

HRANT DINK MEMORIAL WORKSHOP 2008

**Migrations, Connections, Perspectives:
Anatolia and Its Neighboring Regions in the Twentieth Century**

May 30 - June 1, 2008

Sabancı University

Academic Report

by Ayşe Parla

Organizing Committee:

Fikret Adanır, Professor of History, Sabancı University

Akşin Somel, Assistant Professor of History, Sabancı University

Ayşe Gül Altınay, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Sabancı University

Ayşe Parla, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Sabancı University

Introduction

As the organizing committee of the Hrant Dink Memorial Workshop 2008, our initiative for a workshop series in memory of Hrant Dink under the general rubric of “Frameworks of Diversity, Modalities of Interaction,” stemmed out of our belief in the urgent need for continued vigilance against discriminatory forces and tendencies in the context of Turkish nationalism. However, while not trivializing historical and contemporary experiences of conflict and violence, we hoped that the workshops would also provide much needed opportunities to explore untold or silenced stories as well as obscured structures of empathy, interaction, and interdependence. The workshop 2008 theme, “Migrations, Connections, and Perspectives: Anatolia and Its Neighboring Regions in the Twentieth Century,” was selected to inaugurate our series both because of its interdisciplinary appeal and because of its elective affinities with the principles and

objectives of the workshop which draws on Hrant Dink's legacy of highlighting existing human connections and imagining new ones across presumed or imposed borders. As some boundaries, whether national or cultural, are crossed or removed, other boundaries are being redrawn and recreated. We hoped that the theme of "Migrations, Connections, and Perspectives" would allow us to attend to these simultaneous and sometimes contradictory processes, as well as to advance a renewed appreciation of migration as a constant in social transformation in history.

As the workshop organizers, we believe that the workshop not only met these proposed objectives, but also exceeded our already high expectations. The quality of some presentations was remarkably high, and the ensuing discussions after each panel elicited multiple responses that led to productive interdisciplinary debates. The two public sessions that framed the academic workshop were also very successful in drawing an intimate but highly involved audience and in sparking dialogue among scholars and intellectuals from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. The fact that the participants of the workshop came from diverse geographies and disciplinary backgrounds resulted in exactly the kind of rich, challenging, stimulating scholarly and intellectual exchanges we had hoped for. In our call for papers, we had especially encouraged the participation of young scholars from Anatolia and its neighboring regions -- geographies to which Hrant Dink was especially attached and committed. We were therefore pleased that the selected papers did indeed reflect that diversity: Participants came from Armenia, Canada, Germany, Greece, Uzbekistan and Turkey. There were, in total, 15 presenters. For each panel, we also invited scholars who have distinguished themselves as experts in their fields to act as chairs and discussants. Except for two people who had to cancel at the last minute due to personal reasons, all our invited chairs and discussants accepted our invitations without reservation and with enthusiasm. The final program hosted scholars from Bahçeşehir, Boğaziçi, Bilkent, Bilgi, Galatasaray, Koç, Marmara, and Sabancı Universities. Below, we present in detail the content of the public sessions and each of the panels.

First Public Session

The intensive three day academic workshop began with a public session. Ronald Grigor Suny, who is the Charles Tilly Collegiate Professor of Social and Political History at the University of Michigan and Emeritus Professor of Political Science and History at the University of Chicago, delivered the keynote speech. Ronald Suny's talk, entitled "Globalization and the Nation-State: The Future of a Failure," pondered the effects of globalization on the imagined communities we call "nations" and sovereign nation-states, as well as the effects of the nation-form on globalization. His key question revolved around what he delineated as the resilience of the state in the face of globalizing capitalism and American hegemony. While acknowledging the ways in which transnational institutions deterritorialize and constrain the autonomy of national states, Suny underscored the ways in which the nation-state continues to structure many economic transactions and networks and the predominant industries. He emphasized in particular the ways in which the nation continues to be the most powerful form of political solidarity. He therefore argued that the nation continues to remain as the most powerful resource for people in providing a place to stand before the waves of the global. Similarly, he posited that national identity remains as the most salient and resonant one, at least for now, as national identity is identification with a powerful affective community, promising emotional and cultural connections against narrowly economic interests. As a concluding comment and prediction, Suny suggested that the likely victim of the globalization scenario is American hegemony, which according to Suny, is already coming under increasing challenge.

