CHAPTER V
NARRATING THE ATTACKS

It was like wartime. People hid under sofas and beds. We just looked from the window. It was dark everywhere. If you escaped, where would you go? Still the only hope was to get away, instead of staying at home and dying.397

They had flags in their hands. They were singing ‘dagbasini duman almis’ etc [national anthems]. Look at my hair; I get goose bumped [experiencing strong emotions such as fear and anxiety]. […] It was a horrible noise that had a frightening effect. It was like an airplane immediately above us. But thanks to our Allah, [we survived].398

In the town of Bayramic, people who were present in the late 1960s and in the beginning of 1970 recalled the attacks on Gypsies as a time of great violence. People’s houses in the town were attacked, some were beaten, and as a result hundreds of inhabitants fled. The perpetrators were villagers and townspeople, including friends and neighbors of the attacked, and the targets were “the Gypsies.” The same crowd also beat the attorney of the town almost to death in the building of the municipality.

The attorney was transferred somewhere else while “the Gypsies” went to nearby towns as well as big cities. They had to stay out of the town for a certain time, fluctuating from months to years, depending on the kinship and community ties, acceptance in the town, property ownership, savings and ability to survive in the places to fled to. After a while, some came back to the town, while others never returned.

All over the town, the reason that was most frequently mentioned as the cause of the attacks was the immorality and misbehavior of some Gypsies who were accused of making passes at schoolgirls and peeping on women in the Turkish baths [hamams]. The common phrase was that “they were spoiled,” which referred to their misbehaviors as the result of their increased power in the town’s economy. This, however, is the story on the surface that appears as the first narrative for almost all of the non-Gypsies and the

397 See Narrative 56 in Appendix D.
398 See Narrative 57 in Appendix D.
few Gypsies who are considered as locals. The Muhacir Gypsies, who were the prime targets, tell of other reasons and point primarily at the clash of socio-economic interest in the town. This side of the story is not known or remembered properly by most of the non-Gypsies, who emphasize the first (immorality) narrative. Only a few, who knew, remembered and talked about it fairly more or less, supported the Gypsies’ narrative. Not many of the non-Gypsies, however, were eager to talk about it. Thus, if it does, it appears only as the second narrative among a limited number of non-Gypsies.

The account of the attorney Rahmi Ozel, which was published in the newspapers at the time, verifies the muhacir Gypsies’ narrative and appears as the only available written source that in a formal way reports the attacks. The attorney indicated that the attacks were triggered by personal interests linked to the competition over a truck between local people and Gypsies, called kipti, who had been settled in Muradiye neighborhood about fifty years earlier. The first attack was against the muhacir Gypsies and resulted in damaging thirty-eight houses on January 18, 1970. The last incidence happened on February 22, after the word spread that the health condition of the driver Halit Er, who had been injured by muhacir Gypsies in Canakkale because he was one of the key perpetrators, was critical. Then, according to the attorney, at least 3000 people started marching in the streets with flags in their hands and in open violation of the state authority. The people stood outside of the municipality building, which was in the entrance of the town bazaar on the main avenue that also led to the neighborhoods where the Gypsies lived. As the attorney tried to stop the crowd, a group of thirty-forty people attacked and beat him almost to death.

399 Milliyet, “Bayramic Savcisi Vilayeti Sucladi” (Bayramic attorney accused the provincial authorities) (27 February 1970), p. 4. See Narrative 58 in Appendix D.

400 The neighborhood Muradiye, which is known as the muhacir’s and Tepecik, which has been widely occupied by local Gypsies are next to one another. One just has to follow a street for a hundred meters to get the next one. Moreover, the two neighborhoods recently have been identified one in official records recently: ‘Tepecik’. However, people still refer them as different neighborhoods. It also should be noted that spatial differences are perceived differently in the town as a hundred meters can make a big difference in the eyes of townspeople.
The governor of the province of Canakkale, Cemal Tantanci, who was criticized by the attorney for not taking action at the required time and scale, on the other hand, put the blame on the Gypsies when I interviewed him. When he learned that I was from Bayramic, the first thing he said was, “yours’ made the event of Gypsies” as it was the most significant event that he remembered about the town. He shared the negative Gypsy image and repeated the story of the Gypsies’ immoral acts: “The Gypsies said that they had known every women’s panties in the town and that is what triggered the events.” He said that he himself had gone to the town and rescued the attorney when he had heard about the events. However, “the damned attorney” blamed him afterwards. He spoke about the case as a joke and even accused the Gypsies for beating the attorney.

The townspeople referred in various ways to the events. Many called it “the Gypsy incidents” and/or “Gypsy stoning.” Many other, especially those who were called Gypsies used the term “Kirim.” Some said that it was actually “Driver’s Fight” turned into a “Fight against Gypsies.” How the events were described is closely tied to the narrators’ representation of the events and differed according to the subjects’ standpoints, their knowledge and willingness to reveal that knowledge around the related actors and what they saw as the main trigger. The traces of the violence and the fear experienced by the townspeople play an important role in the narrators’ representation of the time. Their willingness to talk and fear to keep silence as well as their diverging stories are highly illuminating. Their stories, on the other hand, can be quite complex with their socio-historical references to the past and the present, and depend on their

---

401 From my interview on 27 April, 2009 in Karakoy with the governor of the province of the time who was in charge from 1967 to 1971.

402 The attacks were called kirim among the Gypsies. Although there were no killings during the attacks in the town, the term in Turkish includes killings and its English counterpart would be massacre. The Gypsy people used the term to reflect the meaning of the attacks for them as it was not only against their houses but also against their existence in the town. The term employed especially by the Gypsies of the town provides a stronger representation of their feelings and the effect of the attacks on them. The non-Gypsies of the town would prefer a neutral term ‘events’ for the attacks instead. I found this difference on terminology remarkable for their representations.
own experiences of the transformation of the town’s economy. What did this violence mean in people’s lives, in the town’s history and how was it connected to our general context?

During the attacks, the content of Gypsyness, what it means to be a Turk and a Gypsy became much more crucial than at any other time before. People were pushed to act upon these categories more than ever to delineate who was “us” and “them.” What exactly happened at that very moment, how the attacks were triggered, how they were legitimized and practiced, who acted how in what agency position, and how people remember will be dealt with in this chapter. It will unveil the actual events, the actors, how they succeeded, the discourses that were in circulation and how people made sense of what had happened and recalled the events.

I will analyze two main stories in the narratives on the attacks of 1970 in the town. They are linked both to the real events as well as to people’s perceptions, which are both meaningful. We should not treat them as separate parts, because the combination and interplay reveal the socio-historical realities. Moreover, both will help us to elaborate different aspects, perspectives and memories. The one which is called the “Drivers’ Fight” reveals the underlying reasons and individual interests that are linked to structural factors to certain extents. The one that is called the “Gypsy incident,” on the other hand, is crucial for understanding the impact of the Gypsy stigma and the motivation of the crowd.403

Only a few people in town remember the events in terms of the story of the Drivers’ Fight, in contrast to the muhacir Gypsies and most of the local Gypsies, for whom this story dominates their memory and also explains the attacks. It offers a perspective on the relation between the economic transformation and rising competition and the conflict. The attacks unveiled some people’s anxieties and ambitions, whose social status changed with the rising power and prestige of the muhacir Gypsies in the transport sector. This should be seen against the background of a more general feeling of rebellion against the old elites and power holders, and the struggle to benefit from new potential opportunities that appeared. The reformation of categories, their function and boundaries between Turkishness and Gypsyness has to be seen in this light. Not the physical but the economic mobility of the Gypsies were seen as a serious threat and violent attacks were utilized to put them in their place within the socioeconomic hierarchy of society and its “order.”

Many Gypsies represented the story as a momentous event restricted to that very moment. Although in-depth conversation and moments of excitement accentuated the discrimination against them and the racist nature of the attacks, most of the time they avoided such articulations. This avoidance along with other reasons stands for their reluctance to situate themselves in an otherized position of Gypsyness. To admit that discrimination was a structural phenomenon would not only make it harder to return to the town after the attacks, but also would complicate their current relations with non-Gypsies. For some, however, the hard feelings, the traces of their sufferings as well as the lucid and hidden sides of discrimination remain vivid.

In the story of the Gypsy incidents, the Gypsyness of certain people was emphasized, reinvented, reproduced and reminded as they started to be perceived as


404 For the usage of violence in seek of “social order”, see Bergmann.
threats because of the socioeconomic power and statuses that they had gathered. New stereotypes and prejudices were reproduced and created to replace some of the historical ones and they strengthened the Gypsy threat that mobilized people against them and to some extent legitimized the attacks. Many stories of the terrorization and victimization of non-Gypsies by the Gypsies along with the alleged immoral acts and abuses of the Gypsies were employed to support the imagination of the Gypsy threat.

The story on the “Gypsy incident” will demonstrate stereotypes and prejudices with respect to Gypsyness. The narratives will concentrate on the Gypsy threat, immorality and unreliability of the Gypsies and finally on how they misbehaved. The narratives will show the effects of historical, momentous and recent discourses on Gypsyness and Turkishness in the town. They will serve to comprehend how individual interest fights were channeled into a conflict over Gypsyness and Turkishness. This version of the story also enabled the legitimization of violent attacks by putting all the blame on the Gypsies and representing the attacks as inevitable and as a form of self-defense. Given the functionality of this story, which underlined Gypsyness, their unreliability and unfitness to Turkishness, it was the dominant one in Bayramic.

In this version, the story instead is limited to the Gypsy threat while the socioeconomic reasons and individual interests do not have a place. In their perspective, the attacks were necessary to put the Gypsies who were spoiled in their subordinate place in the social order which explains why so many chose to remember and represent the attacks as the “Gypsy incidents.” This allowed them not to feel guilty and keep an untroubled conscience while at the same time reinforcing their pure image of being Turks and fighting for it just like their ancestors’ glorious stories against “the invaders in the region.”

In the narratives, moreover, convergences, gaps and contradictions all will be present instead of clear and linear narratives. Although there are particular tendencies in
the narratives of certain groups and people (such as muhacirs, local Gypsies, attackers, protectors) and I to some extent generalize on the group level, we should not neglect the existence of diverging stories. For instance, while the attackers usually built their stories on “Gypsy incident” type, some people felt somewhat guilty and stressed the individual interests involved in the attacks. Similarly, while all muhacir Gypsies more or less accentuated the story of the “Drivers’ fight,” among local Gypsies, the story shifts from one to the other perspective, with some also blaming the muhacir Gypsies. Many times, during interviews perspectives changed. A narrative on the Gypsy threat can shift to a narrative on good relations with the Gypsies, how the Gypsies in the town indeed are very close to the non-Gypsies, their divergences from the dominant Gypsy image in the country and the unfairness of the attacks. These shifts and seemingly incoherent tales of the interviewees are influenced by their specific personal relationships, individual and group interests, communal ways of remembering and forgetting the rationalization and emotions of particular narrators, their own positions, experiences and the will to question themselves.

Beyond the narratives, silence and fear to talk have been overwhelming in our case. People kept their silence regarding certain topics and people. Their silence often marked the taboo of talking about certain issues among the townspeople. Thus, the silence and fear demonstrates together forbidden areas and appreciated discourses as we will see in the following parts.

The Silence and The Fear To Talk

“Our people do not talk. They are that kind of people. They might be involved in the incident, but would not tell. They
are scared that they would get stained [oxtun me birsey sicrar diye korkar].

Silence can give clues about how people relate to specific events, people and issues. Not only narratives but also silences are therefore important. They make clear what people chose to tell or not to tell, where they stop talking, when they hesitate to talk, what issues make them reluctant, and can tell a lot when we want to explore relations, positions, memories and representations.

In the town, people were very talkative about some issues while keeping silent about others. In exploring this particular case, the silence of townspeople proved to be crucial to understand their attitudes, reactions, emotions, past and present relations. First of all, I should note that it is not really easy to talk about “inner cases” in the town. I had an advantage to talk with the people as I am considered more or less from the town. People’s reluctance to talk with a stranger was so evident that some would not tell me anything; they would basically say that they do not remember or know until they find out my links to the town. Still, people feel that they should not talk about who was guilty among the other townspeople. Our next neighbor directly warned me by telling a story about my great-grandfather. He claimed that just before dying in his bed, he had given him the advice, “Never take your neighbors’ secrets out.” Then the neighbor continued and applied this advice to my case: “You too learn lots of secrets in this town, you should never take those secrets out of this town though.” He sounded like he was giving an ethical lesson, but actually it gave me hints about why people would not like to talk with me on certain issues, such as the details of the attacks, when they think that I am a

405 Huseyin Kiltas, an active perpetrator and driver during the attacks. See Narrative 59 in Appendix D.

stranger who moreover might challenge the prevailing power relations. The people felt reluctant primarily for the possibility of stirring trouble that might have repercussions to them. They keep silent although they often know the responsible people. They were clearly intimidated by possible consequences and did not trust the state’s law as an effective and legitimate mechanism that would protect people who were critical towards the attackers.

In a way, in the attacks, the perpetrators felt more or less imitating what they learnt from the state’s treatment of their Greek neighbors in the past.407 Besides, the attacks were embedded in state-led ideologies and categories related to Turkishness and Gypsyness, which partly explains why state organs did not really take preventive actions408 or punish the guilty persons afterwards.

Not only the general policies, discourses and stigmatization around Gypsyness by state organs and officials,409 but also the physical participation of state representatives in the attacks as perpetrators shows the difficulty in drawing the line between the state and the people. Apart from the mistreatment by policemen, many Gypsies blamed Rafet Sezgin, who was the Member of Parliament for Canakkale, and Suleyman Demirel, who was the prime minister of the time. They accused them of violating their citizenship rights and ignoring their Turkishness as representatives of the founding state. Thus, the attacks, including the beating of the attorney as the state’s ultimate representative, illustrate the heterogeneity within the state, and contradiction between different state discourses and power holders.

