

Erginsoy, G. (2013). A tribute to the nineteenth anniversary of the Lausanne Treaty: Immobilized and mobilized narratives from Imbros to Gökçeada, *Turkish Journal of Sociology*, 2013/2, 3/27, 95-108.

## A Tribute to the Nineteenth Anniversary of the Lausanne Treaty: Immobilized and Mobilized Narratives from Imbros to Gökçeada \*

Güliz Erginsoy\*\*

**Abstract:** This paper deals with a saga of compulsory migration, refugees and asylum seekers, ending in the formation of transnational groups, part-time citizenships and diaspora as a result of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne and the additional Protocol of the Population Exchange of *Rum* (Greek) from Turkey and Muslims from the Western Thrace dating back to ninety years.

It is argued that the status of *Gökçeadalılar* (*Imbrians*) is characterized by a loss of communication rights and locates the instance where this loss is most visible – the Imbros island. In this process the island become a ‘detention’ place and the ‘detained’ Imbrians loose their status as ‘interlocutors’, irrespective of the processes that allow them – or demand of them- to speak. The state of exceptionality assigned to Imbrians by the Lausanne Treaty, ironically become the antipode of the fundamental principles of free movement, expression and protection of cultural heritage as tangible and intangible layers.

**Keywords:** Communication Rights, Detention, Diaspora, Irregular Migrants, Intangible Cultural Heritage, Tangible Cultural Heritage

### Lozan Anlaşması'nın Doksanıncı Yılına Saygı: İmroz'dan Gökçeada'ya Sabitleştirilmiş ve Hareketli Anlatılar

**Özet:** Bu yazıda 1923 Lozan Anlaşması ve Türkiye'deki Rumlarla Batı Trakya'daki Türkler hakkında Ek Nüfus Mübadelesi Protokolü nedeniyle; uluslararası gruplar, yarı-zamanlı vatandaşlıklar ve diaspora ile sonuçlanan; zorunlu göç, mülteciler ve sığınmacılar destanı ele alınmaktadır.

Gökçeadalıların (İmrozluların) statüsünün iletişim hakları kaybı açısından belirlendiği tartışılmakta ve bu olgu kaybın en görülür olduğu yere yerleştirilmektedir – İmroz adası. Bu süreç içinde ada bir ‘alıkoyma’ yeri olmakta ve ‘alıkoyma’ İmrozlular, onların konuşmalarına izin veren – veya talep eden – süreçlere bakılmaksızın ‘diyalog içindeki yer’ statülerini kaybetmektedirler. Lozan Anlaşması ile kendilerine tanınan ayrıcalık; ironik olarak, serbest hareket, taşınabilir ve taşınamaz katmanlar olarak kültürel mirasın anlamlandırılması ve korunması temel ilkeleri ile taban tabana zıt hale gelmesine yol açmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** İletişim Hakları, Alıkoyma, Diaspora, Düzensiz Göçmenler, Taşınabilir Kültürel Miras, Taşınamaz Kültürel Miras

\* This article is the revised and expanded version of the paper “Sweet as an Almond: From Glikli to ‘Bademli’ Full Time and Part Time Citizenship (Four Generations in Retrospect)” presented at the international conference on the Exchange of Populations between Greece and Turkey: An Assessment of the Consequences of the Treaty of Lausanne, 17-20 September 1998 – University of Oxford, Refugee Studies Center. For this paper, see [http://openarchive.icomos.org/1241/1/From\\_Glikli\\_to\\_Bademli.pdf](http://openarchive.icomos.org/1241/1/From_Glikli_to_Bademli.pdf).

\*\* Prof. Dr., [guliz@erginsoy.com](mailto:guliz@erginsoy.com).

'...For other sons of mine (Hekabe) whom he took captive would fleet Achilles sell beyond the unwintaged sea unto Samos and Imbros and smoking Lemnos ...'. Homer, the Iliad.

