

## Abstracts (İngilizce özetler)

### **Genocide, coming to terms with the past, political responsibility: Raphael Lemkin, Karl Jaspers, Hannah Arendt**

**DEVİRİM SEZER**

In this article I explore two interrelated questions. What is the meaning of the concept of genocide as a crime against humanity? How should present-day generations who had not taken part directly or indirectly in the crimes committed by previous generations come to terms with a past that carries the burden of genocide? I will explore these questions by focusing on three texts written by Raphael Lemkin, Karl Jaspers and Hannah Arendt between 1944 and 1961. A close reading of these texts not only sheds light on the origins of the concepts of genocide and political responsibility, but also provides us with a comprehensive theoretical perspective from which to assess the Armenian Genocide. The ultimate purpose of the paper is, on the one hand, to critically engage with the arguments put forth in these texts and, on the other hand, to question the official narrative about the Armenian Genocide in Turkey.

**Keywords:** Genocide, political responsibility, coming to terms with the past, Raphael Lemkin, Hannah Arendt, Karl Jaspers.



### **Three generations three massacres: Armenian children and orphans from 1894 to 1915**

**NAZAN MAKSUDYAN**

In this article, I focus on three different generations of Armenian orphans, who lost their parents during the late Ottoman period. First, 1894-1896 Hamidian mas-

sacres, then the Adana Massacres of 1909 and finally the systematic and organized massacres in 1915 that spread invariably to the entire geography where Armenians lived, left behind innumerable Armenian orphans. The aim of this article is to go beyond those subjects of Ottoman history that are traditionally considered important and to pursue an alternative narrative that puts children at the center, that addresses children as parts of history. As a consequence, the paper not only points to the neglected role of children in the making (and writing) of history, but it also stresses the growing political importance of children in the period under question.

**Keywords:** Armenian orphans, children in historiography, children's agency in history, 1894-1895 Hamidian massacres, Adana massacres of 1909, Armenian genocide.



## **The Republic of paradox: Post-war minorities regime and the New Turkey's step-citizens**

**LERNA EKMEKÇIOĞLU**

This article focuses on the years after World War I, especially the first decade following the 1923 establishment of the Republic of Turkey, in order to analyze the position of minorities in the developing "we" of the new nation as projected by its political elite. Situating the discussion in the context of the League of Nations interwar minority protection regime, I demonstrate that the Treaty of Lausanne, which the Ankara government and the Allies signed in July 1923, played an important role in the conflicting treatment that minorities have since received in Turkey. The treaty's minority protection clauses entrenched divisions that had already been formed in the Ottoman Empire during the violence of the preceding decade, including the Armenian genocide. Moreover, reminding Turkish leaders of how 19th-century European imperial powers had used the cause of Ottoman Christians' suffering as an excuse to infringe on Ottoman sovereignty, these clauses alarmed the Turkish political elite, especially as the "Great Powers" themselves were not bound by such minority protection guarantees. The goal of preventing a repetition of this unbalanced international power dynamic, which, according to the new Turkey's leaders, had led to the demise of the Ottoman Empire, engendered paradoxical policies toward non-Muslim Turkish citizens; they have been largely excluded from a Turkness (*Türklük*) to which they were sometimes included, even forcibly included.

**Keywords:** The League of Nations, the Treaty of Lausanne, Turkness, minorities regime, citizenship, non-Muslim minorities.



## Raison d'état and 1915 in Turkey

GÜVEN GÜRKAN ÖZTAN - ÖMER TURAN

The concept of *raison d'état* refers to the sum of strategies, rules and norms through which the state actualizes its authority. This concept suggests that the state authority requires a different set of strategies, rules and norms from the ones used to administer the daily routine of public life. The principle aim of the *raison d'état* is to protect the status of the authority and to ensure the state's institutional survival. The idea that the interests of state authority take precedence over individual, economic or societal interests forms the main assumption of the *raison d'état*. In this conceptual framework, this article aims to analyze how the Turkish state has been responding to demands of recognition of Armenian genocide and the repertoire of action through which agents of the Turkish state have been defending the official narrative from 1915 to present. The article claims that the denial of the Armenian genocide has played a key role in the "integration" of society with the Turkish state. The article first focuses on the roots of denialism in the Early Republican era and then it sheds light on the turning point that systematized the denialist narrative by referring to Esat Uras's book *The Armenians in History and the Armenian Question*. In the third section, the article examines the set of strategies developed by Turkish officers and bureaucrats under the military regime. The fourth section analyses diplomatic tactics used by the Turkish state in order to defend the official stance at the time when Western countries' parliaments began to recognize the Armenian genocide. This paper also focuses on the process of formation and dissemination of official narrative by underlining the role of the Ministry of National Education and Higher Education Board. Finally, the judicial mechanism and court decisions for Orhan Pamuk and Hrant Dink-which fortify the official narrative by referring to the penal code-are incorporated into the analysis. At the end of the paper, we claim that the denial of the Armenian genocide has played a key role in the continuity of the *raison d'état* in Turkey. The official strategies have been changed in accordance with challenges to the official narrative; however, denialism has been reproduced persistently.