407 See the part on parallelization with Greeks.

408 The attorney had criticized the government of the province [valilik] of Canakkale for not taking action on time. The governor of the time, Cemal Tantanci, however, did not accept the accusations when I asked him about it. He revealed that he did not take any responsibility about the attacks or remedies and instead emphasized that these were “simple events”. When I asked about the remedies, he even found it nonsense.

409 Also see Chapter Two for the stigmatization of the Gypsies in the country.
Another reluctance of townspeople to openly criticize what happened is the fear of social ostracism. The town is after all a relatively small place - geographically and socially - so that the word on “who said what” spreads rapidly. Some people hesitated to talk to me because other townspeople would learn about what they said. Moreover, I had the confusing status for being in-between. I had only lived in the town until I was six years old and after that, my presence in the town was limited to visiting my grandparents until my grandmother passed away in 2001. Thus, I had very limited relations with the townspeople as a local. Some knew me personally while others had not ever seen me or had just met me when I was a child. This could easily push me into the position of a stranger as well. This in-between position therefore was both advantageous and disadvantageous. It helped to be accepted as one of them that made it easier for people to confide in me, and repressing the idea that they were telling the secrets of the town to a stranger. This trust, however, could last to a certain degree, as there was always the fear that I might tell other townspeople what they had said to me about the case. At this point, my limited relation as a stranger could also work positively, however. I assured people that I would not mention to any other townspeople what they had said me. Whenever they asked about other people’s representations, I did not give them any details, let alone the secrets that they had trusted me with. I did not even tell my relatives who stated what. Thus, the word spread that I was indeed trustworthy and this reputation explains why some people were willing to tell me further stories, details and secrets that they had not disclosed in our earlier conversations.

At the same time, I tried to understand how their representations shifted according to the way they viewed me. For instance, people could tell a totally different story depending on whether he or she saw me as a stranger. I would just let them tell their stories. However, when the conversation extended and I introduced my personal links to the town, they might tell another story that would include more details and other
sides of the story. In a similar way, some would tell a story that would gain other
dimensions, because they realized that I knew a lot about the case. Thus, some people
tended to hide or not to tell some parts of the story. Their silence and reluctance to talk
were usually related to their preceding and ongoing fear of the trouble that the key
figures of the attacks could potentially create.\footnote{410} This fear was rooted in the
townspeople’s experiences during the period of the attacks and afterwards. Aydin, who
was born in 1923, pointed at the leading perpetrators’ power during the attacks: “They
were the real rulers at that time. They would do whatever they liked. No one could stand
against them.”\footnote{411}

Most of the main figures had already died, but a few were still alive. Among
them, the head figure, Kadir, and his assistant, Halit, were very intimidating figures for
the townspeople. They were the ruffians of the town. Their courage to stand against
people, their willingness to use brute physical force made people reluctant to talk. Both
were former drivers. Halit is still living in the town while Kadir lives in the nearby town
of Balikesir. My attempts to talk with Halit were not successful;\footnote{412} he avoided me because
he was afraid that he might get into trouble. Kadir, on the other hand, had a long
conversation with me about his power, and his position in the town in the past and the
present.\footnote{413} For the period of the attacks, he stressed that he was so powerful that even
the gendarmes in the town backed him up on some occasions. During the attacks, he felt

\footnote{410} Gross, \textit{Neighbours}, unveiled a similar type of fear especially felt by the protectors of the Jews in
the town of Jedwabne, Poland. See his work also for a similar case in the sense of experienced violence
between neighbors in a scale of a small town. Also see van Arkel, \textit{The Drawing}, for power of terrorization
by perpetrators in such violent attacks. In the concluding part, I will demonstrate more on Gross’ and van
Arkel’s points.

\footnote{411} See Narrative 60 in Appendix D.

\footnote{412} Halit came from a poor family. He is now in his late seventies. He had started in the driving
business very early as an assistant driver on the buses between Izmir and Canakkale. In the years of the
attacks, he was Kadir’s assistant. He later worked for Kadir as a driver in his minibuses. In the town, he has
been a frightening ruffian who is known by his insane anger that led him kill someone who just did not
bring him a free ashtray.

\footnote{413} See Appendix for Kadir’s life story.
the obligation to intervene as a head of the town: “As we were like the head of Bayramic, everybody came to us [stands for himself]. ‘These Gypsy boys are abusing girls; for instance Dilaver’s sons [Fehmi’s brothers]. I said ‘do whatever you do but be careful. I am behind you; if you fall, I will support you.”’

The fear around the leading figures was reinforced by the people’s experiences of the actual violence of the attacks. The treatment of the Gypsies, the uncontrollable violence of the attackers, and the threats against the protectors and the employers of the Gypsies was very intimidating and enabled the attackers to do as they pleased. The silence of people who opposed the violence signified their impotence, fear and weakness.

The Silence, the Pain to Talk and the Perception of History

The general perception of the town’s history among the Gypsies as well as the non-Gypsies of the town does not include the attacks on the Gypsies. What they understand about history follows the line relevant to the official historiography. Thus, when I asked about the history of the town, they tried to direct me towards possible sources that would reproduce the official understanding of history such as the foundation of the town, the ruins from the old times, the Greek occupation and the history of powerful families. However, they did not consider their lives or the lives of other townspeople as parts of history. This was why most narrators asserted that they did not know anything historical or they were not equipped to inform me. However, when I asked about social events that had happened in the town, all people including both Gypsies and non-Gypsies mentioned the attacks as one of the most important events, if not the first and the only one that would come to their minds. Thus, I was also supposed

414 See Narrative 61 in Appendix D.
to persuade them that their own stories would be valuable historically, although it was not an easy task for some.

At first, they could not understand why this kind of research and asking about their own experiences had anything to do with historical events. Indeed, they did not consider what happened to them historical at all, as they conceived of history covering the far past, the old wealthy families of the town and ruins. Some Gypsies even joked about the idea of history by playing with the similarity between the sounds of the word \textit{tarih}, meaning history in Turkish, and \textit{talip}, meaning suitor. During the Hidrellez celebration, they had a good time joking around with me “Are you looking for \textit{tarih}? Let us find you a \textit{talip}.”\footnote{“Sen tarih mi arıyosun? Biz sana talip bulalım.”}

While talking about the attacks, most Gypsies in the town were very reluctant when I first arrived. They said that they did not remember that time and some even became nervous about it. Although I was trying to follow their life stories and asking general questions on the local history, the news that I was searching for \textit{kırım} spread very quickly. I suppose it was not only that I was focusing on those years, but that the subject also attracted their attention more.

Furthermore, when I asked about significant events in the town to any local (who has some local historical knowledge), the attacks would figure prominently in the town’s history. This was due not only to the fact that it was a massive event, but also because of the significance of related events although some people did not remember the connection between them. The beating of the attorney in that sense had its effect on the remembrance of the events. Some people, especially non-Gypsies, remembered it as not related to the ‘Gypsy incidents’.

On the other hand, although the Gypsies might have felt reluctant to talk about the events when asked about it directly, it could easily be part of daily conversations. For
instance, when I asked for an address to a market, a Gypsy boy in his late teens started chatting with me and when I said I was from Izmir, he mentioned that his uncles also lived there as they had gone there after *kirim*. For some others, when they trusted me, they would talk about it occasionally. However, some always felt reluctant to talk as it is illustrated in Sebiye’s narrative: “I remember, I remember everything, but I cannot tell.”

There were some who did not want to talk. They became agitated and felt like reliving that time again. They felt insulted and betrayed. From the muhacir Gypsies, Necmi poured out his feelings on why he would like to keep his silence. He revealed that he also felt guilty as he had been doing his military service and had not been able to back his family. Instead, he felt as if he had been sleeping in his safe bed while his family had been stoned and suffering. Thus, talking about that time itself made him remember his feelings of insufficiency and incapability as well as pain:

> When you touch upon that subject, you open my wound. That is why people do not like to talk about it. What difference would it make anyway? It was a massive attack. People do not even want to remember that, they do not even want to keep them in their minds. People do not like to tell their most painful moments. I would not like to tell them, as I would not like to refresh those memories. I realized it is very painful and if I tell it again then my wound were open. We lived through very intense things. I left my family and went to the military. I left my people here in those circumstances and left. While everybody was looking for new homes, I was in the army. I did not know how they survived, how they made money and stayed alive for 2 years. Since the state took me to the military, they fed me there, but I never knew what happened to my family that I left here. It is also very painful. They made *kirim*. Why would you try to murder the people that you live under the same flag with and you are buried in the same cemetery with? The perpetrators should tell me the reasons for this then I would come and talk. Those people would not even have become emotional if they had known about our situation. From 1000 people maybe only 10 would. [...] Those who attacked, tell their children as if they had won a victory. If that child sees it as a victory, I would not take him in front and talk. If you write a book on this, there would be only 15 people who would care to read it.

Another reason to be silent for him was due to his thought that it would not help

---

416 “Herseyi hatırlarım, herseyi hatırlarım da diyemem.”
anyone; they (the non-Gypsy townspeople) did not care and have no interest in trying to understand how they made them suffer. Except for a few people who did care, they would not even listen to them. He asserted that people’s silence was not only because of fear, but also due to the degree of feeling ashamed. Most Gypsies felt that they had been insulted during those attacks and they would not like to recall that time. For some, the pain of that time was so strong that they had great trouble to share it with others.

This narrative of Necmi was highly interesting also for displaying his intimate feeling about the attacks they had faced and the general attitude of the people in the country. For me, it points to the necessity of studies that touch upon similar violations of people’s lives along with inequalities both in the Turkish society and beyond. However, Necmi was rightfully pessimistic about the lack of appreciation of this kind of work. The pain and misery of some people along with violence, fear and injustice may lay under those victory stories of some other people. In the case of Necmi, it was clear that through the attacks, along with fear, and feelings of shame, a huge pain and a guilty conscience had been loaded on the shoulders of the Gypsies of this town.

Narrating the Attacks

There are three main strains of narratives that reflect the townspeople’s articulation of the attacks. These can be classified as a national narrative, a local narrative and personal experiences narrative.417 This classification should not be considered as mutually exclusive. They are surely interrelated. In many contexts, they overlap and converge. How people conceptualize their local context, how they refer to the national

---

417 Karakasidou recognized the different layers of historical narratives in her work with local people in a town in Greek Macedonia. Her account has strong parallels with my perspective on narratives in my field. Her conceptualization and articulation overlapped with my own considerations with slight differences. Thus, in this part on exploring the different strands of narratives, I combine Karakasidou’s and my own account in the field.
context by going through their personal and local experiences and how they perceive their experiences through national and local dominant narratives are pivotal. However, analytically, this differentiation will help us to understand different perspectives in narratives, shifts and contradictions along with overlapping specific discourses, especially that of nationalism and its local articulations. It is also important to realize the hierarchies between these narratives and how people perceive history through these hierarchies. It is not only understanding the past as an official and national history, but also accepting it as the only legitimate reconstruction and discourse. Karakasidou defines this history as the narrative “made up of the generic national history they [the narrators] had learned in school”\textsuperscript{418}.

When Assiriotes [the Greek townspeople in her case] spoke about history, they invoked narratives of the nation that had been taught to them from a young age in school and in church. These verbal texts followed the same canonized and homogenized traditions as periodized national history, referring to oppression under the Turks, Bulgarian efforts to seize Greek lands, struggles against communist subversives, and the like\textsuperscript{419}.

In my town, when the townspeople learned that I was interested in history, similar to Karakasidou’s experience, most spoke about the Canakkale wars by replicating the place of the town and the city in the national history. They also related to local history as a part of this nationally historicized region by inscribing it to this wider context. When I asked about the socio-economic-cultural history of the town, they directed me to the Hadimoglu family or the old ruins from Antique times. They were wrapped around the borders of the historical area as defined by dominant historiography. Their own memories are recognized as part of that history. Their personal experiences, moreover, are intertwined with dominant discourses especially the ones related to national belongingness. The images of Greeks, the constitution of Turkishness, non-

\textsuperscript{418} Karakasidou, p. 231.

\textsuperscript{419} Ibid., p. 231.
Turkishness and Gypsyness as they are employed in national history and dominant understandings thus can be traced in their personal narratives as well.

The second strain of narratives derives from local events and how they make sense of local history. As indicated above, one side of this narrative relies upon the first strand of narrative directly even in the understanding of what could be included in history (i.e. ruins, wealthy families, the war experiences, the Greek time). It was not easy to talk about socio-economic events that took place in the town as part of history. The fact that the townspeople do not consider them as related to history is a very important indicator of the effect of the national/official historiography on people’s understanding of history. Following this logic, the townspeople envisaged their town as a small settlement where significant events in socioeconomic and political terms had not happened except the glorious stories of the Canakkale War. Many townspeople imagined the town in relation to the whole region where the Canakkale Wars occurred and they were proud to be descendants of these glorious forefathers. These narratives, of course, are parallel with the national discourse on the region and its inclusion in the country’s history. There are many works on the Canakkale Wars, but not a single work on local history that would cover socio-economic and political life in the region.

This second strand, however, also includes the narratives on local events. For a stranger, listening these narratives is itself usually not easy to understand, as they are seen as domestic issues. For someone like me who has a liminal position, these stories could be shared because my access to the knowledge and me as “a child of the region” was

---


421 For the only work on the town Bayramic that provides hints on socio-economic atmosphere while its main targets are archeological sides, see Cevat Basaran, Geomisten Ganimuzu Bayramic: Taribi, Cografyasi ve Arkeolojisi (Bayramic from the past to the present: its history, geography and archeology) (Ankara: T.C. Kultur Bkanligi Milli Kutuphane Basimevi, 2002).
recognized. On this level though, the perception of normality and morality, the way of looking at the world and making sense of it are interrelated to and represented through a filter of dominant perceptions. In our particular case, dominant narratives on the guilt and immorality of the Gypsies, the solidarity among townspeople against the Gypsies and their legitimization of the attacks were inscribed into the general perception of Gypsyness, Turkishness, and other related categories such as morality and purity. Not only nationalistic accounts but the dominant discourse on the norm can be used as a reference point if not a manual by townspeople to act, live and perceive the world properly in order to avoid becoming an outcast. They thus rely on the local and nationwide discourse on Gypsyness and prejudices in their narratives on our particular case. However, the dominant understanding of neighborhood, the idea of being a morally good person, and shared local experiences of Gypsies and non-Gypsies also intersect with this discourse. Again, within this intersection, townspeople reveal shifting narratives and contradictions.