To Niko Agalyanos

(1912, *Evlambiyoyeni Mahalle-Imbros* – 2004, *Kalitheia- Athens*)

### Introduction

Although the right to communication, as the indivisible element of globalization, the imagery of mobility and connectivity still concerns the ones who take part in dialogue, neglecting the others as detained minorities, in this case be it in Turkey, Greece or in diaspora. Yet globalized narrative of freedom assumes not only free movement of people, but also the culture beyond the boundaries of space and time. Thus I am interested in those failing to gain the recognition they deserve, those suspended in between worlds, with precarious status of residence and citizenship; studied specifically the *Gliki (Eski Bademli)* village in Gökçeada by the narratives of the islanders. Being a minority intersects with religion, class and status in the matrix of domination, entailing a process analytically organized around institutionally determined moments as: the 'exit' or 'entrapment' from threatening spaces such as leaving the island for diaspora or not leaving ones own house after sun set; the journey to Greece or diaspora as far as New Zealand, Australia; arrival at a space where the status of citizenship is considered as 'Alien', in a sense detained in quarters dedicated to the Imbrian population such as Kalitheia, Nea Kalvari, Nea Symrni in Athens, Greece. As Lyotard puts it 'the threat of exclusion which weighs on all interlocution' in authoritatively created spaces and moments, where and when fear and knowledge of exclusion reigns (Lyotard, 2002, p. 187).

When incarcerated by blurred and changing application procedures related to Article 14 of the 1923 Lausanne Treaty, thus immobilized culturally, Imbrians' right to communicative acts is illegitimately and unilaterally disabled through material, legal, procedural and political economic constraints over time whereby 'institutionalized patterns of cultural value recognize some categories of social actors as normative and others as deficient or inferior' (Fraser, 2000, p. 114). The very normative ones control the legality, the legitimacy and the authority to speak. Thus narratives related to the topic of this article demarcated as layers of tangible and intangible narratives of people and land are controlled on three levels: 'the faculty of interlocution, the legitimation of speech, whereby 'something other' – that which one knows not – is announced, and legitimacy of speech, 'the positive right to speak, which recognizes in citizen the right to address the citizen' (Lyotard, 2002,

p.185). The drama of authorization among interlocutors of which Lyotard speaks is visible when religion, minority and class intersect; clean narratives about those who are screened are accepted to be heard and complex matrices of domination beyond practical and legal terms in shifting paradigms emerge.

### **The Saga: Year 1923 – The “*Etablis*”**

The saga of compulsory migration, refugees and asylum seekers, ending in the formation of transnational groups, part-time citizenships and diaspora as a result of the Treaty of Lausanne and the additional Protocol of the Population Exchange; dates back to ninety years. The saga started with the Article 14 of the Treaty is as follows (LCTS Treaty Series 16 – Treaty of Lausanne, Cmd. 1929), p. 21):

The islands of Imvros and Tenedos remaining under Turkish sovereignty, shall enjoy a special administrative organization composed of Local elements and furnishing every guarantee for the native non - Moslem population in so far as concerns Local administration and the protection of person and property. The maintenance of order will be assured therein by a police force recruited from amongst the Local population by the Local administration above provided for and placed under its orders. The agreements which have been, or may be, concluded between Greece and Turkey relating to the exchange of the Greek and Turkish populations will not be applied to the inhabitants of the islands of Imvros and Tenedos.

The events that took place during the creation of the Turkish Republic in 1923 seemed remote from these islanders, who usually traded at the *Merkez* (the central village) and traveled no further than Limni or Pireus. Yet despite the distance, the islanders were caught in the middle of a geo-political tug-of-war that had all the elements of a dramatic play: threats, aggressive moves, a defense, and even paranoia, as the nations of Turkey and Greece were restructured in the aftermath of World War I.