Dr. Suny's speech was followed by a roundtable discussion. In contradistinction to Suny's insistence on the continued relevance of national affiliations, Etyen Mahçupyan (*Agos* Newspaper and the International Hrant Dink Foundation) and Ayşe Öncü (Professor of Sociology, Sabancı University) underscored those trends that may point to the diminishing importance of the national. Baskın Oran (Professor of Science, Ankara University) stated the increasing irrelevance of the modern nation-state form in much stronger terms and called attention instead to the increasing significance and recognition of sub-national identities.

The Academic Workshop

Session I

The first session of the workshop was chaired by Dr. Arus Yumul (Istanbul Bilgi University). After the presentation of Stefan Winter (Université du Québec à Montréal) on "Beyond the Syrian-Anatolian Divide : The Millî Confederation, 1834-1930," Dilek Güven (Sabancı University) delivered a paper on the "Massacre and Deportation of Pontus Greeks, 1916-1922." In her archival analysis of the forced deportations and violence that took place from 1914 to 1922, Güven argued that the deportations were part of the demographic engineering that was seen as a necessary precondition to set up a triumphant nation-state. She noted that Balkan migrants or other Muslim groups were settled in certain villages. Although Turkish officials reassured the members of different consulates that the deportation would not resemble the case of the Armenians a year before, the departure of the Greeks was accompanied by many cruelties. Based on official correspondence, Güven stated that even local Muslims were shocked at times by the extreme measures taken against the Greeks. She gave the interesting example of the intervention of Muslim notables in Samsun, whose protest managed to stop, albeit only temporarily, the order from Ankara in 1921 to deport women and children from Samsun. Güven concluded by stating that the severity of the deportations and the massacres of the Pontus Greeks belie military and strategic justifications and that they ought to be viewed as the outcome of the attempts to homogenise Minor Asia.

The third panelist of the first session, Arpine Bablumyan (The Armenian Genocide Museum, Yerevan) presented a paper on "Kharberd/Kharput Armenians in the USA : From the History of the Ottoman Armenians' Emigration from the End of the XIXth to the Beginning of the XXth Century. " She began with a striking statistics from The US consuls in Turkey, who estimated that four fifths of the early Armenian emigrants in the USA were from Kharbert province. The flow of Armenians to the USA began alongside the actions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and the desire to leave for the USA was greater in those territories where this organization had centers and active missionaries. While one of the biggest centers was opened in Kharbert and the American missionary organization's activities, along with the

homebound letters of the early emigrants, gave a stimulus to the immigration, Bablumyan argued that the underlying causes of immigration need to be sought elsewhere. She pointed that the economic inequalities, poverty and the oppression of the minority group, including heavy taxes, lack of civil rights, the massacres of 1884-86 and forcible conversions became the main reasons of immigration from the Western Armenia between 1880-1894. Bablumyan also stated that these initial migrants did not intend to make America their permanent home. However, when the situation in homeland became worse, many of Armenian immigrants wanted their families to leave for America too. She then focused on the connections and networks among the Armenians in Kharbert and those who had immigrated, and showed how the former could buy to become landowners with the help of migrant remittances. She pointed out that the return migrants, who had learned the trade, opened up carpentry shops, factories, etc. She concluded by stating that after most of the Armenian population of the Kharbert province fell victim to the Armenian Genocide, the Armenians in America lived in closely-knit communities in order to maintain their culture, language and belief in the USA and also to assist their compatriots in the homeland.

The discussant of the first panel, Dr. Oktay Özel (Bilkent University), emphasized the need for more systematic methodology as well as the need to make more explicit the deployment of the various archives in terms of what can, in fact, be read off the records, which records, and why. A key debate that emerged from the subsequent discussion concerned how to deploy the notion of ethnicity. In particular, the question—also taken up in several of the later panels—concerned whether or how one might avoid essentializing ethnicity while continuing to use it as an analytic category.

Session 2, Public Panel (described above)

The reception following the panel was held at the penthouse of the Sabancı University Communication Center in Karaköy. The reception provided an opportunity for the panelists, chairs, discussants and the workshop participants to meet each other.