Eventually, the third strain is the one that people regard as their personal and daily experiences. Some of these narratives, of course, follow the first two strains; they coexist along with gaps and contradictions. Some openly represent conflicting stories through daily references and personal relations between people. This also is not perceived by the townspeople as part of history, just as they themselves are not part of history. Karakasidou detected similar reactions in her field:

“[…L]ocal narratives […] of mundane personal and family histories were not considered by villagers to be ‘history’ as they had been taught to understand it. Rather, such accounts were regarded as mere recollections of personal experiences that were largely irrelevant to the historical record, as defined by established (and hegemonies) national canon.”422

This is also the very area that some people would not like to disclose at all. Some clearly remain within frame of the dominant local narrative, and just use their personal

422 Karakasidou, p. 232.
experiences as supporting details for the dominant story. Others shift to their personal knowledge and experiences to mark the beginning of the real story: (i.e. “OK that was what people said but indeed this and that happened in this and that way…”). Some of these narratives represent the intimate personal space. This is the most secret part of the story that they do not want to reveal easily. Through experiences and their emotions, people may feel they are unveiling a domestic secret and may possibly betray the town’s local discourse about a particular case and communal remembrance of it in a particular way.

This type of narrative includes life stories, people’s feelings about individual cases and relations. In the former narrative for instance, one could reproduce the negative Gypsy image around the events. However, through one’s personal experiences and relations with a particular person who is a Gypsy, another story is produced that opens a space for solidarity and commonalities between them. Moreover, these narratives of the events represent interests of particular people in the town, close interactions (including some non-Gypsies’ who hid and protected Gypsies) between Gypsies and non-Gypsies, as well as feelings of pain, regret and fear. For some people, the personal experiences narrative dominated their understandings and representation, and this thus became the master narrative to them. For others, it came after the locally dominated narrative. For the rest, this narrative did not reveal anything because they did not have related personal experiences, or because those experiences were suppressed by dominant local discourse.

The two main narratives regarding the Gypsies’ forced dislocation, “The Gypsy incident” and “The Drivers’ fight,” as mentioned above, emerge through the filter of the three strains. The former one legitimizes the attacks by putting the blame on the

---

423 Of course, this is problematic as we cannot separate the dominant from the personal that easily but these narratives also present a gap and/or conflict between the experience and dominant discourse.

424 See the part on silence and fear in the town.
immorality and misbehavior of some Gypsies in the town. It is rooted in the dominant morality, Turkishness and the negative image around Gypsyness in the country and in the town. The latter, on the other hand, mainly appears through personal experiences, and gives us insights in the personal interests, economic competition and changing relations in the town parallel with the socioeconomic transformation in the country.

Most townspeople tell the first story, which is not surprising as it reproduces the prevailing power relations in the town. As explored in the part on silence and fear, the townspeople feel reluctant to talk about some parts of the story and thus some never learned about those sides. Therefore, this story appears as the dominant one and is reproduced by many townspeople, mainly Turks and even some local Gypsies. The latter story, on the other hand, finds its place as secondary in the voices of some narrators. Some people disclose it only through their personal experiences and knowledge. It appears as the primary story only among the Muhacir Gypsies, some local Gypsies, and a few Turks who overtly expressed the unfair treatment of the Gypsies in the dislocation.425

Below, I will establish how people represent the forced dislocation and the attacks through these two stories. Under the narratives on “the Gypsy incident,” I will first demonstrate how the townspeople refer to the dislocation by legitimizing the attackers and reproducing the legitimizing discourse around the events of the time.426 In this story, I will dwell on the moral sides of the explanations; the constitution of the Gypsy threat through the Gypsy stereotype; the overall violence within the attacks; nationalism and comparisons with similar local cases; and reflections on the role of the

---

425 There are also some Turkish people who express unfairness but would not know about the underlying relations that triggered the dislocation. Thus, they would refer it as “people generalized the some Gypsy people’s fault to the all.”

426 See Bergmann on exclusionary violence and its conditions: “A collective assault on an ethnic minority within a community must be legitimized and prepared culturally, since it violates the fundamental norms of communal life and--- particularly in pacified societies--- state monopoly of power.” (p. 172)
state. Second, I will include the narratives on “the Drivers’ Fight” that will disclose personal relations and experiences regarding economic competition and interests in the town as triggering factors of the dislocation.

The Gypsy Incident

The most repeated reason given for the attacks by the Turks was the immoral acts of some Gypsy boys towards Turkish girls. It was claimed the Gypsy boys had tried to seduce, or at least behave improperly towards Turkish girls who were on their way to secondary school. For many Turks, this behavior, which was perceived as an attack on the moral values of the Turkish people, showed the true nature of the Gypsies and they considered it as a legitimate reason to take revenge. The phrase that was repeated over and over again was “They got spoiled,” referring to their behavior along with gaining socioeconomic power, which would explain why they had the courage to behave ‘immorally’ towards Turkish girls. The stories, which revealed the threat that many Turkish people felt, included negative images and sayings on the Gypsies and stressed the positive results of the attacks, which would have ensured that the Gypsies would not act in the same way anymore.

The narrative of “Gypsy incident” mainly puts the blame on the Gypsies. The dominant idea is that they misbehaved and the townspeople corrected them. The emphasis on their misbehavior and immoral acts legitimized the violent attacks. Maybe not all Gypsies deserved it, but it was inevitable, in order to show the Gypsies their place in the social hierarchy of the town. The unavoidable result was that “the wet ones would

---

427 “Simardilar.”
In this narrative, the representation of the Gypsies as threats against the social order occupies a significant place.

Nationalist feelings were mobilized and exploited during the attacks. Anthems and flags were present during the attacks and the Gypsies were attacked as if they were national enemies, as threats to the existence of “us”. Instead of an interest group, the “us” here was defined in nationalistic terms. Thus, Turkishness and Gypsyness in the town were constructed as opposites. Personal relations were suppressed and the people who were called Gypsies were labeled as enemies and dangerous others. This also allowed parallels with other cases, like the Greeks and Kurds. While the Muhacir Gypsies do not refer to other incidents, but only their ancestors’ dislocation from Greece as the proof of their Turkishness and the dislocation as violating the state’s recognition of their Turkishness, the non-Gypsy townspeople see the attacks as a reaction against any potential enemy. They interpret their behavior as a way to protect their Turkishness (as well as the rights and privileges attached to it); as if they are protecting their country. Previous memories about Greek neighbors who were treated as enemies for their supposedly taking sides with the Greek army during World War I, their punishment, killing and deportation were recalled by some townspeople as a similar incident. Most, however, associated the “Gypsy Incident” with the dislocation of the Kurds in 1991.

After all, the homogenization, generalization and reproduction of the category of Gypsyness in relation to the idea and feelings of threat and positing Gypsies as a threat who attacked the morality and peaceful lives of the Turks was powerful and gained overall support, invoked nationalistic discourses and negative feelings against the Gypsies in the town. They found their base in the historically constructed stigma around Gypsyness in the town. At the moment of conflicting interests because of new opportunities and socioeconomic transformation in the country and the town, the power

---

428 "Kurunun yaninda yas da yanar." Common saying for the attacks meaning that the innocent people would get hurt if they are close to the guilty ones.
of the stigma became functional in spite of previous close relationships and
commonalities beyond the category of Gypsyness. While it had been always contestable
and negotiable to what extent they belonged to “us” before, in 1970 the Gypsies were
definitely no longer part of “us.”

The Gypsy Threat

The perception of “the other” as a threatening subject was crucial in legitimizing
the attacks. There were few aspects to highlight the Gypsy threat. Labelling Gypsies
with negative terms triggered by the misbehavior at the time was widespread. The
negative perceptions of the Gypsy neighborhoods in other places provided narrators
with arguments to reinforce their point. The evil image and the idea that the non-Gypsy
townsmen could themselves be in danger had they not attacked the Gypsies were also
very powerful motives. This representation of vulgar Gypsies strengthened the idea
that non-Gypsies were the victims and posited the attacks as inevitable to rescue the
town. In the town and surrounding places, the attacks even created a heroic perception
of the townspeople with an emphasis on their solidarity and intolerance of unevenness.

429 Bergmann pointed at the construction of a Jewish threat in his study following the power
approach. The collectivization of opposing interests and individual conflicts into ethnic antagonisms would
be essential to generate collective violence according to this approach: “A participant in exclusionary
violence operates within a friend-foe schema as a victim of an injustice, discrimination, or aggression and
reacts, under certain circumstances, with violent forms of social control.” (p. 166) In this context, changes
in the balance of power between different groups of people are critical, but it also needs to be transformed
to a threatening scenario to generate collective violence (p. 167). For the legitimization point, also see p.
172. For the demonization of Jews in the Polish town, Jedwabne, see Gross, Neighbours. For the
significance of representation as threats in Hindu-Muslim conflicts in India, see Stanley J. Tambiah, Leveling
Crowds: Ethnonationalist Conflicts and Collective Violence in South Asia (London: University of California Press,
1996). For the construction of threat against non-West immigrants in Western Europe especially in recent
decades, see Leo Lucassen, The Immigrant Threat: The Integration of Old and New Migrants in Western Europe since

430 For self-victimization of perpetrators involved in racist violence, see Larry Ray, David Smith
and Liz Wastell, ”Understanding Racial Violence,” in The Meanings of Violence, edited by Elizabeth A. Stanko
The present mayor of the town, Ilker Tortor, laid out why and how the events happened. In his narrative, the greedy and racketeer image of the Gypsies dominated. His story of the attacks followed perception of misbehaving Gypsies. He represented the Gypsies as unreliable people of the town who violated the goodwill of the townspeople:

We had the secondary school up there where you were supposed to pass through the Gypsies’, what we call vatandaslar [‘citizens’ in a reference to esmer vatandas—dark citizen that is widely used term for Gypsy people in Turkey], neighborhood. They were making passes at schoolgirls there. And they were also in the trade business, they were buying from the villagers, some stuff like walnuts, almonds etc. And selling this on the market. But they were cheating for example by claiming that what they were buying weighed less than was the case. When townspeople offered them 20 kilos they claimed it was only 15 kilos and wraught the money by force. This kind of experiences accumulated in people’s memories. They were cheating a lot and people got so angry that they threw the horse carriage of Brother Yasar from the stone bridge. Especially, the villagers did that kind of things. Whoever took any piece of wood and went to Tepecik to attack them [the Gypsies] rightfully or unrightfully. They climbed on their roofs and crushed it, threw the tiles down. 431

In this narrative, the misbehavior of the Gypsies was punished and corrected by the attacks. Solmaz, who was the former mayor of 2003, also indicated that it was not only making passes at the girls, but some Gypsy porters had started stealing from the stores and from the load that they were carrying. Moreover, they stopped non-Gypsies who wanted to pass through their neighborhoods. He further explained the Gypsy terror of the people:

Gypsy ruffians never operated on their own. Now you are alone, what can you do? You cannot cope with them and get beaten. For instance, you are flying a kite. A Gypsy would come and cut it. You would go home crying. He would come and cut it with a laser. What could you do? You cannot do anything. They were little bit stronger too as they were porters. After all, the minority would mean union. Our fathers would also be on their guard. Everybody would keep to themselves. […] To whom would you complain? 432

By criminalizing the Gypsies, Solmaz represented non-Gypsies as innocent, while the Gypsies did evil things just for fun. In this representation, the Gypsies attacked non-

431 See Narrative 63 in Appendix D.
432 See Narrative 64 in Appendix D.
Gypsies without any reason. Many non-Gypsies similarly pointed at the vulgarity of the Gypsies preceding the events. They indicated that the Gypsies were disturbing and attacking non-Gypsies and mentioned the widespread fear of the Gypsies. Solmaz explained their will to dominate:

In the meyhanes [traditional bar or restaurant serving alcoholic beverages], they would raise a stick just to raise a stick. They tried to dominate Bayramic by force. They started to bully us. He [a Gypsy] would say ‘treat me’, ‘order a bottle of wine for me’. Not only children but the elders also started. For instance, they would make a pass when you went through Muradiye neighborhood. They tried to dominate. They had chiefs.433

The president of the Chamber of Drivers, Nitki, affirmed the victimized position of the townspeople. He is also a politically active figure who is considering entering the coming elections as a candidate for the Republican People’s Party. He was among the perpetrators during the attacks. When the events started he was twenty years old and he was in the same business as the leading figures of the events, working as an assistant driver. During the attacks, he was among those who stoned the Gypsies’ houses. He explained how terrified they were by the Gypsies:

Because of the Gypsies, we were not able to pass by the streets on Wednesdays. They would go out in the streets; they were busy with their animals like packing saddles etc. While we were passing, I do not know… For instance, if you stepped on their stuff or passed closer or hit by your wind, they would immediately beat you. The people said: Enough! Moreover, then they made passes at our girls. […] You just pass by, and someone would kick you, you cannot even imagine. There were Yasars, they were powerful. When we saw them, we looked for an escape route. I was 16 or something. They hung the flag here in front of the municipality. I was happy, I mean. Instead of being upset, I got happy. Why? They hurt us. […] The attorney was also there. We went to Tepecik [He went on to describe “shocking” immoral acts of the Gypsies towards respectable women of the town…] Such things cannot be said. How can I say? The doctor’s the wife… Bad assaults…Both by words and other things…434

Solmaz even put the responsibility on the Gypsies for starting the events, which forced the non-Gypsies to defend themselves:

433 See Narrative 65 in Appendix D.

434 See Narrative 66 in Appendix D.
They started it. If somebody starts, it becomes bigger. How would it become bigger if you do not start it? The others [Gypsies] also started to like it [dominating]. Would not domination be a good thing, dear! They [the others] started to join him [refers to the muhacir Gypsy Dilaver who was referred to as the chief and who had a truck partnership with the leading perpetrator.]435 There are incorrect people among clarinet players; musicians who turned out demagogues and who wanted to dominate us. And then the moment came that some people in Bayramic were unable to go out in to the streets. That is why I asked you whether they [the Gypsies] told you that ‘we did’, ‘we had a fault’.436

In this narrative, Solmaz portrayed the non-Gypsies as victims of Gypsies who wanted to dominate them. In this articulation, the events were rebellion against brutal Gypsies. Moreover, the story of domination reveals the feelings of the Turks about losing power in the town. This story overlapped with the struggle for the redefinition of power in the town, which in the eyes of many was at stake. As the hierarchies between Turks and Gypsies were strong, whether the Gypsies attempted to dominate or not, even some Gypsies who neglected the hierarchies might be seen as violating the norms. The Gypsy threat was furthermore constructed in an unrealistic and extreme way. Some people mentioned the rumors that the Gypsies were taking over the town.437 A neighbor, Meliha, represented a similar narrative, which illustrates the overwhelming feelings that Gypsy constituted a real threat to the town:

The Gypsies made people hate them. They were very numerous. They would almost take over Bayramic. They were going to take over Bayramic! They attacked them and people got rid off [them]. Now they would not do anything like this. I mean they would not raise their voice. It was good from on one side. It has been very good; children could not go to school through the Gypsy neighborhood. Would people let their children have passes made at them, my girl?438

In further explanation, the recent mayor also revealed the feeling of relief and stressed the positive outcomes of the attacks when he was comparing the town’s Gypsies

435 In drivers’ fight story, the relation of this family will be explained in more detail in compatible with the storyline.