Technically, Imbrians were never actually included in the Exchange. In spite of this, repercussions from the Exchange extended to the island and continue to affect it even today. Perhaps if the islanders had been exchanged the suffering might have been short-lived. However, not being exchanged but being subjected to various interpretations of the Exchange created a state of perpetual unrest. Petitions written by the islanders to the British public officer in Athens, is about the island's autonomy (as granted by the Lausanne Treaty of 1923) which the islanders have doubts about was not negligible. An example from 1927, a petition entitled the “Treatment of Inhabitants of Imbros and Tenedos by Turkey” received by the British consular agent at Modros from the committee of natives of islands protesting against action taken by Turkey in violation of Article 14 of the Treaty of Lausanne was that the “Consul-

General at Salonica has instructed Mr. Palmer to reply that complaints should be addressed to Greek Government or League of Nations” (Public Record Office, 1927, registry no. E 1023/173/44). The minutes in response to the this was:

It is unlikely that the position of the Greek inhabitants of Imbros and Tenedos is anything but profoundly unsatisfactory –but every time that the petition has arisen it has been shown that we are powerless to intervene. Mr. Crow’s reply is in accordance with our policy. PS. Instruct Sir. P. Loraine to [appropriate] his language.

As the time passed, the ones who stayed in the island, some of them began to break the law by giving, for example, false information in court about the ownership or the size of evacuated properties. Others even cheated their own kin on the share of rent or the value of sold property. And there were those who chose to leave and became refugees or aliens.

The fields of inquiry were designed to reveal the history of each family. Villagers were asked to recount their lives, including their childhood, education, religion, marriage, property, migration, work, and citizenship. Some were unwilling to discuss the ways in which historical events or the policy of Turkification had affected the village.

Although the family was the primary social unit in the village, it is important to remember that these families were highly fragmented and sometimes members lost track of the others. Members of these families were dispersed, and no longer bound by the circumference of the village, or indeed any other established unit of place or time. Because of historical events, these families were scattered across countries and even continents.

Nevertheless, the family unit was used as a device to relay events and gauge their consequences. The memories of the departed were reported by those who stayed behind and vice versa, so that memories intersected and overlapped. Members of the same family are now citizens of different countries; most have pursued and established new professions and careers. Often, the children cannot speak their parents’ language, or two or more languages are used in conversation, in function of the generation that is addressed. Numerous are grandchildren who have never seen the land of birth of their grandparents.

Those who left their native land behind more than ninety years ago have pursued their careers abroad. The aged members of the Gliki village live alone, and have often at one time or another has made friends with a villager from Anatolia, the New Muslim Turk Islanders, who can be considered refugees. The Gliki villagers, the new islanders-, and both groups looted each other – form the people of Imbros, the Imbrians, and Gökçedalılar – the inhabitants of the island.

### **Theoretical Considerations About the Narratives:**

#### ***“As We Forget How Fragile We Are”***

As the building blocks, or theoretical pillars of the mobilized and/or immobilized “identity narratives” of the Island, I decided to work through three dimensions. The first one being the awareness of the “fragility and coincidentalness of cultural heritage” that makes any kind of collectivist ideology untrustworthy.

Following Benhabib (2011) the issue is how to reconcile universalistic principles of “human rights, autonomy, freedom” with our concrete particular identities as members of certain concrete human communities divided by language, by ethnicity and by religion. The second pillar is about “communication rights” and is based upon the three principles derived from Hegel. The three principles in the state, as morality, legality and ethical life. Morality is what we all should have in common as moral rational beings. Legality is the system of rights under which we live, and the ethical life is basically the structure of the family, the market system etc.

The third pillar is iterations or rethinking processes. Within this context the concept of ‘reiteration’ by Derrida is most useful (Derrida, 1991, pp. 80-111). The meaning of reiteration is to use an expression or a concept in the repetition processes, is to use it differently and transform its authenticity, as pure copying is not possible. The proposition is to use the concept of reiteration in the following fields: global justice, cosmopolitan citizenship, new political subjectivities and the paradox of democratic legitimacy.

Thus, putting these concepts into the framework of the island the following conceptualizations need to be reiterated not only within the borders of the nation-state, but they should be reiterated at the meta level of the Terra by different mouths, belonging to different agenda setting bodies – narratives of the people and land, slow city, cultural heritage, permaculture, urban protection, rural and urban site areas. Thus the archeology and ethnography of the layers of narratives were identified.