Session 3

The workshop reconvened on Saturday, May 31, at the Sabancı University Communication Center in Karaköy. The morning session, which was the second panel of the workshop, was chaired by Kemal Kirişçi (Boğaziçi University). After Nicole Immig's (Freie Universität Berlin) presentation on "Forced Migrations of Muslims in South-Eastern Europe in Comparative Perspective : The Muslim Communities of Thessaly after 1881," Vangelis Kechriotis (Boğaziçi University) took the floor to speak on "Educating the Nation : Migration and Acculturation on the two Shores of the Aegean at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." Due to personal reasons, Kemal H. Karpat (University of Wisconsin, Madison), who was also slated for the same session, could not be present. The discussant was Ayhan Aktar (Istanbul Bilgi University).

In his presentation, Vangelis Kechriotis addressed the processes through which The Greek-Orthodox communities became both objects and subjects of the proliferating cultural and social networks as they first migrated to İzmir and then to Athens, where opportunities of education and social mobility signalled better prospects. He argued that close attention to the role of migration in these processes leads one to redefine the very concept of 'community,' and claimed that the community administration, despite its pledge to multiple loyalties, functioned as a major tool of acculturation. Rather than focusing on the economic conditions of social transformation, therefore, Kechriotis chose to ponder the cultural aspects of bourgeois life which he argued provide a privileged field for the study of the acculturation process of the Greek community in İzmir. He demonstrated how the systematic exposure of young people to official Hellenic education accounts for the process of acculturation that took place on the western shores of the Aegean. at the end of the nineteenth century. However, he cautioned against assuming these young candidates of acculturation as only passive instruments in a larger process. Instead, he underscored how many of them used the opportunity for social as well as geographical mobility, eventually negotiating both their commitment and their professional strategies in ways that put personal, familial, and local well-being above their 'national mission'.

Session 4

The next session's chair was Haldun Gülalp (Yıldız Technical University). The first presenter, Arsen Hakobyan (National Academy of Sciences, Yerevan), gave a paper on "Exchange and Resettlement (A Case of Armenian and Azerbaidjanian Settlements Exchange During the Nagorno-Karabagh Conflict)." Obviously, the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict was coupled with a huge wave of refugees. Hakobyan first briefly reviewed the clashes between Armenians and Azerbaijanis up to the ceasefire in 1994. While not denying the tragic consequences of the deportations, he posed a stimulating question as to whether these processes had always been equally brutal. He suggested the possibility of relatively peaceful processes of separation, and as a case study, provided the example of the settlements exchange between Kerkendj (Azerbaijan) and Dzyunashog (previously Kzl Shafag, Armenia). Hakobyan described this case as a civic initiative in the conflict period, founded on an oral agreement and carried out under the auspices of community elders. The agreement guaranteed the inviolability of cemeteries, the exchange of houses, as well as the right to visit each other and the respective cemeteries. Hakobyan ended his presentation by listing changes that were enacted in one of the villages after the resettlement, such as renaming the village, switching occupation, and rebuilding the interiors of the houses in ways viewed as more befitting for the Armenian community.

The second presentation of this panel was co-authored by Lale Yalçın-Heckmann and Milena Baghdasaryan (both Max-Planck-Institut für ethnologische Forschung, Halle) and entitled "Forced Migrations, Property and Citizenship in Postsocialist Azerbaijan and Armenia." Yalçın-Heckmann and Baghdasaryan defined their framework as the exploration of property relations and property regimes, which have been commonly theorised under conditions of order and peace, and thus, they suggested, under-theorised under conditions of war and ethnic cleansing. Keeping a broad perspective that includes multiple socioeconomic factors such as declining Soviet citizenship, the emerging processes of nation-state building and economic (quasi)liberalism, Yalçın-Heckmann and Baghdasaryan focused on two cases: one, the Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan, and two, the Azerbaijani and Kurdish internally displaced persons (IDPs) who fled their homeland and are now living in a IDP settlement in northern Azerbaijan. First, Baghdasaryan elaborated the ways in which the availability of housing as private