436 See Narrative 67 in Appendix D.

437 Rumors are very powerful generators in similar violent events. Also see Tambiah, p. 53; Bergmann, p. 173; Gross, Neighbours, pp. 122-5.

438 See Narrative 68 in Appendix D.
with the ones in different towns and the city. He referred to the Gypsy neighborhood “Fevzipasa Mahallesi” in Canakkale that is known as a dangerous place with a high criminality rate. The mayor stressed the difference in the town with the effects of these previous attacks and the attitudes of townspeople towards Gypsies: “They became well-behaved”. An attacker who was a driver at the time working with Gypsy drivers, Salim, made a similar point about the positive effects of the attack and its transitive power on the Gypsies: “They [the leading attackers] did not do anything after they [Gypsies] came back, but then they all became like pussycats. They came to heel. Because the fight was very big. After all, you have a house, a living, and work here. Suddenly they make you leave; they put pressure. Is it easy to live somewhere else? […] They became better mannered.”

He made similar comparisons with the neighborhood of Canakkale. If the attacks had not happened, he asserted that the Gypsies in the town would have become like the ones in the Fevzipasa neighborhood of Canakkale who are known as troublemakers. Thus, the Gypsy threat was not limited to that time, but it is represented also as a recurrent phenomenon that has to be held in check and which sometimes urges people to intervene: “They would become like that [referring the situation in Fevzipasa], too. They would get very spoiled then. They had annoyed people little by little.”

This fear and the image of terrorizing Gypsies opened a channel for solidarity among the townspeople against “the common enemy.” The attacks then would acquire a heroic and nationalistic character that was stimulated by nationalistic symbols such as flags and anthems during the attacks. A non-Gypsy inhabitant, Ismail, in the current

---

439 See Narrative 69 in Appendix D.

440 See the part on nationalism in this chapter. Carrying flags, marching and singing anthems are excessively demonstrative in similarly framed violence. Tambiah also pointed at the significance of rituals in his analysis of conflicts among Hindu and Muslims in India: “A prominent role is played in such disturbances by processions of demonstrators, accompanied by loud music and carrying emblems, flags, statues, and placards, embellished by slogans, insults, and boasts. The timing and presentation of such parades are integrally linked to the religious and civil calendar of festivals and commemorative rites and to
Gypsy neighborhood stressed the solidarity among the townspeople against such a danger. His narrative is noteworthy also for the Gypsification of the attorney and explains his "taking sides" by portraying him as a Gypsy himself:

Our events are very important. The event happens and is conveyed to the police station. The attorney lets them go, he does not arrest them. They then misbehave every night. Petty thievery, peeping, verbal harassment, the ones dealing with trade would give less; they would cheat. The attorney would let them go. The word started spreading that "our attorney is also a Gypsy". There was gossip that the attorney was having an affair with a Gypsy. They grabbed the attorney and he took his gun out. […] In Bayramic, events get on fire very suddenly and Bayramic people support each other in social events.441

The heroic aspect attached to the attacks, on the other hand, was clear in the statement of a driver who regretted for not having been present due to his military obligation. He had worked with Gypsy colleagues and asserted that he would have attacked in front of the non-Gypsy crowd if he had been in the town. His father had informed him about the situation in which he had put all his effort: "My arm ached from throwing stones."442 This is an expression showing the excessive anger that the people felt and how they perceived the violent attacks as if these were heroic actions. The chosen words also were striking as he used the word "cleaning": "They said, 'let's clean Bayramic of the Gypsies'."443

The phrase "they became spoiled" additionally was common, especially referring to the Gypsies' immoral behavior and attitudes towards people. However, there is also a second type of narrative that is activated sometimes even by the same people. When they feel closer, go deeper into the story, question their conscience and try to display other sides of the story or when they realize that I know that part of the story, some start

other features of public culture. The processions themselves mobilize people for public support and action. Parading through streets, past civil and religious buildings and monuments, and converging and aggregating at squares and parks and maidans is a public display of social presence and the taking command of space and territory, some of which belongs to the "enemy"[…]” (p 53)

441 See Narrative 70 in Appendix D.
442 "Tas atmaktan kolum ağrıldı."
443 "Bayramic'i Cingenelerden temizleyelim dediler."
talking about the unfairness in these acts while some refer to economic interests’ impact on the events as motivating factors. Then, the narratives on the misbehavior of the Gypsies are coupled with an opposing narrative that mentions well-behaved Gypsies.

Another issue here is also that most people in the town are reluctant to accuse anyone of the events. Stressing the misbehavior of the Gypsies as an explanation for the events seemed a good way to avoid accusations of racism and discrimination. However, when I asked for personal examples, and more ironically, when I mentioned the economic interests and the violent behavior of the leading figures, most of them started to distance themselves from their previous narratives. Some looked relieved as if they had been freed from their self-imposed refusal to admit the discriminatory nature of the attacks, and started all of a sudden a new story, revealing personal interests, in which most of the townspeople stressed that nowadays the Gypsies are not a threat and some even questioned that they were in the past. Then most admit the unfair violence against the Gypsies, the possible economic benefits that some townspeople reaped of the dislocation of Gypsies and so forth. This new story is represented by the second type of narrative.

Although nobody was killed, the fear that the people felt and the extent of the violence that was experienced had made a deep impact to many people including Gypsies and non-Gypsies. The muhacir Gypsies were the ones who faced the greatest physical violence in the two waves of attacks. The second time, the local Gypsies also were targeted, while the key perpetrators also threatened the non-Gypsies who protected the Gypsies. Moreover, no one in the town was left untouched by the effects of the violence at the time.

---

444 This part will be clarified by the narratives in the part on Drivers’ Fight.
The Extent of the Violence and Fear

The violence of the events can be approached in two ways: the physical violence and symbolic violence on the people.\textsuperscript{445} There were literal physical attacks on people, stoning and damaging their houses as well as beatings. Although no one was killed, the perpetrators could easily have killed and seemed not to care what the effects of their violent behavior. The Gypsies were scared of losing their lives and therefore fled. Finally, the Gypsies indicated that they also had been told that the perpetrators would come for the Gypsy women to kidnap and rape them. Moreover, as the perpetrators put Gypsies in a bad light, they also attempted to influence the cognitive world of the townspeople accordingly through rumors, gossips, and intimidating people who employed Gypsies and by juxtaposing Gypsyness versus Turkishness.

Muhacir and Local Gypsies

Discrimination against the Gypsies in the town was widespread during the attacks. They were degraded and “otherized” to a large extent. They were not able to work or even go shopping. People who employed or protected Gypsies were also threatened, leading to what Van Arkel in his theoretical model to explain violent outbursts against minority groups labeled as ‘the terrorization to discriminate.’ Some shops did not even sell to the Gypsies while most Gypsies were too terrified to go to the center to shop for their basic needs. They hid indoors day and night and some neighbors

\textsuperscript{445} The term of symbolic violence is borrowed from Bourdieu. See Pierre Bourdieu, “Social Space and Symbolic Power,” Sociological Theory 7, no. 1 (Spring 1989), pp. 14-25. Bourdieu defines symbolic power as “a power of world making” (p 22). In this sense, the reformation of categories, certain values, perceptions and legitimate areas in the social order is up to the space of symbolic power that can be attained violently.
brought them news and foods. During the attacks, the perpetrators also terrorized people with nationalistic symbols through singing national anthems and waving the national flag. Thus, the Gypsies of the town were symbolically excluded from the national and the local society, no matter how much they had felt as a member before.

Their fear was great. They described how scared they were for their lives, their children and their honor. They remembered how they had grouped together in order to protect themselves and they described how terrified they were by the verbal aggression, gestures, metaphors, and physical violence. Sometimes this fear could only be detected through their ongoing reluctance to talk about the events and worries on possible further violence.

Additionally, some women who were pregnant at the time remembered how afraid they were to have a miscarriage, early birth or complications related to the birth. This made them remember the exact dates of the events. “Didem was pregnant, you were also pregnant (to another woman). Ayy, the woman in her pregnant situation went under the sofa.”

Or “in the second, I lost lots of blood.” In the narratives of some women, the perpetrators’ threats to their lives are linked to their fear of losing children. Sebiye was one of them who described the violence of the attacks, full of excitement and fear as if she was reliving the events:

You [to her nephew] were a baby and look the stone was here [she was showing very close place to the baby]. You were a baby and the stone, look, was here [she was so exciting and repeating the same sentence also to give the feeling of the moment]. Look, how Allah protected us with his angel. My mother went to one side; Rifkis went to the other side [of the room]. My baby was left in the middle in his swaddle. My sister-in-law said, ‘Aaa, take the baby’. My mother grabbed him. Look the baby was here and the stone was just next to him, next to my Metin. This happened during the second attack. One week or fifteen days later... I do not ever want to tell these. My nerves turn on. Look how people are, looking at you in the face and [saying] “hello, my neighbor.” Look, I am living in his house on the third floor. You see, there were neighbors among those who did not feel.


447 “İkincisinde benden bir suru kan geldi.”
these. The neighbors also got involved. [She gets furious] the neighbors in our neighborhood! [She retells the significant story for her on the betrayal of their acquaintances and their attempt to attack them]. Hikmet Aga had said to them “Do not go in, there is a bride who just gave birth inside”. “Turn off, turn off Sister Esmeray’s light, break down and get in” [they said]. They would come to us through the living room. They would break our window. That time, Uncle Ali was coming with a toy rifle. “Aaa, they will kill us here, let’s run’ let’s go away” they had been saying.

She was very excited, as she was telling how their lives were at stake. She could have lost her baby if the stone had hit him. Even while she was telling her story, Sebiye revealed her fear by repeating “Oh my God!” This narrative is important, as she remembered not only how the attackers had no respect of their lives, but also how they themselves managed to survive the event. Thus, although no one was killed, this did not mean that the attackers were just trying to scare them. Most of the Gypsies thought that their lives were in great danger. Many of them therefore hid and then fled. The crowd was armed with stones and sticks, not with guns, but it seemed like they did not really mind killing a Gypsy. A good example of this violent atmosphere is the recollection of Fazil who heard one of the attackers, the guardian Hakki, saying, “pour the gas on Tepecik and let it go, why would you waste your time with them?”

Cevza’s articulation of the extent of the violence makes it understandable that many Gypsies feared extreme violence: “It was very bad. […] They just did not put us into camps. If they had put us into the camps and humiliated us, it [the responsible one] would be the government.” She actually imagined the treatment in resemblance to the holocaust experience and asserted that the difference was the absence of the organizing power of the state. Here, the state had not organized it, but the extent of the violence that reminded her of that experience:

---

448 See Narrative 71 in Appendix D.

449 “Tepecik’ten gazi dokun yakin da geciverin ne ugrasiyonuz onlarla.”