#### ***Towards the Construction of the Mobile, Immobile and Diasporic Layers***

Thassos, Lemnos, Samothrace, Imbros, and Tenedos form a geographical unit known as the Thracian Sporades at the northeast Aegean Sea. They are very close to Dardanelles. Imbros is located eleven nautical miles from the mouth of the Dardanelles and comprises an area of 285,5 square meters. There are six authentic villages on the island; *Eski Bademli (Glikì)*, *Dereköy(Schoinoudion)*, *Kaleköy (Kastro)*, *Yeni Mahalle (Evlambiyo)*, *Tepeköy (Ağrıdyá)*, *Zeytinliköy*

(*Agaios Theodoros*). Each village used to have their own nearby beach, e.g. *Pirğos* was *Dereköy*'s. For nearly 8,000 years, the islanders enjoying a daily routine of agricultural labour, bartering, trade, and prayers; they produced oil from their oil groves, wine from their vineyards, honey from their hives and wove silk harvested from mulberry trees.

As Homer mentions the island has harsh winds. It has also a short summer, long spring and autumn with mountains, forests, fountains, lakes, rivers; generic goats and sheeps, game, a flora and fauna generic to the island on land and in the sea with coral reefs, mamals, echinoderm (Aslan-Cihangir, p. 29). For the islanders *Aya Paraskevi* and *Aya Spiridon* as well as *Aya Nicholas* is extremely important Saints looking after the ear, the eyes and protects them from the evils of the sea respectively.

They herded sheep and hunted for game or fish. Elders offered almond cookies to guests seated under trellises while the young danced the *hora* (A group dance usually made in circles) in the *alonyi* (threshing field) until dawn. The islanders lived in stone houses with outside ovens and built-in windmills, and sometimes in the *dam* - a shelter designed more or less like a house, located in the distant areas of cultivation to stay a night or two during the heavy work seasons, such as picking up grapes and olives or during harvesting.

The immaculately laid stones defied the frequent earthquakes, and today they serve as reminders of an existence that many would rather forget. At the *Merkez* (the centre), there were bakeries, grocery stores, pastry shops, photographers, a printer and a marketplace. Villagers would come to buy sugar and paraffin. Salt was hauled by donkey from *Aliki*, the salt lake. After the Republic was formed, the lake was nationalized under state monopoly, but the donkey continued their journey for a time, in the quiet of night.

### ***The Chosen Trauma in Four Generations of Narratives and Encounters: 1923 – 2013***

Here, I would like to start with the Volkan Vamik's concept of chosen trauma (Vamik, 1998, p. 7). According to his definition a chosen trauma is "the image of a past event during which a large group suffered loss or experienced helplessness and humiliation in a conflict with a neighboring group." Here it should be noted that this choice of drama, apart from political factors can be considered as a reflex, as Vamik calls it, maybe 'it reflects a group's unconscious choice to add a past generation's mental representation of an event to its own identity'. As the chosen trauma passes from generation to generation it can change function. The historical truth about the causing event can recess and be secondary to the group cohesion maintained by the chosen trauma, 'woven into the canvas of the ethnic or large group tent, thus becomes an inseparable

part of the group's identity' (Vamık, 1998, p. 9). Activation of a chosen trauma plays a major role in the anniversaries, yet a mystification and/or sublimation mechanism can be replaced – such as by not commemorating the 1923 Exchange of Populations but by dutifully attending the *Panaiya* festival of Virgin Mary's coming from all over the world on the 15th of August each year. This situation is ironic because the diaspora people come to the country where the trauma occurred ninety years ago. Four generations have passed. Different encounters are now in question; and the right to communicate and be an interlocutor in a dialogue occurs once a year over a religious ceremony. This irony is even more accentuated, and becomes even more precarious during the festival celebrations to which the local governors are particularly invited, as Babül puts it: "...where both sides race with each other to act like the host and welcome the other to the island" (Babül, 2006, p.43).