**Keywords:** *raison d'état*, Armenian Genocide, denialism, official narrative, Esat Uras, Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Armenian question"



## Four generations: The unrecoverable end

TALIN SUCIYAN

In this article I tried to explain the concept of post-genocide habitus of denial through an oral historical account of Prof. Mihran Dabağ, that to my mind reveals the institutionalization and banalization of denial constituting everyday life. As personal as it may be, I find his account at the same time representative of experi-

ences of Armenians living in the provinces after 1923. Therefore, I utilized his account by referring to other primary and secondary sources. Further, regarding the post-1915 generations, I argue that the institutionalized and banalized denial has been perpetuating the reproduction of victim and perpetrator generations –albeit in different forms– and continues to define history of Turkey to this day.

**Keywords:** oral history, post-genocide habitus of denial, Diyarbakır, Prof. Mihran Dabağ, Armenian genocide, 1915, history of Turkey.



### **“The youth writes about many of the things. They identify with certain roles, certain slogans”: The generation of 19th January and demands regarding memory**

**ÖNDERCAN MUTİ**

In this article, the effect of the murder of Hrant Dink on political engagement of Armenian young people born ca. 1990 is discussed. As the first historical event experienced by a large age group in Turkey, the date of 19<sup>th</sup> January led especially Armenian young people born ca. 1990 to gain a collective sensation and reflection and moreover gave birth to a new Armenian political generation. The continuity between the Armenians of generation '78 who were engaged to the leftist movement in Turkey, and this younger generation can be observed, and the Armenian identity plays an important role in the engagement of the last one, regarding the same continuity. The same emphasis is consistent with the objections made by this generation during the Gezi Park protests, which can be called 'demands regarding the memory'. The political dynamism has given birth to a generation of 19<sup>th</sup> January in potentiality, and the Gezi Park protests have given this generation the opportunity to reveal their common reactions and demands as a political whole.

**Keywords:** 19<sup>th</sup> January, generation, collective memory, Gezi Park



### **From a 'distanced' state to a 'serving' one: The partial recognition politics of AKP**

**BÜLENT KÜÇÜK - CEREN ÖZSELÇUK**

This paper analyzes the ways in which the Justice and Development Party (JDP) has aimed to transform the art of governing difference as well as the national body politics, in large part, in response to Kurdish movement's demands for rights, status and democratic autonomy. In so doing, the paper employs discourse analysis of interviews that were conducted with several ideologues and leading figures of JDP and RPP in 2009 (the same year as the official announcement of the peace process),

as well as public declarations and speeches of important political figures of JDP. The paper tries to demonstrate how the universal imaginary of neo Ottomanism which frames this new art of government differentiates from that of the Republican Peoples' Party (RPP) which is based on the myth of the 'neutrality' of state. Partial recognition is the term we mobilize to understand this transformative process that has aimed at replacing the old secularist nationalism, which was in crisis, by another and more efficient (multiculturalist) conservative nationalism. The concept of partial recognition enables us to interrogate the articulation of the shift in the mentality of state, which now operates through the neoliberal logic of the entrepreneur and mobilizes people through a particular discourse of market (hizmet), with the transformation of populist body politics. Partial recognition is a de-politization strategy adopted by the corporate state in order to domesticate the egalitarian universalism of politicized identities and construe an imagined (conservative) national body (millet).

**Keywords:** JDP, RPP, Kurdish question, recognition politics, corporate state, populism, ideology of service, neoliberalism, neo-Ottomanism.



## **A Bourdieusean approach to legal profession in Turkey through debates on mediation**

**SEDA KALEM BERK**

In this piece, debates around Law No 6325 on Mediation in Civil Disputes will be discussed in light of Pierre Bourdieu's general conceptual framework with a particular focus on his use of the concept of "juridical field". In Bourdieu's sociology, the boundaries of the field are constituted by the competitive struggles within the field as well as against the effects of the outside forces. As such, these boundaries are always open to redefinition. These debates on mediation can at first glance be interpreted as acts in defense of professional interests. However, an empirical observation of these debates in fact allows for a questioning of who get to determine the boundaries of the juridical field in Turkey and what kinds of struggles go into this process. This type of an analysis also allows for situating these struggles within larger historical forces. Such a reading necessitates a review of the secular legal system in Turkey and modern professions operating within this field as direct products of the republican project. Hence, in this piece, this alliance between the republic and the legal profession is studied as a historical force that affects the ways in which these actors imagine and talk about their field and the society as they go about debating mediation.

**Keywords:** mediation in civil disputes, Pierre Bourdieu, juridical field Turkey, legal professional habitus, legal profession Turkey, sociology of law.