property influences citizenship practices among Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan. Among the striking results of her detailed ethnography was the fact that many refugees do not want to accept citizenship without first being provided with considerable support by the state. She demonstrated how the formal *refugee status* has become important in the eyes of refugees: they assume it to be a powerful tool to negotiate with the state, to assure that they will not be neglected by it and to claim certain actions from the state (in terms of support). She also pointed out the multiple functions of property and the meanings it takes on: According to the refugees, both those included and excluded from the support programme, property is also significant in terms of its promise to live a family life according to local expectations and to be included in local social interactions. After Baghdasaryan, Yalcın-Heckmann shifted the gaze to Kurdish and Azerbaijani IDPs among whom citizenship appears to be a desirable, however not yet acceptable status. Although IDPs are all Azerbaijani citizens, they have been structurally and legally hindered from receiving privatized land shares, and their ownership rights to privatized shares have been ‘postponed’ from coming into effect until the lost territories are recovered. Hence, they cannot be economically full citizens of the new state within the market economy. Among the conclusions both authors drew was the fact that forced migration and displacement implicate social and cultural exclusion, and that both refugees and IDPs struggle for access to property in order to be included in the mainstream societies.

The discussant scheduled to speak for this session, Ahmet İçduygu (Koç University), was not present as a result of a last-minute travel complication. Fikret Adanır, who acted as discussant instead, raised the important point about the distinctions between forced migrant vs. refugee vs. internally displaced persons, and what is at stake in those distinctions. Adanır also invited the attendees to think about the “culprits” implied in these presentations and hence the role of nationalism. Along with his additional comments on methodology, Adanır triggered a productive discussion on the methodological differences and similarities between historical and anthropological analysis.

Session 5

After lunch, during which the discussions from the previous session continued in full force, the workshop resumed with session 5, chaired by Cengiz Aktar (Bahçeşehir University). The first presenter, Christoph Ramm (Universität Bochum), spoke on the "Turkish Cypriots and the 'Blackbeards' - Immigration from Turkey and (Trans)National Identity Formation in Northern Cyprus." Ramm stated that the predominant focus on the nationalist conflict between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots has not adequately exposed the significant role the immigrants from Turkey play in the process of identity formation in northern Cyprus. Ramm's presentation sought to remedy this absence by depicting the ways in which Turkish Cypriot self-images have been increasingly reformulated since 1974 against images of the newcomers from Turkey. Ramm also cautioned, however, against the general public perception of the immigrant population from Turkey as a homogenous community. He distinguished TRNC citizens from temporary residents who have no voting rights. After noting that the *Türkiyeli* are generally looked upon as 'very conservative', 'strictly religious', and 'not civilized,' he stated that such paternalistic attitudes still pose an important obstacle to the active participation of *Türkiyeli* citizens in the society and the political system of northern Cyprus. Ramm also noted, however, that although the migrant workers from Turkey provide cheap labor, they are still widely resented. He thus concluded that immigration from Turkey should not be confined to the narrow framework of the Cyprus conflict and the Turkish occupation, but be analyzed as part of larger transnational migration processes resulting from worldwide economic inequalities.

Following the presentation by Raoul Motika (Universität Hamburg) on "The Emergence of the Alevis as a Transnational Actor," the last presenter of this session was Anna Harutyunyan (Freie Universität Berlin). Harutyunyan's paper, entitled "Turkish Armenians in In-Between Spaces," argued that the Turkish Armenians in Germany occupy spaces between rooted "dichotomies." Harutyunyan reflected on the forms of representation among communities in which, despite shared histories of deprivation and discrimination, the exchange of values, meanings and priorities may not always be collaborative. Examining the case of the Armenian community of Berlin, she first mentioned the growing visibility of the Republic of Armenia in the community as *the*

center and homeland and the intensified nationalization and the politicization of the homeland for the diaspora Armenians in the community from diverse backgrounds. Harutyunyan accounts for the intensified connection with the homeland by a number of reasons, including the constant flow of people coming from or going to Armenia, satellite TV transmission from Armenia, cultural programs by artists from Armenia, the presence of the Armenian Apostolic Church representative in the community, the increasing tendency of Armenia Armenians to attend community events, and the regular arrival of Armenia Armenian students and professionals for work or study purposes. Finally Harutyunyan emphasized how the murder of Hrant Dink and the events in the aftermath of the murder made more visible not only the Armenians of Turkey, but the Turkish Armenians of Berlin. The frequent presence of Turkish language in the community began to be regarded as a cultural value and there was an upsurge in interest towards Turkey which manifested itself in trips to Turkey as well as workshops about Musaler Armenians and Polis Armenians.