When I started my research in the village of Glikı in 1989, it was clear that the population was aging, which was significant. Family and the maternal lineage have a special status in *Glikı*, due to the dowry given by the bride's father. Land and possessions are also handed down through daughters; when asked about the owner of a piece of land. It is very typical to get an answer as "*Oh! That olive grove used to belong to Pelegia Leondaris' son.*" This was the primary basis for inheritance and the preservation of lineage. New civil laws that created a system whereby inheritance became more egalitarian among family members was instituted by the Republic and it served to completely undermine the foundation of the family in this Orthodox Greek Community. This was further exacerbated by the fact that many family members no longer physically lived in Glikı and were not made aware of the changes in the law. In addition, often what they learned was an interpretation of the law and not based on fact.

Apart from religious ceremonies, the main social interaction in Glikı used to be to go to one of the five coffee shops (or indeed any shop) to make company (*parea*) and chat. After the population began to dwindle, the coffee shops and the grocers began to close down, one after another. Shops owners who had not fled earlier decided to leave. The lone coffee shop, where the head of the village still keeps an office, was only recently reopened to cater to tourists and visiting emigrants in the holiday season.

Another typical form of social intercourse takes the form of house visits, where people meet to drink coffee and talk. A conversation is accompanied by various sweets and can last for hours. This type of visit became the basis for the oral history I was gathering. One soon learns when to keep quiet or ask questions. A small group of multi-lingual assistants helped conduct these interviews, based on a format specially designed for the project.

The first generation of Imbrians had their initial encounters with the new migrants from mainland at around the age of thirties. The family came and settled to *Kaleköy* at 1947 from the Black Sea region. The father and mother died, and their children are currently running a hotel and a restaurant. This was an individual migration and not related to settlement policies. Most of the later settlements until today was the result of state driven policies of migrating whole of the villages from mainland to the island by establishing new administrative units – as villages: Uğurlu, Şahinkaya being the examples. People from Muğla-Milas-Yatağan, Burdur-Bucak, Samsun, Siirt, Van, Iğdır, Çankırı, Diyarbakır, Trabzon, Ünye, Bingöl, İstanbul, Isparta, Çanakkale-Biga-Çan, Artvin, Erzurum became the new islanders (Özözen Kahraman, 2005, s. 46-48; Ongan, 2012, s. 58-59). At this point the encounters of the generations began to be mixed up, and a multiplicity of patterns of networks among the Rum and Muslim population began to emerge nearly on all possible subjects – land issues, mixed marriages, trade, expropriation of property, friendships... etc.

### ***Diaspora and Mobilization***

The experience of the era from the Lausanne Treaty up until today shows that the line between being a minority citizen and a refugee is blurred in Imbros. The Rum minority in Imbros enjoyed certain rights during periods of mutually friendly relations between Greece and Turkey. However, the same minority group can also become refugees overnight.

The rights of minority citizens in any part of the world should be respected today, without any question. However, it is disturbing to note that starting with the Lausanne Treaty and up until today, the minority rights of those in neighboring nationalistic states are respected only in periods when relations are friendly. Minority citizens can become refugees overnight or feel like refugees, either because of government policy or as an accumulated and learned response. The importance of shared and reconstituted memories for any uprooted group is that they can be used as a means for cultural survival. The memories can be transformed into a sense of belonging and identity for displaced individuals (Hirschon, 1989, Chp. 7 - *The House: Symbolic and Social Worlds*, p. 134-165). Symbolically the empty houses, coffee shops and the school building become the material expression of the Imbrians transcending the boundaries of a nation-Turkey. The immovable properties became a political issue, tied up with the identity of the islanders in Turkey and abroad. The status of being displaced is most clearly seen in the problems surrounding the immovable properties.



The major waves of Rum exodus from Imbros and from İstanbul coincide with periods of strained relations between Turkey and Greece, which resulted in prolonged pressure on both societal and psychological levels. These periods of strained relations are roughly marked by the years 1922-1929, 1955-1959, 1964-1967, 1972-75, 1994 and finally 1998. Such pressure is against the tenets of the Exchange, as set forth by the Turkish and Greek Governments. The peaceful periods were reflected in the behavior of the Imbrians on societal, cultural, and economic levels over the four generations. Such peaceful intervals can be roughly named as 1930-1940, 1947-1954, 1959-1964, 1967-1971 and finally 1988-1991.