## Yazarlara not

*Toplum ve Bilim*'e gönderilen yazıların başka bir yerde yayınlanmamış ya da yayınlanması amacıyla başka bir yere iletilmemiş olması gereklidir. Yazarlar, yazıları ile birlikte bir sayfayı geçmeyen İngilizce-Türkçe birer özet, açıklayıcı nitelikte anahtar sözcükler/keywords iletmelidirler. Ayrıca yazarlar, isimlerinin başına bir asteriks koyarak makalenin ilk sayfasının altında kendilerini ünvanlarıyla tanıtmalıdır.

Yazıların toplumbilim@iletisim.com.tr adresine word.doc olarak gönderilmeleri gerekir. Dergiye ulaşan yazılar en geç iki ay içinde hakem okurların da katkısıyla değerlendirilecek ve sonuç yazarlara yazılı olarak iletilecektir.

**Biçim:** Makalede diğer kaynaklara yapılacak göndermeler, ana metin içinde uygun yerlere parantez içinde yazarın soyadı, yayın tarihi ve sayfa no belirtilerek yapılmalıdır. Metin içinde aynı kaynaklara tekrar gönderme yapıldığında da aynı yöntem izlenmeli ve "age.", "agm." gibi kısaltmalar kullanılmamalıdır. Eğer yazarın adı metnin içinde geçiyorsa, yalnızca yayın yılını parantez içinde vermek yeterlidir; örneğin, "... İnalçık'ın (1985) belirttiği gibi...". Eğer yazarın adı metin içinde geçmiyorsa, hem yazarın adı, hem de atıfta bulunulan kaynağın yayın tarihi parantez içinde verilmelidir; örneğin, (İnalçık, 1985). Eğer sayfa numarası vermek gerekiyorsa, yazar adı ve yayın tarihinden sonra iki nokta üstüste konulmalı ve sayfa numaraları yazılmalıdır; örneğin, (İnalçık, 1985: 23-27). Eğer atıfta bulunulan kaynak iki yazar tarafından kaleme alınmışsa, her ikisinin de soyadları kullanılmalıdır; örneğin, (Lash ve Urry, 1987; 125-128). Eğer yazarlar ikiden fazlaysa, ilk yazarın soyadından sonra "vd." ibaresi kullanılmalıdır; örneğin, (İnalçık vd. 1985: 23-27). Eğer gönderme yapılan kaynaklar birden fazlaysa, aynı parantez içinde yazarların soyadları ve yayın tarihleri, aralarında noktalı virgül olacak şekilde sıralanmalıdır; örneğin, (İnalçık, 1985; Mardin, 1989; Poulantzas, 1979). Buradaki sırlama yazarların soyad-

larına göre alfabetik olmalıdır. Metin içinde kaynak göstermek için dipnot kullanılmamalı, dipnotlar sadece ana metin içinde yer alması uygun görülmeyen notlar için kullanılmalıdır. Dipnotlarda yapılacak göndermelerde de yine ana metin içinde kullanılan yöntem izlenmelidir. Ana metinde ve dipnotlarda atıfta bulunulan tüm kaynaklar, yazının sonuna eklenecek "Kaynakça" içerisinde yer almalıdır.

**Kaynakça:** Kaynakçada sadece yazıda atıfta bulunulan eserler yer almalı ve bu eserler, yazarların soyadına göre alfabetik olarak sıralanmalıdır. Bir yazarın birden fazla eserinin kaynakçada yer alması halinde, her seferinde yazarın soyadı ve adının baş harfi tekrarlanacak ve sıralama, yazarın en son yayınlanmış çalışması en üstte gelecek şekilde yapılacaktır. Yazarın aynı yıl içinde yayınlanmış birden fazla çalışması kaynakçada yer alacaksa, yayın tarihinden sonra "a, b, c" gibi ibareler kullanılmalı ve metin içinde de bu şekilde atıfta bulunulmalıdır. Kaynakçada yer alabilecek örnekler aşağıda belirtilmektedir:

**Kitaplar:**

Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Harvey, D. (1985a) *The Urbanization of Capital*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Harvey, D. (1985b) *Consciousness and Urban Experience*, Blackwell, Oxford.

**Derleme kitaplar:**

Gregory, D. ve Urry, J. der. (1985) *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, Macmillan, Londra.

**Dergilerdeki makaleler:**

Johnson, L.C. (1994) "What future for feminist geography", *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1(1): 103-113.

Peet, R. (1985) "The social origins of environmental determinism", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 75(2): 309-333.

**Derleme kitaplar içindeki makaleler:**

Massey, D. (1993) "Politics and space/time" Keith, M. ve Pile, S. (der.) *Place and the Politics of Identity* içinde, Routledge, Londra, 141-161.

Urry, J. (1989) "Sociology and geography" Peet, R. ve Thrift, N. (der.) *New Models in Geography* içinde, Unwin, Londra, 795-317.

**Tezler, yayınlanmamış çalışmalar:**

Şen, M. (1992) *Development of the Big Bourgeoisie in Turkey*, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, ODTÜ Sosyoloji Bölümü, Ankara.

Ayrıca kaynakçada yer alan çalışmalar Türkçe yayınlanmış ise, parantez içinde mutlaka belirtilmelidir.