The discussant for this session, Deniz Yüksek (Koç University), interrogated the very notion of transnationalism itself and asked the provocative question of how to identify the difference between transnationalism and good old internationalism. The ensuing discussion also involved the potential uniqueness of the diaspora community in Berlin and what may be gleaned from comparing the diaspora in Berlin to other Armenian diasporic groups.

Session 6

The final session on Saturday was chaired by Ferhat Kentel (Istanbul Bilgi University). The first presenter, Gulnara Kuzibaeva (National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent), whose paper was entitled "Migration for Sex Work : Case of Uzbekistan," explored how women from Uzbekistan are becoming part of a new and growing supply source for the international sex industry. The paper addressed the circumstances under which women migrated for the purposes of sex work; how they adapted to the sex trade and the role social networks play in the migration process. After a succinct discussion of the socioeconomic conjuncture and the structural adjustments have led to the feminization of poverty, Kuzibaeva criticized the Uzbek media coverage that portrays

migrant sex workers in sensationalistic terms as sexual slaves. She stated that her research reveals instead a more complex reality than these stereotypes suggest, most importantly in terms of the degree of autonomy with which women travel and go into sex work. To that end, she distinguished between purely trafficked, semi-trafficked, goal-oriented women. She also underscored the economic situation in which earnings in the sex industry outside of Uzbekistan far exceed anything that might be earned in other occupations in Uzbekistan. Based on the research's original findings, Kuzibaeva concluded with policy suggestions towards deterring women's entry into the sex industry. She underscored the need for realistic information about working conditions, as well as the rights and duties of migrants. Rather than reproducing the stereotypes propounded by the media, she argued that large-scale information campaigns should focus on the problems of living in a foreign country and the specific violations that women face.

The second presenter, Itir Bagdadi (Izmir University of Economics), continued with the same theme, but approached the topic from a different perspective in her presentation entitled "The Political Economy of Sex Trafficking." After emphasizing how trafficking, different from smuggling, carries the purpose of exploiting unwilling women, Baghdadi argued that sex trafficking is not something to be expected in every country suffering an economic crisis or outright collapse. She proposed that it is in those states where women were given more freedom, equality and education in ambitious but failed modernization projects that we find the prevalence of commercial sexual exploitation of women. She argued that the governments' ambitions in modernizing have adverse effects on women who are raised to a new level of empowerment only to lose their newly-found rights when the states experience economic decline. She concluded that the most important lesson to be derived from the experience of the post-socialist states is that a gendered understanding of modernization, development and state-building must be developed in order to fully democratize and give all citizens equal rights and equal state protection.

The discussants for this panel were Sema Erder (Bahçeşehir University) and Selmin Kaşka (Marmara University). Both of them underscored the importance of looking critically at the categories for sex work provided by the International Organization of Migration (IOM), and the need to distinguish, à la Kuziebeva, between

forced and voluntary sex work. The ensuing discussion also stressed the need for more studies of masculinity and men's role in sex trafficking, not just as members of smuggling networks but also as consumers.

The full day of presentations was concluded with a conference dinner at "Giritli", where the keynote speaker Ronald Suny delivered an impromptu speech. Suny depicted the trajectory of the burgeoning dialogue in the United States between scholars from Armenia and scholars from Turkey and he underscored the significance of the Hrant Dink Memorial Workshop also as part of and within the context of these exchanges.

Session 7

The final day of the workshop convened at the Sabancı University campus in Tuzla. The morning session was chaired by Didem Daniş (Galatasaray University). The first presenter, Ayşe Akalın (City University of New York), delivered a paper on being "Illegal, Armenian and Anatolian: The Armenian Migrant Domestic Workers in Turkey."