In early August of 1923, the final decision for the transfer of power was made public. Panic stricken and alarmed, Imbrians filled the port for evacuation. 'Potential undesirables' fled before the arrival of Turkish forces on the island. Those that ventured to return found their property and land confiscated under the Turkish Abandoned Property Act. It is difficult to reconcile these events with the Declaration of Amnesty signed at Lausanne.

Then the tide changed. The *Mahalli İdareler Kanunu* (Local Government Act) was passed on 26 June 1927, creating a local administration for the islands of Imbros and Tenedos. A superficial reading of the law suggests that the Turkish government did in fact make a serious effort to fulfill obligations under Article 14 of the Education Act (also 1927), which allowed local inhabitants to establish part-time minority language and religious instruction, albeit at their own expense and by a teacher licensed by the Government. Moreover, prior to 1930, the *Rum* minorities was confined to the limits of their residence (e.g., Imbros and Tenedos) and were not allowed to visit any other province of Turkey without special permission. This contravened Article 38, Paragraph 3 of the Lausanne Treaty, which gives *Rums* the right to circulate freely, which the Turkish Government has recognised. In 1950, Imbros acquired the status of *Kaza* (province) enabling judicial affairs to be settled locally. Article 14 of the 1927 Education Act was replaced by the Law 5713 allowing a special Greek educational curriculum for Rum minority schools. Glikli villagers rebuilt their demolished school around this time, encouraged by rapprochement of the two NATO allies.

The tide changed again. In, 1955 *Rum* shops in Istanbul were ransacked by a mob. This culminated in the events of 1964, described earlier. Similar tensions were felt during the Cyprus crisis in 1974.

The last change of the tide was in 1988, when the Government freed previously frozen *Rum* assets. The point here is that the tides of change quite rapidly altered the status of the Imbrians on a social, economical, political, and psychological level. Sometimes the new status was official, but even when

it was not the insecurity of their existence weighed upon them. Citizen or refugee? Both or neither? This dilemma is the ultimate displacement. Despite all this, it is astonishing to see how the people of Gliki managed to adapt – even to some disturbing and traumatic tides.

### **Archeology and Ethnography of Identity Narratives Constructed: Immobilized and Mobilized Layers**

Place, memory and meaning as intangible and tangible heritages of culture; as “landscapes” and “cultural landscapes” has their own narratives and voices that one hears in the island. Both landscapes rely on each other as heritages, when it comes to understanding the meaning and importance of each, specially during the times of crisis.

I argue that two sets of narratives in relation to the above mentioned theoretical framework emerges: mobilized narratives and immobilized narratives. Identity narratives are read under these titles be it human or inhuman. As every participant, every song, every fairy tale, every child game in this research had a voice, by the same token every related inhuman aspect – generic sheeps, goats, game, plants, fish, houses, vine yards, mulberry groves, site areas, water, stones, furniture, shoes, radios, kitchen utensils, gardening tools, baking powder tins scattered on the ground indoor or outdoor as well, that I have found over the years; have their own narratives with a different voice to be heard.

Tangible culture has eight different layers of identity narratives, the corner stone being, the establishment of the Turkish Republic. The first, second, third and fourth are the respective generation of islanders’ narratives, decay and relocation narratives is the fifth one, the sixth one is the narratives of the expropriators/appropriators, the seventh layer is the narratives of the dreamers, the last one is the narrative of the returnees and the INGS and NGO during the last ninety years of the Turkish Republic.

Immobilized cultural identity narratives have four different layers corresponding the narratives of the mobilized cultural identity narratives. “The layer of Paleopoulos”; the first layer is named after the naive painter, who painted what was necessary to be remembered as genuine during 1920’s. And this corresponds to the first four generations’ identity narratives. The second layer is decay and relocation, the third is the appropriation narratives and the fourth is the narrations of the dreamers, returnees; the fifth is INGO/ NGO narratives related to intangible aspect of the culture, lastly the sixth one is about violations of any kind, here exemplified by the SIT violations in Gliki, Bademli village, which this year took a peak in relation to the building of a new hotel on the outskirts of the Gliki village.