450 “Cok fenaydi. […] Kamplara koymadilar bizi, bi o yok yani. Eger alıp da kamplara koysular negoci etseler, bunu yapmam da bukimmel olacaktı.”
They took us but we were watching from the back. I could not watch because I was so afraid. Here, the crowd was like this [hand gesture for very crowded]. Oh, how we were attacked, do you know! Oh my Allah, disaster! We suffered a lot. On the second time, we went to Canakkale then. The buses did not take us. We became desperate. The people did not even take us into their bus; there were threats. We therefore took the bus to Canakkale outside of the town.451

Like Cevza, many Gypsies recalled those times as a war. Turning off their lights during the attacks by the Gypsies was similar to what the whole town did a few years later when they feared attacks by the Greek in 1974. Thus, they all attempted to protect themselves in the way that the whole town would later do in a possibility of war. Ezgi, from the local Gypsy group, revealed her anxiety as well, although the attacks primarily targeted the muhacir Gypsies:

That night nothing much happened but the next night, they collected villagers. They collected everyone; they made them drink raki downtown. All people came here. Look at this window. They broke it. There were arguments that night in front of our door. My husband said, “it is not your business.” I said, “they do not differentiate any one. This fight is too big. They attacked both men and women, I do not know what would happen.” I said. He told me again to go to bed. The next night, there was Dark Fanise, who was a grocer. “Ezgi Ezgi!” I asked: “what happened, Fanise?” “I swear, they will not differentiate anyone. They do not mind door or window nor they are afraid of killing.” She hid by the walls. Oh my mother! My children were very little. They were all very little. Oh my mother, we were going to take our children away. Then we did not know where to hide. We were hiding our children so they would not die. Cengiz was hit on his back. You see, what we went through. There was no guilt on us.452

That their girls would be assaulted was another fear during the attacks although no one reported any sexual abuses or rape. It might have been explained by the accusation that Gypsy men had misbehaved towards non-Gypsy women. The kidnapping of Gypsy girls was a common fear, as Rana from the muhacirs stated that the rumors had come out a week after the first attack. Some referred to this possibility as the factor that made them leave the town. Although they had not thought of fleeing the town before,

451 See Narrative 72 in Appendix D.
452 See Narrative 73 in Appendix D.
the fear of an assault on their girls made this a real option. Thus, the attacks on the houses were the first action that would unveil the anger of the non-Gypsies. However, the assaults on women would damage the relationship entirely. Ezgi from the local Gypsies expressed how this influenced their decision to leave:

They were going to fuck [rape] us. They said so. Look at those damned [men]. How we suffered… My husband would not believe it. He said, “Come on, nothing will happen”. I said, ‘you always say that, damned man! Come on, I am leaving, you can stay here.” Then I packed some stuff for my children and left. He also came after me. He was locking the door. Come on, would a lock prevent them! Whatever! They messed around, they shit on the plates; they damaged our property. We did not have anything. We were running by the river, in the shape of a rope. We became a rope.454

While narrating, reliving the time of the attacks also revealed the vivid feelings and gestures of some Gypsies. The Gypsies were sensitive about talking about the events and many used the idiom of “having goose bumps” [having bumps on the skin due to experiencing strong emotions such as fear and anxiety] while talking about their experiences. Others relived those moments even through performing their experiences. With the presence of her daughter, mother and sister, Cevza described the scene with the fear on her face: “My brother Emre had a hoe in his hand [to protect themselves]. We were stuck in the corner with my mother. My poor grandma was standing in front of the door not to let them in. While I was looking from the window, I saw one of them, it was coffeehouse owner Huseyin…”455

453 For the relation between boundaries, social order, violence and gendered body, see Maria B. Olujic, “Embodiment of Terror: Gendered Violence in Peacetime and Wartime in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina,” Medical Anthropology Quarterly 12, no. 1 (1998), pp. 31-50. For how violence was gendered in the break-up of Yugoslavia, see Dubravka Zarkov, The Body of War: Media, Ethnicity and Gender in the Break-Up of Yugoslavia (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007); for the avoidance of rape at stake with the possibility of coexistence between groups, see Hayden, Robert M. “Rape and Rape Avoidance in Ethno-National Conflicts: Sexual Violence in Liminalized States,” American Anthropologist, 102, no 1 (2000), pp. 27-41. For the construction of nation in relation to gendered body, see Yuval-Davis.

454 See Narrative 74 in Appendix D.

455 See Narrative 75 in Appendix D.
She stood up and reenacted the experiences in the past. She pretended to hide from people, imitating her grandmother. At this moment, her daughter said: “Oh my Allah, my mother is telling like she is living through it again.” Cevza’s answer was noteworthy: “Of course I am reliving. I did like this [she was squatting down] ‘Oh, they are coming!’ One gets scared, my girl [to her daughter].” How they relived the attacks, excited and full of fear was dramatic. However, they were also joking about it, laughing about those things. It was both sad and funny at the same time.

Moreover, these experiences were strengthened their sense of collectivity, as people experienced similar sufferings. For some, their present miserable position and dissolved families are the outcomes of the attacks. The violence also created distrust of people especially of the non-Gypsies in the town, as a local Gypsy from Tepecik neighborhood asserted: “Goray [a term used for non-Gypsy townspeople, especially Turks] can be good to you until they get angry.”

Additionally, it made some people more sensitive as they were attacked by villagers, most of whom did not know them at all, but also by the people with whom they had had good relations up until that point. Thus, the attacks also meant betrayal for most Gypsies. Some local Gypsies, on the other hand, were offended for being mixed up with the muhacir Gypsies although they had not been involved in any previous unrest. Fazil, a local Gypsy, underlined that they did not even have a close relationship with the muhacirs. However, the people did not differentiate between the muhacirs and the Romans, but all were called Roman. He described how the perpetrators attacked and decided on the houses that they would destroy by choosing name by name, as people

456 “Ayy geliyolar. Korkuyla insan kizim.”

457 “Goray kızına kadar sana iyi olabilir.” See Brubaker on ethnic grouping after violence.

458 Corkalo et al. also pointed at feeling of betrayal between neighbors after the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
knew everybody by name: “When they went into a street, they went from house to house. ‘Whose house is this?’ ‘Fazil’s house’ ‘attack!’ ‘Whose house is this?’ ‘Ahmet’s house’ ‘Attack!’ ‘Whose house is this?’ ‘Hasan’s house.’ ‘Do not touch’.”

Furthermore, some Gypsies pointed at the prolonged effects of the violence on their social capital. Dilaver’s daughter Rana explained how the violence had ongoing effects on their lives. She stated how successful one of her sons had been at school, but he had to drop after the attacks. She could imagine her son as a noncommissioned officer like his friends, but not after the attacks. During the period of attacks, they were beaten while they were going to school. Thus, it influenced many Gypsy children’s further education; as they also had to adapt to new schools in the new destinations:

They beat the children. How could he go [to the school]? How many times my son was beaten! We could not go out at night out of fear. It was the same during the day. Our people were not going to the downtown area. Aaahh how we suffered at that time… Then the children did not go to school. […] My son’s friends are coming to see me now. They are saying ‘Osman was more hardworking than us’. They became officers. He was going to be one, too. Now, he is working in Germany instead. I do not even know what he is doing.

For being from the primary targeted family of Dilaver, Rana was among the ones who experienced the attacks in full and his family never reunified again. His father and two brothers went to Ankara; one brother went to Edremit and the rest of the family stayed in Canakkale. She recalled her pain when she was going to visit her family in Ankara. At that time, even traveling alone all that way to an unknown place was itself scary, but her heart was full of the pain of having lost her home and unified family:

We kept our silence in the dark. We were filled with fear. I went to Ankara. I was going at night as we were in Canakkale. My parents had escaped to Ankara. I went to see them. My family was in Canakkale and I did not know Ankara. My brother was going to take me from the terminal. While I was on my way, everybody was asleep on the bus. I was saying that ‘I wish that was my house’ pointing at the ones in the villages that we were passing. I was saying ‘what

459 See Narrative 76 in Appendix D.
460 See Narrative 77 in Appendix D.
happened to us!’ and I was crying. […] We were passing through towns. I was thinking that we had lost our houses, our children were going to school, we had become desperate, my father and mother had gone somewhere else and I was crying. ⁶⁶¹

They also had lost their professions and jobs in the town. The muhacir Gypsies in the service sector of the limited economy of the town such as drivers, porters, and shoe-polishers were replaced quickly. The local Gypsies’ positions as musicians were not that easy to replace due to the required talent and experience, but some non-Gypsies went into that business as well. One of them was a shepherd who improved at playing the flute and later started playing at weddings. Ezgi recalled the time that her husband, who was a clarinet player, could not go to the weddings, as the attackers did not let them work. Thus, they were outcast economically as well during those days. Several non-Gypsies affirmed stories about Gypsies who were banned from weddings. At that time, some non-Gypsies started going into that business. A non-Gypsy memory was so fresh about this phenomenon, as his wedding was in that period. He as an ordinary towns-person remembered that they had had to play a tape instead of hiring musicians. They recalled the gendarmes had not allowed the Gypsies to play either, as a caution for a possible attack. The violence first targeted the muhacir Gypsies with the local Gypsies as the secondary target. However, the effects and the fear generated by the attacks were not limited to the Gypsies.

**Ordinary Townspeople**

Many Turkish townspeople experienced the terror and the fear in several ways. Some were only the Gypsies’ neighbors, some were wealthy Turks who employed Gypsies, some were ordinary townspeople who chose not to engage in the attacks, and

⁶⁶¹ See Narrative 78 in Appendix D.
some became involved in the attacks against their own will or interests. Some were passive spectators while others were active protectors of the Gypsies. The town was terrorized in such a way that many people felt and experienced some part of it.

Many Turkish people acknowledged the fear that they had felt during the attacks. The crucial point for some was the beating of the attorney. It symbolized the uncontrollability of the violence, people’s outrage and the impotence of a state representative against the perpetrators. It also illustrated the perpetrators’ power by attacking the state representative. The town counselor (il enaumeti) of the time, Salih, was very afraid to testify against the attackers. At the time, to testify as a witness, he had demanded a passport to leave the country afterwards. He revealed his fear during our conversations. Only after he trusted me after a month, he started telling me about his role as a protector of a Gypsy, which he had kept secret in all those years. He stressed the seriousness of the case at the time and the terror that the attackers had generated:

It had been 1-2 days [of the attacks]. That night, the event got very big. Mr. Dilaver [judge in the town] told me that he would imprison me [if I do not give testimony]. I told him ‘get a passport to Russia for me. Do you want me killed?’ […] The attorney was young, dark and tall, but not everybody would have survived the beating that he took. One person started hitting and then he was passed on from one attacker to another.⁴⁶²

Some asserted that the crowd and the other state officials were angry with the attorney, as he had released Gypsies who had been involved in a fight. The attorney wanted to make an announcement from the municipality and then the disorder escalated. While Mukhtar Kemal was describing the beating of the attorney, he revealed his fear and feeling of impotence against the crowd: “They leaned a ladder against the balcony of the municipality building. We witnessed this, but it was not possible [to say] ‘don’t do

⁴⁶² See Narrative 79 in Appendix D.
that’. You could not [say], because you would be beaten, too. Once they had rebelled...\textsuperscript{465}

My uncle, Selim, also pointed at the impotence that many people felt. Although there were people who did not approve of the attacks, they could not stand against the perpetrators due to their lack of organized power:

The responsible people like state officials and teachers did not approve these attacks but we also just watched. There were people who were angry with the Gypsies, and there were tradesmen who supported them. “Well done Kadir, you did a good job.” They asserted that [the Gypsies] were spoiled, but the conscious people never approved of this. [...] They did not raise their voices; they were not organized. The perpetrators, on the other hand, organized people through their driving business foundations, coffeehouses, etc. Halit was involved in this business, but he was given orders by Kadir, later Halit also killed someone. Kadir killed his wife; he drowned his wife while beating.\textsuperscript{464}

The fear for the uncontrolled rage of the leading figures terrified many people in

the town. Aydin, who had not given any leading figures’ names during our conversation, stated his reluctance to talk at the time and also afterwards. When I asked him directly whether he had heard that Kadir had been involved as the leading figure in the attacks, he just said, “I mean even though I knew, I would not say Kadir, etc., for instance.”\textsuperscript{465}

He went on telling about his own and others’ fear and silence: “The people kept silent. The attorney was beaten and he was left like that. The Gypsies were stoned, etc. If someone testified, they [the perpetrators] would catch him.”\textsuperscript{466}

The neighbor Meliha mentioned similar fear after the attacks at the Gypsies and how the people had warned one another. When I asked her whether she was afraid, she answered: “Would we not fear my child [\textit{dadam}],\textsuperscript{467} would we not? But they did not do

\textsuperscript{463} See Narrative 80 in Appendix D.

\textsuperscript{464} See Narrative 81 in Appendix D.

\textsuperscript{465} “Yani bilsem bile Kadir falan denem mesela.”

\textsuperscript{466} See Narrative 82 in Appendix D.

\textsuperscript{467} In the local dialect, it means my child in a very close relation.
anything [to us]. They knew where the Gypsy houses were. The uncle [her husband, who went to the bakery to make bread] said ‘do not fear, lock your door and stay inside.’

Our conversation was fascinating as in the beginning she distanced herself from the events and repeated the dominant discourse in a way of gossiping. However, later on she revealed another narrative about her fear, experiences and feeling that it was forbidden to talk about the attacks in its real terms. Her fear constrained her narrative and concealed the contradictions between her personal experiences and the local dominant discourse, in spite of the inconsistent and irrelevant statements. It was not only fear of the real attackers but also fear of exclusion, fear of sympathizing with an excluded or attacked person. It was related to being part of “us;” to be the same and to be accepted even though it might include sharing guilt or keeping silent. She told how her older neighbor advised her not to talk about the attacks:

The next morning we got up. I asked ‘Sister Aysel [her older neighbor whose husband was working in the municipality—zabita], did you see what happened here? [She is imitating her whispering] “wipe your mouth”. “Do not raise your voice’ I mean ‘wipe your mouth’. She said. ‘Look they broke [kirdilar] here tonight. Then let’s not make any noise. I mean they are enraged, they would come and harm us too.’ That poor woman told me this. ‘Do not make any noise. Go into your house.’

Her narrative is remarkable as it shows how some ordinary people reacted to the attacks and kept silent out of fear. Another neighbor, Ayfer, told how afraid she was to leave the house at night during the attacks: “Would not we fear? We could not go to one another at night.” Thus, the attackers created an atmosphere of terror in the town that intimidated even the ordinary townspeople.