After contextualizing the migrant women from Armenia against the backdrop of the emergence of the "feminization of poverty" in the post-socialist period and the labor demand in Turkey, Akalın posited what distinguishes the migrant domestics and creates the demand for their services is their willingness to work as *live-in's* rather than their national origins. Having said that, however, she also noted that in the employers' appreciation of their workers' performance, there is an implicit revalorization of an overall socialist heritage. She then delineated the specificity of domestic workers from Armenia who are likely to show a much better competence in learning Turkish than not only Georgians but many of the "Turkic" women, as well. The family histories of the women reveal an Anatolian heritage, as the grandparents of many of the women were forced to relocate out of their lands at the beginning of 20th century. The demand for Armenian migrants first came from the Turkish Armenian community who preferred employing them in order to support the language education of their children. Similarly, the opportunity to work for Armenian families seems to have played the role of a protection shield for Armenian domestics. However, given the limited size of the Turkish Armenian community, for those migrants who are not intimidated by thinking in

economic terms, the chances are switching to working for Turkish employers. Therefore, it is highly likely today to come across Armenians working for Turkish families, as well. In conclusion, Akalın posed a series of challenging questions, including the dynamics of Turks and Armenians sharing the same private space, and the dynamics of unequal class relations between Armenian migrant workers and employers that raise the thorny question of “which Armenians ended up belonging where and why.”

Zeynep Ülker Kaşlı (Sabancı University) presented a paper entitled "A Broken Line of Legality and Regularity : The Impact of Visa Policies on Everyday Life of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants in Turkey." Following the Agambean notion of exception-as-the-rule, Kaşlı argued that the recent situation of the post-1990s Bulgarian Turkish immigrants to Turkey not only exemplifies the “inclusive exclusion” of immigrants to the nation-state but also indicates how state uses this particular process of exclusion to reproduce its sovereignty both within and outside of its borders. The arbitrariness of state practices in terms of who is eligible to stay and under what circumstances produces, according to Kaşlı, broken lines of legality which people are constantly made to cross. Kaşlı’s specific case under discussion, namely the experiences of the post nineties 1990s Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria exemplify, on the one hand, a global trend of liberalization according to the needs of the labour market. On the other hand, regularization and legalization of Turkish Bulgarian immigrants in return for voting in the elections reveal that the sovereign state instrumentalizes such migrants also for the perpetuation of its transnational political power.

The last presenter of this session was Ayşe Parla (Sabancı University), whose paper on "Hierarchies of Otherness" inquired into the paranoia and backlash unleashed by the slogan, “We are all Armenians, we are all Hrant Dink” chanted at Dink’s funeral. In examining the hierarchy of otherness fundamental to the construction of hegemonic Turkish national selfhood, Parla focused not on those bodies considered the most suspect for the national body, but instead at those bodies that have historically been seen as the most desirable for incorporation, namely, the group designated as the Balkan Turks. She posed a historical argument about the availability of the othering of particular groups in Turkey as a means of “passing” as the Turkish self proper and stated that since the 19th century, the construction of the Bulgarian Turks in particular (and Balkan Turks more

generally) as the privileged immigrants went hand in hand with the denigration, expulsion and, if necessary, annihilation of the undesirable others, predominantly the Armenians and Kurds.

As the discussant, Mine Eder (Boğaziçi University) emphasized the importance of not glossing over structural constraints and paying attention to the dynamics of neoliberalism. She also urged for an explicit discussion of how the processes that have been discussed in the papers are gendered.

Session 8

The final session of the academic workshop was chaired by Ahmet Öncü (Sabancı University). The first presenter, Suren Manukyan (National Academy of Sciences, Yerevan), dwelt on "Labor Migration: The Armenian Case." After reviewing what he called the tradition of labor migration for Armenians leaving their homeland and providing a historical background on migrations including forced ones, Manukyan examined in closer detail the labor migrations starting with the transition period. According to estimates he provided, some 475, 000 people left the country during the transition to the market economy. Manukyan provided striking details regarding the conditions under which migrations occurred, such as people exchanging air tickets to Moscow for their apartments. He explained that research and surveys conducted during that period show that economic motives were cited as the foremost motive to account for the outflow of the population. Manukyan concluded his talk with an assessment of the positive and negative impact of labor migrations out of Armenia, and cited brain drain, the lack of skilled workers and the psychological problems of family members left back at home as the major negative consequences.