Both mobilized and immobilized narratives meet with each other in the person as follows: The islanders, the settled, the convicted, the military personnel, the rantiers (annuitants), racketeers, dreamer Turks, civil servants disciplined according to the norms of the nationstate, volunteers of the INGOs and NGOs, diaspora, intellectuals, clergyman. The new narratives related to land began with the narratives of the islanders.

**Narratives of the Land Vis-à-vis the Narratives of the Islanders:  
The Interdependence of the Immobilized and Mobilized Heritage**

As stated in the keynote address by UNESCO Assistant Director General for Culture, Mounir Buchenaki; cultural heritage is a ‘synchronized relationship’ involving society as systems of interactions connecting people; norms and values. Symbols, technologies and objects are tangible evidence of underlying norms and values. Thus, they establish a symbiotic relationship between the tangible and the intangible. The intangible heritage should be regarded as the larger framework within which the tangible heritage forms a shape and significance (Bouchenaki, 2003).

The Istanbul Declaration, adopted at a round table of seventy one Ministers of Culture, organized by UNESCO in Istanbul in September 2002, stresses that “an all-encompassing approach to cultural heritage should prevail, taking into account the dynamic link between the tangible and intangible heritage and their close interaction.” For Imbros, specific policies are now essential to allow for the identification and promotion of such forms as “mixed heritage” as noble cultural spaces and expressions produced by the islanders, old and new.

Some of the islanders who went away most probably will come back. Some of the Glikians, members of any of the four generations, will keep on visiting in the summer and will attend the *Panaiya* dutifully. The ones who was born in Gliki still want to be an islander: “Everybody wants to die, where one is born.” (Nikola Ağalyanos, Head of Village, 1915-2003)

***What can be done? Cosmopolitanism, A Place Holder:  
Thinking Beyond the Confusing Present towards a Possible and Viable  
Future***

As stated by Seyla Benhabib, a political philosopher, morally, the cosmopolitan tradition is committed to viewing each individual as an equal unit of moral respect and concern; legally, cosmopolitanism views each individual as a legal person and ties them to the protection of their human rights in virtue of their moral personality and their national membership or other status (Benhabib, 2011). Benhabib proposes in the same speech a ‘Normative

Model of Cosmopolitan Human Rights' entails four basics: Participation, equal speech act, agenda setting and metanormative considerations about challenging the rules of the discourse to protect individuals; as opposed to abusive state behavior, entailing self-sufficiency tied to the territory of the nation-state and homogeneity of the citizens.

### **Epilogue: "Proud to be a Turk"**

According to the Chair of the Imbrian Association in Athens, Kosta Hristoforidis states that hundreds of people are thinking to apply to be a citizen of Turkey and wants to leave to their children the 'Turkish citizenship' as an inheritance; leaving aside the monetary dimensions such as a house or a field, he continues "The motherland is there' (Tayman, 2013). A series of similar comments were read in newspapers during the first week of April 2013 the reason being the decision of the Ministry of Education for the opening of the *Ayios Todori* Primary School of Zeytinliköy after 49 years (Karlı; Kavukçuoğlu; Batu; 2013). Restored, the Atatürk's bust with the caption "Proud to be a Turk" in its garden, the school is awaiting its new students from all over the world.

Inspired from the UNESCO's "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention" (Annex 2A. Paragraph 83-84):

Attributes such as spirit and feeling do not lend themselves easily to practical applications of the conditions of authenticity, but nevertheless are important indicators of character and sense of place, for example, in communities maintaining tradition and cultural continuity. ... The use of these sources permits elaboration of the specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of the cultural heritage being examined. "Information sources" are defined as all physical, written, oral, and figurative sources, which make it possible to know the nature, specificities, meaning, and history of the cultural heritage.

A central concept in Gadamer the *phronesis*, in the case of the Imbros, is a practical wisdom giving emphasis to being – in – the –island with a mode of insight into ones own concrete situation - both practical as well as existential (Gadamer, 1989). In a Gadamerian hermeneutic sense the methodology to approach the issue of from Imbroz to Gökçeada in terms of a precarious mode of migration; it is essential to let the language over time and culture to function for communication and let it articulate the cultural identities.