468 See Narrative 83 in Appendix D.
469 See Narrative 84 in Appendix D.
470 See Narrative 85 in Appendix D.
Employers and Protectors

The terror and violence also led to direct pressure and threats from the attackers towards the employers of the Gypsies and those who protected them. The perpetrators told the employers to fire the Gypsies or to face ostracization from society and be boycotted. Still, some employers resisted and protected the Gypsies while others did not dare to protest. The attempt of the attorney to stop the crowd and point out the unfairness and unlawfulness of the attacks was the best example of civil courage. Those who had the courage to voice protest were mainly the wealthy families who also employed Gypsies. These were not organized, but it remained individual cases of resistance. They all faced threats from the attackers including swearing and physical violence. Canan, whose father was from a distinguished wealthy family at the time, told how her father protected the Gypsy employees who were working in their house:

Around the date that I gave birth, we heard that the events were going to start… To expel the Gypsies from Bayramic... I was doing my routine walks. I was close to birth. We were in front of the forest [100 meters from the municipality]. There was a moan in front of the municipality. I looked back and a cloud, a dark cloud was approaching. In their hands, they had, I guess they were sticks. They had phoned my father. Nurcan [muhacir Gypsy girl who was working as their maid in their house at the time] had come to my mother’s house at the age of 14; she was always the girl of the house, I mean. Now she [referring to her current maid from the muhacir Gypsies] is with me. Then, I remember my father standing on the balcony with a rifle. Then, we went in. He had made them go back. The gendarme was always in the same place [very close to their house]. I mean, they [the gendarme] did not come. […] During these events, someone had called my father and said ‘they are coming to your house for you are protecting them, take them out!’

For Hale from the belvacis (Halva makers and sellers), whose family protected their employee Ummuhan, the fear was still vivid. Even while describing this in a café, she was whispering to me. During the attacks, she said that they could not go out to look

---

471 Her father was among the first founders of the Republican Party in the town.

472 See Narrative 86 in Appendix D.
at what was happening although they heard the noises and sounds of people running around. She asked me not to tell her name and her narrative to anybody in the town. She still had trouble talking about the leading perpetrators. She told about threat letters that they had received during the attacks:

They wrote a letter to us. Sister Ummuhan was working with us. ‘Do not let them [the Gypsies] work for you.’ […] One [Driver Halit] even came and yelled in front of our door. But do not tell him that I told you this; he insulted us. No one came out and at least made a call [to the policemen]. There were phones at that time; not many, but the ones who had, did not [make a call]. But everybody was afraid. For what if they had phoned and people had found out about it?473

The town counselor of the time (il ancumen) Salih explained that the attackers wanted to leave the Gypsies without jobs and to have them starve. As for threatening letters, he revealed that the threat was felt very easily and letters were not even necessary to inform the people: “There was no need for letters, my dear. ‘Nobody can employ a Gypsy’. If you do, they would break your windows. You cannot employ them anyway. If you do, there would not be a need of a letter. You would be beaten and if you were a tradesman, they would destroy your store.”474

Ramiz, who had been a tradesman at the time, was among those who had been the victims of violence because he employed a Gypsy driver. They had damaged his jeep: “The threats expanded to the employers of Romans. I had a jeep. I was transporting goods to villages. One night, four tires were stabbed for I was employing a Roman driver. I knew who did it, but I would not like to tell. Two of them are already dead anyway.”475 Although there were some protectors who did not fire the Gypsies, there were few. The result was a disaster for the Gypsies, as they could not find jobs in the

473 See Narrative 87 in Appendix D.

474 See Narrative 88 in Appendix D.

475 See Narrative 89 in Appendix D.
town. Even months after the attacks, the people would warn anyone not to have their shoes polished by Gypsies. “We are not letting Gypsies do any job.”

The threat to the protectors was so strong that Salih stated I was the first person he had ever told that he had hidden a Roman in his store. He had protected him from being beaten as the attackers were chasing all the Gypsies in the streets. The Turkish people were scared to oppose the violence and the Gypsies had to find protection. Salih explained the situation as follows:

The people did not give jobs to the Romans then. [He used the term Roman]. The people would harm the ones who did. They did not give [jobs]. The guys [Gypsies] were left starving. Some of their wives or husbands were Turks. Those ones were not touched a lot but most left anyway. Some of the Gypsies [he switched to the term ‘Cingen’] came back but there are some who did not.

Salih explained why he could keep these secrets both regarding the Gypsy friend that he had protected and his unwillingness to testify about the attorney’s beating: “Can you keep a secret? It was seen as a national case. If you protect something that all of Bayramic condemned… against them… [Silence asking for an understanding for the great pressure].”

Nationalism in the Attacks and Parallels with Other Cases

What the old town counselor (il ençumeni) told me meant that turning someone in during those events was regarded as an act of nationalism. Not only attacking the Gypsies but also the attorney was presented as an act of patriotism. Thus, the attacks were staged as a national event as if they were mimicking the military occupation. They

---

476 See Gross, Neighbours, pp. 129-131, for a similar fear from fellow townspeople for hiding Jews and a stigma out of it in his case.

477 See Narrative 90 in Appendix D.

478 See Narrative 91 in Appendix D.
were carrying the Turkish flag, singing national anthems and evoking national feelings of
the people as if they had faced a threat against the national unity.

The question of loyalty to the national unity had reinforced the power and
legitimacy of the attackers and the fear against them by regenerating the categories of
Gypsyness and Turkishness. They also redefined some people within the mutually
exclusive categories of Turks and Gypsies. Moreover, Gypsies were represented as
“national enemies” in this process in correlation with other groups of people and events
that exemplified similar manifestations of nationalism and violent treatments.

Both Gypsies and non-Gypsies remembered the extensive usages of nationalism
and nationalist symbols. The Gypsies still feel offended by the nationalism of the
townpeople, as if they were the enemies of the Turkish nation instead of being part of
it. Sebiye told how she felt: “March, march! [They were singing] the independence
anthem [the national anthem] in the streets. I mean [as if they were saying] ‘we have
saved Turkey’. They passed by flags. I mean as if we were *gavur* [ giaour] and they were
Turks and they took over.”

This marching and singing anthems is a widely known and an often-narrated
story. Some non-Gypsies made jokes about it since people used the flag as a symbol of
legitimacy. The story went as follows: Dark Ali was carrying the flag and leading the
crowd. When the judge came to stop them, he said, “I am holding the flag, if you have
the courage, step on the flag.” They sang anthems and swore against Gypsies. They used
nationalist symbols, anthems and sayings when they passed through the streets and
stoned the houses.

The use of nationalist symbols and discourses as well as the mobilization of
people to stand up against “others” made people imagine that they were restaging the

---

479 See Narrative 92 in Appendix D.
war against the Greeks in 1922. The connection with the Greeks has a double meaning in the town; a relatively violent history of the population exchange of the Greek citizens had also been experienced by the muhacirs’ ancestors in Greece. Non-Gypsies, however, are the ones who mostly draw parallels in their representation of the strong patriotic feelings. The narrative of the oldest woman in town illustrates the way he viewed the attacks as a natural way of treating “unfits” and “unreliable others” in society: “I am very old and there is no one older than me in this town, thus no one would know better either. I remember everything that has happened here; the butchering of the Greeks, the expulsion of the Jews, the stoning of the Gypsies, the dismissal of the Kurds.”

The attacks on the Gypsies were neither the first nor the last incident of collective violence in the town. The treatment of the Greeks has been recalled as the outstanding example of the Turkish power over “the others” in the town following the national discourse of the heroic war historiography of the region. Thus, some townspeople drew parallels with previous attacks against some other minorities who are portrayed as “the misbehaving other.” Very old people who were children at the time of

---

480 For the stories on the Greek army’s violence that are referred by the people, see Kadir Misirlioglu, Yunan Mezalimi: Turk’un Siyah Kitabi (The Greek atrocity: the black book of the Turk) (Istanbul: Sebil Yayinevi, 1997) [first edition in 1966]. For the experiences of the town under national historiography, also see Ahmet Altintas, Milli Mucadele Düneninde Canakkale: 1919-1923 (Canakkale in the time of national struggle) (Istanbul: Asil Yayinlari, 2007), pp. 89-94. On the other hand, Danacioglu in her research on the experiences of 1919-1922/23 questioned the construction of Greek neighbors as national enemy in the official historiography through oral narratives from fifty-eight different settlements of Izmir in Turkey. The exact sayings of “they were spoiled” and "the wet wood was put into the fire with the dry ones” dramatically repeated in those narratives as well. Esra Danacioglu, “Isgal, Gundelik Hayat, Kurtulus: Yunan Isgali Altinda Izmir” (The siege, daily life and salvation: Izmir under the siege of Greeks). In Kusaklar, Deneyimler, Tanikliklar: Turkiye'de Sozlu Tarih Calismalari Konferansi (Generations, experiences, witnesses: oral history works conference in Turkey), edited by Aynur Ilyasoglu and Gulay Karacan (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi, 2006), pp. 149-156.

481 The expulsion of the Jews is not a story that is even mentioned in the town. They are mentioned as having left on their own will. She might have included the Jews for the sake of power in her narrative or she might have revealed her feeling about the departure of the Jews. Although it had not been forced, the feeling and the atmosphere might mean as such for her. However, it is also very probable that she heard discriminative and violent attitudes against the Jews if not in her town in the city center. For the instances in Canakkale from the year of 1934, see Bali.

482 One of my most influential narrators, ninety-six year-old Fitnat, who passed away in 2009, summarized the social history of the town ironically in our conversation on June 03, 2008.
the Greek incidence in their memory connected the two stories. Fitnat (96) started telling the story of the Greeks when she was asked the Gypsies’ forced dislocation:

Ataturk kicked the giaour out. I know that the giaour [Greek neighbors] were here. They would not let the lights on. Everywhere it was dark. Like the Greeks [soldiers] were hanging out at nights, we were getting afraid. When the evening prayer called, we were locking our doors and put the lights out.[..] It was very cold, they said the giaour should go, they should go to their homes, their countries. Then another call came, the ones that had stayed can stay as before. I had a brother, he was a shepherd, and we had sheep. One giaour had taken his sheep. This time, the giaour will be cut. My brother went to Kutluoba piny [pine tree forest]. He told that if he had seen that giaour who took his sheep, he would also do [kill him]. Among the leftovers, some put their money in their bread, some in their water cup. They [Greek neighbors] had to go somewhere but they did not know where. They stabbed cut them in Kutluoba piny. Then over there, they found a lot of money afterwards. 483

The townspeople indicate that only three Greeks stayed in the town after the exchange. Not only the violent acts but previous close relations between some Greeks and Turks were also revealed in these stories. 484 Parallel to the Gypsy incident, the Greek story was represented, as a normal attitude against the unwanted other as the state security forces was perceived as the motivator if not the leader of the attacks against the Greek citizen fellows. While Nebahat was describing the Gypsy incidents, she revealed direct parallels by shifting to the Greek story in her narrative:

[…]. No one could make their voice heard. When you said something, immediately a fight and a quarrel would start. You know, the Gypsies have that kind of manner. They might have hurt many people, so that the people [attacked] like that. Otherwise, without a reason, nothing like that would have happened. I mean, it was a kind of genocide. Ah, you should have listened to the Greeks. If my aunt-in-law had been alive… Look, what they had done. Whose book is that called ‘Greek mezalimi’ [The Greek Atrocity]. There it tells. Moreover, Muhterem’s Ismail Bey was executed by Greek’s shooting. They said that everybody should be disarmed when Greek occupation happened. […] 485

Her narrative is highly interesting, as she gets confused about the subjects and objects of violence; who was the perpetrator and who was the victim. While she was

483 See Narrative 93 in Appendix D.

484 Some townspeople cried when they remembered the sufferings of their Greek neighbors and there were also some who tried to protect their Greek neighbors.

485 See Narrative 94 in Appendix D.
telling about the sufferings of the Turks, she shifted to the sufferings of the Gypsies, as it resembled genocide. Then she passed to the Greek army’s violence towards the Turkish townspeople during the Greek occupation of the town. Similar shifts are crucial to follow people’s confusions and contradictions.

While reproducing these stories, the townspeople usually followed the dominant narrative around the evilness of the Greeks. They told horrible events, like taking Turkish people to be killed and putting them into holes or burning them ruthlessly. Many tried to defend the attacks against the Greek neighbors like Fitnat who even equated a sheep with a human. These stories legitimized this kind of treatment as in national stories around “the evil Greeks.” When they shifted to their personal experiences though, some revealed their sad feelings for their Greek neighbors. A narrator even got drowned in tears when he was uttering his failure to protect a local Greek girl against the Turkish soldiers. The parallels that many non-Gypsy people drew with the Greek incidents, are not only explained by the fact that people remember those events, but also because it serves as a legitimization: If “the other” acts “improperly,” you have the right to use violence and kick them out of “your land.”

Some muhacir Gypsies, on the other hand, constituted a link between the attacks against them and their ancestors in Greece before the population exchange. The continuity of destiny that they shared with their ancestors was striking to them. It meant not only their similarities with what happened to their ancestors, but also the illegitimacy of the attacks, because the founding leader of the Turkish Republic had protected their ancestors and brought them into the country and accepted them as Turks. Thus, when the muhacir Gypsies referred to the population exchange, they recalled not only their grandparents’ similar destiny being pushed to leave their homeland, but it also provided a ground to construct their Turkishness as part of the population exchange brought about by the founders of the Republic. If they did not directly refer to the ancestors’ past in
Greece, they compared the attacks with the population exchange, as in Cevza’s narrative:

“They passed by two to three times, they damaged a lot. They swore. As if we lived in 
gavour’s country… If we had been in Greece, they would not have done so much 
harm.”

Here, Cevza connected two incidents in her narrative. As her ancestors had come 
from Greece due to the attacks on Turks, she recalled that story of their coming and 
settling in the town. Even though their ancestors had fled Greece and come to the town 
with the promise of protection, they faced similar attacks in Turkey almost half a century 
later. Thus, the attacks were in flagrant opposition to the promises of the Republic.