The second presenter, Laurence Ritter (Caucasus Media Institute, Yerevan), gave a talk entitled "Migrants from Armenia : A Migrant Wave or the Forming of Another Armenian Diaspora?" Ritter first posed the critical question of how one in fact defines diaspora and provided a review of the prevalent conceptualizations of the term. Her paper sought to elaborate the reasons for what is more than often called an "exodus" by taking as her specific examples the settling strategies of Armenians in France (Marseille) and in the US (California, LA). After distinguishing between seasonal migrants and

permanent migrants as people who go abroad with the clear intention to stay, she explored how the two groups in Marseille and L.A. interact with the existing Armenian Diaspora, which she described as a non-homogenous body. Her presentation modified the previous presentation by arguing that economic motives are not enough to explain the migrations out of Armenia. Additionally, Ritter claimed, the Armenian memory strongly holds some collective remembrance of having been uprooted from a national territory left behind in today's Turkey. She proposed that because collective memory tends to locate the national territory "elsewhere," even after independence, the current Armenian territory is still not perceived as the single incarnation of the nation. Ritter concluded by suggesting that regardless of whether these new migrations will be absorbed by the existing diaspora or will constitute a second one, the changes and the ongoing inventions and reinventions among the Armenian communities invite us to rethink our concepts of the nation-state as well as of diaspora.

Aslı Odman (Istanbul Bilgi University), gave the last presentation of the final session. Her paper, entitled "The Maritime Entrepreneur, the Subcontractor and the Migrant Workers of the Shipbuilding Industry in Tuzla, Istanbul" brought into stark relief the ways in which the increasing numbers of deaths in the shipbuilding industry are not exceptional occurrences, but rather, are part and parcel of the outsourcing system integral to the global neoliberal economy. After delineating the connections between the local, national and the global, which are usually rendered invisible under the hegemonic discourses of neoliberal capitalism, Odman focused on the "ethnicization of class" in Tuzla. More specifically, she demonstrated the ways in which those migrant workers who occupy the lowest rungs of the ladder in terms of the jobs they are assigned to and the wages they receive tend to be migrants from the southeast of Turkey, a demographic and class-based fact which then gets reified as a problem of being Kurdish and associated with being uneducated and unskilled.

The discussant, Ayşe Buğra (Boğaziçi University), alluded to Eric Wolf's *Europe and the People Without History* to emphasize the ways in which the panel brought to the fore the stories of migrants and workers by and large ignored or silenced. She also insisted, however, that the voicing of such stories should not remain confined within the borders of the academic community. She emphasized the need to formulate such

concerns under the rubric of rights and entitlements that are to be demanded from the state.

In her concluding remarks, Ayşe Gül Altınay invoked the legacy of Hrant Dink as someone who had also striven to highlight existing connections and to cross beyond presumed borders. She thus suggested that Hrant Dink would have been in solidarity with the migrant workers of Tuzla. Her remark was a perfect segway into the final public session held in the afternoon.

Session 9

Final Public Session

The workshop concluded with the public session entitled “From Tuzla... to Tuzla...,” calling attention to the simultaneous stories of displacement and arrival—the closing, on the one hand, of the children’s camp Hrant Dink grew up in and later worked at, and, on the other hand, the relocation of the dockyards in Tuzla and the influx of internal migrants as workers in the industry. Sabancı University Dean Ahmet Alkan (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences) opened the public session. His remarks were followed by an eloquent speech by Aslı Odman (Istanbul Bilgi University), in which Odman interlaced Hrant Dink’s own words with those of other inhabitants of Tuzla from the orphanage and the dockyards together and placed them in dialogue with the omniscient voice of Walter Benjamin’s “angel of history.”

Aslı Odman’s talk was followed by a simultaneously radical and measured speech by Cem Dinç, the head of the Limter-Is Union, who called attention to the plight of the workers in the dockyards in Tuzla and drew parallels between their predicament with the predicament of minorities in Turkey. Finally, Nil Uzun (Cultural Studies MA student) and Burak Köse (Political Science, Ph.D. student) spoke on behalf of the recent student initiative on “Tuzla Studies,” elaborating on the efforts of the undergraduate and graduate students who take as their starting point the usually unmentioned interconnections between the various spaces and happenings in Tuzla and the university campus they inhabit.

The first half of the public panel thus focused on the socio-economic transformations of Tuzla in the early 1980s. This was followed by the screening of the documentary "Swallow's Nest" (directed by Bülent Arınlı on the Tuzla Children's Camp, and based on a long on-site interview with Hrant Dink), followed by comments from Garabet Orunöz, one of the "children," like Hrant Dink, who constructed the camp's facilities with their own hands. After the session, the participants, including Arat and Haycan Dink, visited the Children's Camp and the dockyards, and a dinner with the Linter-İş union members.