Thus it is important to keep and protect the integrity of any related treaty as a body; keep on reiteration of the related issues with regards to tangible and intangible cultural heritage; in relation to the human rights and equality

maintenance of the delivery of essential services on location; macro issues as education, translation, micro issues as garbage collection, etc; removal of marginilization by the physical geographical constraints such as travel; elimination of the barriers of being far from the center; elimination of the Minorization of poverty; increase public awareness; increase law enforcement (specifically in site areas); provision of legal aid.

What needs to be done is: domestic and international remedies on the implementation and information about legal, social, cultural spaces with iterations and to be realistic and work through the sustainable one – thus maintain sustainability with the remains: natural resources, agro-eco-health tourism and most importantly by the establishment of a self sufficient, green, sustainable higher education institution as the first example in Turkey, focusing on social sciences and design in a broader sense.

### References | Kaynakça

- Aslan-Cihangir, H. (2012). The Echinoderm Fauna of Gokceada Island (NE Aegean Sea). *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances*, 11 (1), 26-29.
- Batu, P. (4 Nisan 2013). Benim güzel mektebim. *Milliyet*. 08 Nisan 2013, <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/Yazdir.aspx?aType=HaberDetayPrint&Ar...>
- Benhabib, S. (2011, November) *Democratic Sovereignty and International Law*. Straus Public Lecture. New York University, School of Law. 25 Mart 2013. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vK-zFpVDxck>
- Bouchenaki, M. (27-31 October 2003). *Introductory lecture*. ICOMOS, 14th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium. Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe. 21 March 2013. <http://www.icomos.org/victoriafalls2003/papers/2%20-%20Allocution%20Bouchenaki.pdf>.
- Derrida, J. ([1982] 1991). "Signature, Event, Context". P. Kamuf (Ed. & Introduction). *A Derrida Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking Recognition. *New Left Review*, 3, 107-120.
- Gadamer, H-G. (1989). *Truth and Method*. (2nd rev.edn. 1975). J. Weinsheimer & D.G. Marshall (Çev.) new York: Crossroad. (1975).
- Hirschon, R. (1989). *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe: The Social Life of Asia Minor Refugees in Pireus*. Oxford & New York: Clarendon Press.
- Özözen Kahraman, S. (2005). Gökçeada'da Göçlerin Nüfus Gelişimi ve Değişimi Üzerine Etkileri. *Coğrafi Bilimler Dergisi*, 3 (2), 39-53.
- Karlı, Ö. (4 Nisan 2013). Rum Okulu'nun ilk mezunları. *Vatan*, 8 Nisan 2013, <http://haber.gazetevatan.com/rum-okulunun-ilk-mezunlari/527234/1/...>
- Kavukçuoğlu, D. (8 Nisan 2013). Gökçeada'da Rum İlkokulu. *Cumhuriyet*, 8 Nisan 2013, <http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/?hn=408300&kn=48&ka=48&kb=5&kc=48>
- LCTS (Treaty Series 16 – Treaty of Lausanne, Cmd. 1929).
- Liotard, J-F. (1989). *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*. G.V. D. Abbelee (Çev.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ongan-Tunçcan, N. (2012). Göç Eksenli Kalkınmanın Demografik Analizi: Gökçeada Örneği. "İş, Güç" *Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 14 (4), 47-70.
- Public Record Office, 1927, registry no. E 1023/173/44.
- UNESCO, World Heritage Center (2012, July). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. 25 Mart 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide12-en.pdf>
- Vamık, V. (1998, August). *Transgenerational transmissions and chosen traumas*. 27 Şubat 2013. <http://www.vamikvolkan.com/Transgenerational-Transmissions-an...>
- Tayman, E. (1 Nisan 2013). Gökçeada'da okulaçılıngöç olur. *Radikal*, 8 Nisan 2013, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/radikal.aspx?atype=radikaldetayv3&artic...>