In direct parallel, she constructed more similarities between their situation and 
the fear that their ancestors shared. Amazingly, in her narrative she told not only about 
the terror they felt by the attacks of the Greeks, but also about their feelings of unsafe 
and insecurity when her ancestors came to Bayramic:

They lived in Selanik, in the city, not in a village. If they had lived in a village, 
they would have gone to a village, but they did not like it and preferred it here. 
They were given houses, but sold them and lived in one place together with the 
other muhacir Gypsies, because they were scared. So, how they experienced 
those events, we experienced the same in kirim. As if this was a gavour [Greek] 
country. We were scared that people would say something against [us], but I do 
not have any fear of anybody now.

The parallel with the Kurdish case, on the other hand, is the most common and 
the strongest representation in the Turks’ narratives on the attacks against the Gypsies in 
the town. There are several reasons for this strong connection. First of all, the attacks 
against the Kurds happened more recently, in 1991, and people’s memories of those 
attacks are more vivid. Second, in the last decades, the feeling of discontent with the 
Kurds have been very strong in the town due to the country-wide dominant propaganda 
against the Kurds, which is manipulated by the war between the Turkish state and the

486 See Narrative 95 in Appendix D.

487 See Narrative 96 in Appendix D.
Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) as well as the increased presence of the Kurdish people in the western regions looking for a better life and employment. Compatible with the discriminatory nationalist discourse on Kurdishness, the townspeople have felt threatened by and have raged against the improved socioeconomic status of the Kurdish people in the region. Thus, instead of talking about the Gypsy case, they wanted to talk about the Kurdish issue that was burning inside them. They also expected a similar attack against the Kurds in the town, which indeed happened on a small scale in the summer of 2009. In sum, many townspeople regarded the Gypsy and Kurdish “incidents” as very similar. This way of remembering, on the other hand, also reinforced their idea of being unified against threatening others through homogenizing and criminalizing others in contrast to the innocent and heroic self. Some represented the attacks as an act of justice, as the recent mayor, Ilker Tortor, pointed at in his narrative:

That [the violent events and dislocation] was enough for them [the town’s Gypsies]. Look, then there is a Kurdish incident. The Kurds terrorized our people and they do not accept this. Especially, when you come from the mountains and try to kick one out of the yard. They [the others, here especially the Kurds] exaggerate children’s fight and organize as a group. But the law does not allow [punishing the Kurds], they [state security] just take them in and then again release them, because there are gaps in the law. Because… There is discrimination. He [the Kurd] makes the discrimination. And then conflicts in society arise. Every citizen is equal; they do not accept this since they are in the minority. But then the minority starts suppressing the majority. We do not have that anymore.


489 See Narrative 97 in Appendix D.
Neighbor Ismail also connected the attacks against the Gypsies to those against the Kurds in the town. He talked more enthusiastically about the latter one as it also influenced his life more. He was afraid to become a victim himself of Kurdish anger, because he was working as a teacher in Agri where a remarkable Kurdish population was present. The policemen also warned him not to reveal his town of origin. He told people he was from Balikesir instead.

These incidents had happened like this: The Roman citizens [Roman vatandaslar] misbehaved and abused the Turkish citizens. A conflict arose between Gypsies [Çingene] and Turks. […] Another incident happened, too. Let me tell that. I was a teacher in Agri. […] Here, a Kurdish child had done something with an animal [a goat], excuse me, they had caught him here, and killed him. Then, his relatives had killed that guy’s [the goat’s owner] son in a restaurant. Here the people again became agitated. There were marches. With a Turkish flag in their hands, ‘we do not want [the Kurds]’ etc. They abused the eastern people here too.490

In the period of the Kurdish case, there were Kurdish people who came to the town to work on the dam that was under construction. After the attacks, they left and the townspeople took over their jobs. The two attacks were inextricably linked in the minds of many Turkish townspeople and seen as characteristic for the relations in the town: “I swear, this kind of things happened here; events that aroused indignation happened here. Bayramic people are little bit sensitive, I mean. Their constitution is like that. I mean, against immorality or other things, the people are very easily aroused.”491

Dark (Kara) Ahmet similarly told two incidents in parallel as well. He emphasized the bonds between the people in the town and acting on impulsion:

The Gypsies were little bit a lot here. […] Everybody was agitated here. What would you need? One of the Kurds did something and the same thing happened. We beat the Kurds, too. The police could not stop us. People went with sticks. What would happen if it had happened now? You would go, too. You would act upon that anger. […] You should realize that Bayramic is a tight community.492

490 See Narrative 98 in Appendix D.

491 See Narrative 99 in Appendix D.

492 See Narrative 100 in Appendix D. For a similar parallelization and few interviews on the attacks against Kurdish people in Bayramic, see Sengül Kilic, Biz ve Onlar: Türkiye’de Etnik Ayrımcılık (Us and them: ethnic discrimination in Turkey). (Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1992), especially p. 27.
While this parallel is significant in the non-Gypsies’ narrative, none of the Gypsies compared the two incidents. Most Gypsies did not want to generalize the characteristics of the town or townspeople, either. Their personal experience, of course, makes it unique for them. Furthermore, to be compared to Kurds is very problematic for them. Gypsies generally do not want to be considered like Kurds as they are situated opposed to the Turkish nation and as the enemy within. Moreover, while non-Gypsies articulated the two incidents as similar to one another due to their ethnic features, the accusation of immoral acts and massive dislocation as a result, Gypsies usually referred to the economic conflict that triggered the attacks. Indeed, both were socioeconomically grounded in their particular ways, but in both cases, the dominant nationalist discourses that were used for otherizing and discriminating these communities were pivotal in generating the attacks.

As the mayor clarified, a certain act would not be perceived as improper and immoral if Turks committed it. He portrayed Gypsies in stereotypical ways by focusing on their unwillingness to work and their improper behavior in the town. He openly acknowledged the fact that it had happened to them because they were Gypsies. He clarified this statement also by drawing parallels with recent developments. Today, there are university students residing in the town as some departments of the Canakkale 18 Mart University have been built there. Some people are not happy with the presence of the students since they perceive them as influencing the moral life negatively and disturbing the townspeople. The mayor mentioned how the young boys went after the university girls and harassed them. Here, it becomes ironic as not the act but the interrelation appears to be important in the minds of people. The mayor, Ilker Tortor, clearly asserted that: “There is this image of Bayramic people that they would not allow this. Now, the university students are in town. There are also boys from our community
who made a pass to them. If it had been them [the Gypsies], it would have been taken care off already.”

The mayor’s narrative is important as it clarifies how the Gypsies are perceived both by the local administrator and a townsperson as he has been living in the town since his birth in 1945. Thus, he not only explained how the dislocation could be seen in relation to the current situation, but he also had witnessed the events as an ordinary townsperson at the time. This narrative displays a high degree of hypocrisy, because he finds it normal not to act when immoral acts are committed by “their” boys against “other” girls. However, the mayor clarifies that the act would be “corrected” if it had been committed by Gypsies, and adds that they had “corrected the Gypsies” before. This reveals how he legitimized the dislocation of the Gypsies and furthermore the underlying binary between Gypsies and Turks in the town. The boundaries between the two categories are not always very rigid and the classification of people does not just rely on the boundary between Gypsyness and Turkishness, but it was at stake during the events. However, we see how it easily becomes blurred in other narratives on Gypsies especially when they are presented as “our Gypsies.”

In sum, the comparisons with other events and people homogenize the “others” as non-nationals and naturalize violent acts against them. Many non-Gypsies expressed feelings of pride and self-justification. The Gypsies, on the other hand, revealed the particularities in their experience and avoided parallels. For the townspeople, however, the parallel with the attacks against the Greeks allowed a legitimate base that once led the state itself to rescue the Turkish land and the people against “the enemies.” Additionally, the later attacks on the Kurds took its place in the town’s history as an unquestionably heroic victory against the non-national others.

---

493 See Narrative 101 in Appendix D.
494 Guler similarly pointed at the outstanding usage of commonality through locality in the interviews she gathered in the city of Canakkale. Guler, p. 171.
The Narratives on the Role of the State

The role of the state appeared mainly at two levels in the attacks on the Gypsies; on the discursive level and on the state intervention during the attacks. The discursive level can be traced in the hierarchies between Gypsyness and Turkishness that are supported by the state policies and rhetoric on national identity, different allocation of rights and resources to citizens.  

The latter, on the other hand, relies on the actions of state representatives against the attacks that I discussed in the previous part. How the state representatives took action, how the townspeople perceived their roles, whether they stood against or supported and even contributed to the attacks.

In the section on Turkishness I already argued that the constructed national identity as Sunni-Muslim Turks produced hierarchies and discriminations. Although the Gypsies in the town were citizens in the country, their rights were limited compared to their Turkish fellows. The most prominent classification of Gypsies as Kipti led a

---

495 Navaro-Yashin 2002 in her work argues on the public space in Turkey being not exempted from the impact of the state and people and state not as different entities but sharing the same domain. See her work also for the construction of public life in the country especially in the 1990s: Yael Navaro-Yashin, *Faces of the State: Secularism and Public Life in Turkey* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002).

496 The discursive and policy level were laid out in depth under Gypsyness in Turkey and the relationship between Turkishness and Gypsyness in Chapter Two. In this part, it will be only mentioned roughly to dwell more on the stresses of the narrators.

497 Another narrator also claimed about a Gypsy arranging an adoption for himself to be a commissioned officer. In the State classification of Ottoman time, the category of Gypsyness appears in the Ottoman tax enumerators after the conquest of Constantinople and the 'Gypsy sancak' in the 1520s in Rumeli (See Marushiakova and Popov). Karpat, *Ottoman Population*, indicated that the first modern population census in the empire was conducted in 1828/1829 where they also categorized the population according to collect taxes. In the censuses, the population was referred to as Muslim, Christian, Armenian, Jewish and Gypsy (Kipti). Karpat pointed at the separate recording of Gypsies although other Muslims would not be registered with different terms such as ethnic names (p. 20). The first initiation of Ottoman identity cards (*tezkere-i Osmaniyye*) was issued and distributed as twenty million in 1866 [p 24]. However, the establishment of General Population Administration [*Nüfus-u Umumi Idaresi*] was in 1881/1882 (p. 29) to register the population. In the last Ottoman census in 1905/1906, each registered individual was decided to have a *tezkere* (p. 35). For detailed information, see Karpat, *Ottoman Population*. Through our academic collaboration, the historian specialized on Gypsies in Turkey Adrian Marsh asserted that the practice of having the sign of K for Kipti has ended in the 1950s while some older Gypsy people have told him their
different categorization by the state, at least in the eyes of the townspeople. It was a classification from the Ottoman era, but it was still in circulation in the 1960s. Moreover, Gypsies were excluded from state jobs until the 1960s, as being a state official was restricted to people of Turkish ethnic origin. The change in the Law, which stipulated that all Turkish citizens instead of only ethnic Turks were full citizens, was realized in 1965. This change also may have effected the relative socioeconomic positions of the Turks in reality or in perception. However, the preceding situation constituted by the state discourse and policies around Gypsyness as such was influential in legitimizing the discrimination and the attacks.

Solmaz makes a direct connection between the state discrimination and its counterpart in the society: “The state was discriminating against the Gypsies at that time anyway.” Thus, if the state does it, every other citizen could feel it legitimate to follow this example. Even if it did not openly constitute harsh discrimination, the hierarchies created, reinforced and shaped the relations with the Gypsies. Solmaz explained the discrimination of the state at that time:

They [Gypsies] could not be commissioned officer. For instance, when I was in military school, one was admitted by mistake. He was a Gypsy from Edirne. They found [out about] the kid. He was my class-mate. He was in the second grade. His name was Oguz. They kicked him out in 1959 or 1960. Then he became a teacher. They would make them teacher, but not commissioned officer. Now they are.

cards remained with the 'K' until the 1970's. Researcher Ali Mezarcioglu also affirmed the information with two oral narratives.

498 For different ways of discrimination and state’s role, also see the recent ERRC report.
499 See Chapter Two. Soner, p. 298.
500 Republic of Turkey, Civil Servant Law, no. 657, Article 48 (1965). Also see Aktar.
501 “O zaman zaten devlet disliyordu Cingeneleri.”
502 See Narrative 102 in Appendix D.
When I asked him whether he knew about the discriminatory legislation, his
narrative displayed how people read state politics and get the message: “I do not know if
there was a law. I only know that they took that kid from there. I knew that a Gypsy kid
could not be a commissioned officer.”503

We do not only learn from the procedure or laws, but also from the practice.
How the state organs treated a Gypsy was more important than what the law prescribed.
Many townspeople referred to the guiding role of the state in the discriminatory
treatment of Gypsies. They referred to the state as the first actor in determining the
nature and the origin of this discrimination as Nebahat asserted: “After all, kipti was
written in their identity cards.”504 Fitnat furthermore complained about the Gypsies’
tricky ways of getting state jobs in the past: “If you are a Gypsy you should do a Gypsy
profession. Their father was a blacksmith, grandfather was a blacksmith. The boy
changed his identity card and became a state commissioner. That was not right.”505

Although the Gypsies referred to overall discrimination to some degree especially
by emphasizing forbidden intermarriages between Gypsies and non-Gypsies, they did
not mention the state’s general discriminatory policies and constructions at all. They felt
reluctant to say anything against the state or to look critically at the content of
citizenship. Instead, they took it for granted and tried to legitimize their own place in it in
several ways such as emphasizing their Turkishness, their legitimate ground to be in the
town and negating the prejudices for their individual status. That is understandable in the
Turkish context in which criticizing the state discourse and questioning Turkishness
could be criminalized easily and is mostly treated as a taboo.

503 See Narrative 103 in Appendix D.
504 See Narrative 104 in Appendix D.
505 See Narrative 105 in Appendix D.
However, with regard to the actual performance of state representatives, the Gypsies were not silent at all. Except for the attorney, the state representatives had remained passive and not stopped the perpetrators, while some policemen were even accused of joining in the attacks themselves. The attorney’s punishment, on the other hand, was blatant.\footnote{Also see the narratives of the attorney and the governor of the province in the beginning of this chapter.} At this phase, the Gypsies mainly described the misbehavior of the policemen and local state representatives along with the role of the prime minister of the time.

