hale geldiği bir oluş

sürecidir bu. Bir bakıma, ailelerinin farklı kuşaklarına mensup katılımcılar, 'biz varız ve tarih yazımında aktif bir rol oynuyoruz' diyerek, kuşaklar arasında hatırlamaya dair başka bir tür mücadele alanı yaratırken, bazıları resmi tarih anlatısını takip ederek hatırlamaya, bazıları tamamen resmi tarihe karşı olarak, bazıları da resmi tarih anlatısıyla müzakere ederek hatırlamaya meyletmişlerdir.

Sonuç olarak, çatışma sonrası toplumlarda yaratılan her hafıza anlatısı spesifik bir siyasi iddiaya sahiptir çünkü geleneğin ve geleceğin kurulmasını amaçlar ve bu amacı doğrultusunda da geçmiş üzerinde hak iddia eder. Bu noktada önemli olan, hak iddia edenin ulus devletler, azınlık gruplar veya herhangi başka bir grup olmasının, hiçbir grubu geçmişini anlamlandırırken iktidar ilişkilerinden azade yapmadığını görmektir. Çünkü metodolojileri ve hafıza anlatıları farklı olsa da her grup veya birey hafıza anlatılarını oluştururken geçmiş üzerinde hem geçmişini hem de geleceği tasarlamaya yönelik olan politik iddialarda bulunarak hak iddia eder. Bu nedenle, neyin gerçekten yaşandığına, neyin kurmaca olduğuna veya sadece yaşandığı söylendiğine dair iddiaların toplumsal ilişkilerin içerisinde çıktığı ve bu nedenle de değişen toplumsallıklara göre şekil değiştirebileceği unutulmamalıdır. Bunun sonucu olarak da, ne savaşı birebir tecrübelemiş, sevdikleri öldürülmüş ve belki de bu nedenle tıpkı ulus devletlerin anlatısında olduğu gibi spesifik devletleri ve ulusları olumlu, kurtarıcı, yücelten, hata yapmaz olarak anlatan ve hatırlayan ilk kuşak 'doğruyu' söyleyen ve görebilendir, ne de kendilerinden önceki kuşakların görüşlerini reddeden, çözüme ket vuran, doğru olmayan olarak gören en genç nesil yanlış bilince sahiptir. Bir başka deyişle bu çalışma, ampirik gerçek kavramı üzerine kendisini kurmanın yaratabileceği suçlu-suçsuz, gerçek olan-gerçek olmayan, mağdur olan-mağdur eden gibi hiyerarşi ve düşmanlık gibi duyguları perçinleyebilecek ikilikler ve bu ikiliklerin yarattığı anlayış üzerine kurulmamıştır. Onun yerine, yaşananları tarihsellik içerisinde sunmaya, geçmiş anlatılarının pek çoğunda 'doğruluk payı' olduğunu ve farklı toplumsallıkların içerisinde doğmuş ve sosyal değişim dönemlerini deneyimlemiş kuşakların hatırlama anlatılarının tüm bu gerçekliklere dayanarak değişebileceğini, ve aslında tüm bu sürecinde politik olduğunu göstermeye çalışmıştır.

D. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

(Please fill out this form on computer. Double click on the boxes to fill them)

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐
- Enformatik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Informatics ☐
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : KIZILTEPE
Adı / Name : BEYZA HATUN
Bölümü / Department : Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi / Political Science and Public Administration

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): THE POLITICIZATION OF MEMORY BETWEEN PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE: GENERATIONAL REMEMBERING AMONG TURKISH CYPRIOT FAMILIES

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans / Master** ☒ **Doktora / PhD** ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. * ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. * ☐

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date

(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.