The impotency of state officials in the town was emphasized. The story of the attorney’s beating, which happened during the second attack, illustrates the defiance of state authority by the perpetrators. Although this story is overrepresented by the non-Gypsies, the Gypsies do not mention it. It may be because they did not know about it very much as some had already fled or some other were in preparing to leave. Another reason for this lack of representation could be that their memories worked selectively and their own feelings of the time preoccupied them.

For the impotency of the state official and their cooperation with the perpetrators, on the other hand, Bidon Hilmi said: “The mayor or the policemen here did not do anything to prevent [the attacks]. They both did [contributed] and got afraid of what they did themselves.”\footnote{See Narrative 106 in Appendix D.} He also asserted that the police chief helped him when he was running away from the people who had knives in their hands. The crowd became a mob and the state was unable to stop them. When he went into the police station, the police had protected him but they did not take any action against the perpetrators. He described the perpetrators as having been more powerful than the police and the state authorities. His wife Melike affirmed the policemen’s mistreatment of the Gypsies as
their few elders who had stayed in the town had been taken to the police station to be beaten. She also stated that the police did not do anything as “they [the perpetrators] were like a pack of dogs.” “Nobody cared.”

One of the perpetrators, Huseyin Kiltas realized the power of nation-state symbols over the power of individual state representatives:

Ali was holding the flag and then there was Hilmi, the head of the gendarmes. He came with soldiers, but how could soldiers prevent the attacks? He [Ali] made Hilmi stand still by [saying] ‘respect the Turkish flag’. He had the flag hoisted and the other one [Hilmi] saluted it, I swear… it was so crowded that the people could not fit into the center.

Rana, as the oldest daughter of the Kocayar family, stressed the cooperation of the state officials with the perpetrators: “The [Gypsy] youngsters were beaten a lot. They would not be scared, but what could they do! They did not say anything. The policemen, the head officer of the district, acted as one; they all acted as one.”

The leading perpetrator, Kadir described how gendarmes and security forces backed them up. He was drinking in the *meyhane* (bar-like restaurant) together with the head of the police when the people left to attack the Gypsy houses. He said that all state officials had supported them. The local ones gave consent to everything and the ones who came from the outside were reluctant to stop them. He stated that the government at the time also encouraged them, as they did not do anything against it, and some even overtly supported it. Rana also indicated how the head of the policemen had acted when the attacks first started:

We could not understand why it happened. I swear, we could not… One night, we were sleeping, “sangir!”[sound of glass breaking]. My husband went out. Stones were thrown at our children. [My husband said] ‘Who is doing this? Are

---

508 See Narrative 107 in Appendix D.
509 See Narrative 108 in Appendix D.
510 Bergmann pointed on the belief of perpetrators in collaborating with the state. They would feel that they would not get punished if they had attacked the Jews in Bismarck. He also noted active participation of police in the attacks in Heidelberg in 1819 (p. 168), and soldiers support in the Hep Hep riots of 1819 in Wurzburg (p. 170).
we in gavurs’ hands? Butcher Yakup went outside. He [also] asked ‘who is doing this?’ The chief of police lived nearby. He came and saw us, the stones, and the broken glass. He said ‘it was good that the stones did not hit the children’. We were trying to protect the children from the glass. My husband covered the windows with wood. They were breaking it at night. They beat my father a lot, also the chief of police. They almost killed him. When he returned coming from the downtown area, they took him to police station and beat him almost to death. My father became paralyzed by sadness. After that, my parents stayed in Canakkale.\textsuperscript{511}

She also claimed that when they returned to the town, the chief of police asked money from them to have their house painted. Although they painted their house themselves, the policemen charged a large sum of money to allow that. She also stressed being criminalized and mistreated by the local policemen. Cevza’s mother, Kismet, likewise revealed that the state did not take any responsibility for the damage. Their houses were not repaired nor did they receive any compensation. They were all left with the ruins of their houses. When I asked whether they had reported any complaints, her answer was ironic: “We did not report a complaint, where would we complain?”\textsuperscript{512}

They felt helpless, as they could not differentiate the state authorities from the perpetrators. The attorney was the only protector among state authorities who stood up against the perpetrators and he was punished himself by the beatings of the crowd. Thus, the state officials were not seen as protectors at all, whereas some were seen as perpetrators themselves. Although the Gypsies mentioned abuse by the policemen and their cooperation with the perpetrators, they were not the main targets of their critique. They thought, given the small number of policemen in the town, it would not have been possible to stop the people even if they had tried. However, they blamed the prime minister of the time, Demirel: “Not from the province but from Ankara, the thing exploded.”\textsuperscript{513}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{511}] See Narrative 109 in Appendix D.
\item[\textsuperscript{512}] See Narrative 110 in Appendix D.
\item[\textsuperscript{513}] See Narrative 111 in Appendix D.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
They asserted that a townperson, Riza, who was a member of the Justice Party,\textsuperscript{514} made a call to Ankara to Rafet Sezgin, who was the Member of Parliament from Canakkale at the time. The story that was repeated over and over again was that the state representatives in Ankara had given the permission to the perpetrators. According to some Gysies’ narratives, they had authorized them to take care of the Gypsies: “Do whatever you want except killing.”\textsuperscript{515} Others asserted that state representatives from Ankara had warned the townspeople not to be very harsh on the Gypsies, with no result.

The Gypsies emphasized that the state did not take any responsibility for the attacks and it had not really done anything. They referred to Demirel frequently and held him responsible. While some thought that he had even supported the events, others indicated that he did not do anything to prevent it. “Demirel gave the order.” Sebiye from the muhacirs revealed her anger at Demirel: “Demirel had them do it. Let Allah make him suffer. Animal! He had it done. What an animal he is. […] Would you like that this would go out to the surface and Demirel would be ashamed?”\textsuperscript{516}

Cevza stated on Demirel’s role:

The parliament above us did not care. It was Demirel that time. There was Demirel; he did not care. Indeed, he could have sent soldiers here. There were soldiers in Ezine. That time, they said that. […] Our children appeared in the newspaper [at that time]. Did not Demirel see those papers? But why did Demirel’s parliament not take charge of it?\textsuperscript{517}

Cevza explained why not, through their political affiliations:

My girl, I was 16. We were living in Bayramic. Everything was beautiful for us. What is more, there were lots of interest in the elections here. We were on the Republican side.\textsuperscript{518} The people who committed these [attacks] were mixed then.

---

\textsuperscript{514} The Justice Party was in power between 1965 and 1971.

\textsuperscript{515} See Narrative 112 in Appendix D.

\textsuperscript{516} See Narrative 113 in Appendix D.

\textsuperscript{517} See Narrative 114 in Appendix D.

\textsuperscript{518} Although some people said that the Gypsies would take their side along with their interests and they would hang the flag of every party and mimic with them, most acknowledged that they mostly
They were from the Republican Party and the Justice Party from that time, but then they became one and portrayed us badly to the prime minister. The prime minister of those times was Demirel. They even said that Demirel had broken [us]. I mean the houses. If he had done it, let him take our sins. Lots of things happened. Oh, how much we suffered!519

Demirel’s involvement in the attacks was especially mentioned by the muhacir Gypsies in their self-constructions as the descendants of people who had been brought to the country by the Republican People’s Party (RPP) during the population exchange. As their ancestors had been protected by the RPP, it was interpreted as symbolic that the attacks happened when their political opponents were in power. Moreover, they do not think that the Turkish state was intrinsically anti-Gypsy, but the party and the people that happened to be in power. In general, however, they stressed the underlying reasons, highlighting the particularities of the time and the roles of individual economic interests. Their stories lead us a totally different insight of the events that would be called the “Drivers’ Fight” in the next part.

The Non-Gypsies did not talk about the permission from Ankara while some believed that the people could not have acted in the same way if they had not been supported by the state. The attorney, on the other hand, blamed the government of the province (valilik) of Canakkale for not having taken action in time.520 The governor at the time, Cemal Tantanci, however, did not accept the accusations when I asked him about it. He revealed that he had not taken any responsibility for the attacks or remedies while indicating them as “simple events.” When I asked about the remedies, he dismissed my question as irrelevant. Moreover, he got irritated by further questions about the attacks and at last, when I asked about Rafet Sezgin’s connection, he just said: “He was a man who loved his country.”

519 See Narrative 115 in Appendix D.

520 Milliyet, 27 February 1970.
Drivers’ Fight

They portrayed us very badly. “They are thieves and alike, they look at our girls, wives,” they had said. Indeed, no one, not any of our young men… but the truck… it broke down the atmosphere.”

“They made kırım over the truck, my beautiful girl. Over the truck, they said “you” and “me”. Then they did not differentiate any of us, my lovely child.”

For most townspeople, my interest in the events was discomforting. Indeed, any interest in the Gypsies made the townspeople uneasy, including most members of my family. This illustrates how studies on Gypsies are perceived in Turkey. Dealing with the inequality that is faced through Gypsyness or other marginal positions is not usually considered a worthy topic. Moreover, our case reveals not only the construction of Gypsyness in the town, but also how it functioned in relation to power relations in the town, the socio-economic and political context of the time and the mobilization of nationalist feelings for personal interests. The targeted people in the attacks happened to be labelled as Gypsies when their power increased in the town’s economy. Some Gypsies were not attacked although they would have fitted in the stereotypical images more than the ones who were accused. Here, they mainly attacked immigrant Gypsies-muhacirs and as many people used the idiom “the wet wood goes into fire with the dry wood”.

Ahmet, a lawyer whose father-in-law had protected their Gypsy servants during the attacks, revealed his own perspective on the events: “When they [the Gypsies] started

521 See Narrative 116 in Appendix D.
522 See Narrative 117 in Appendix D.
523 See Narrative 118 in Appendix D.
asking for a share in the economy, there caused unrest. It was also that they could not integrate, I mean, they are a minority.\textsuperscript{524} The economic interests, new opportunities and rising competition highlight the underlying dynamics and motivations of the leading perpetrators. The narratives on these interests do not find their place in the collective remembering of the events. Instead, the previous narratives as “Gypsy incidents” gained widespread circulation by the Non-Gypsy townspeople and few local Gypsies. Solmaz’s description of the economic background and shifts into ethnic framing are illustrative:

This bread fight started among the drivers. The chiefs were drivers, I mean. An event would need chiefs to be realized.\textsuperscript{525} [...] “Driving! They [Gypsies] started beating the drivers. It went on from there. In essence, it was drivers’ war [with stress]. The drivers’ war turned into Gypsy war [war against the Gypsies]. At that time, the drivers were united. Who could look at the Bayramic drivers disdainfully! If one beats one of the drivers, they would get together and would go to beat the guy. The Gypsies wanted to take over the business. This time, the people of Bayramic stood behind the drivers. Since they were the majority, the majority won out.\textsuperscript{526}

He told the story as if the Gypsy drivers had sought to dominate the driving and transportation sector and the fights had started for that reason. But the fights had not been limited to the drivers. The struggle turned into “white” versus “black,” Turk versus Gypsy. The usage of minority and majority is interesting in his narrative. This gives us clues about the perception of being a majority, the significance of the economic interests, power and resource allocation in so called ‘ethnic cases’.

\textsuperscript{524} See Narrative 119 in Appendix D.

\textsuperscript{525} He posited the story into a nationalist atmosphere by paralleling it to the founder of the republic and his fight as if the fight against the Gypsies was similar to the fight of the national founder against his enemies: “Look, if Kemal Pasa did not exist, would Turkey have been rescued? Mustafa Kemal Pasa rescued Turkey but he had many arm mates [silab arkadasi] and it became thousand of people. They [the leading perpetrators against the Gypsies] were like this. There was an event in the middle and the event had a core. They [drivers] were the cores. We did not do anything. I would even tell you one thing. We had a grocery. A Gypsy from Bayramic had run away to Canakkale. He would come to Bayramic to sell fish. From here, someone, a butcher, hit his scales. His scales fell down and the Gypsy started crying. My father had seen it and gave him his substitute scales. ‘Come, hit on this too and let me see you’ he said [to the man who had hit the Gypsy’s scale]. Then, nobody could hit because someone from our Bayramic backed him. The events happen like this.” [See Narrative 120 in Appendix D.] This narrative reveals his confusion as well. While he was representing Gypsies as if they were enemies following dominant discourse, he started telling his father’s position in helping a Gypsy as if the perpetrators were unfair. All over his narrative, he can easily shift from one side to the other.

\textsuperscript{526} See Narrative 121 in Appendix D.
When he referred to the Turks, he used the term “whites.” “The whites would not work as porters, it was done by the Gypsies. The Gypsies would not let them in and the whites viewed portering as a derogatory position”. However, at the time of the attacks, there was also a demand for porters as it was considered the easiest profession. The newcomers from the villages wanted to be porters as this did not require any qualifications except physical power. However, in the eyes of the poor villagers Gypsies monopolized the labour market and refused to let them have a share. Solmaz used a similar explanation:

Poor people coming from the villages hoped to become porters, as it was the easiest profession at that time. They [Gypsies] did not take them among themselves, they did not let them do portering; they beat.  

The ex-driver and one of the attackers Huseyin Kiltas revealed the individual interests in the attacks and how the story of the boys making passes at the girls was used to veil these motives:

What stayed in my mind most is the immediate cause. The cover was that the secondary school students were passing through that neighborhood… And these [Gypsies] were a little bit spoiled. It started out as ‘making a pass at the students’ incidents, but interests of some people in the driving business also mattered as far as I know. We were passing by and joined the crowd. A man had put wood [to use as sticks] in front of his door; everyone took one, with no exceptions. It was very crowded. The people then started throwing tiles from the top of houses. There were no tiles left on the top of Dilaver’s house. They went on the roof, I mean, they were going to weigh it down.  

What contributed to this rage? What had changed in the business that the Gypsies had started to be perceived as threats? Why did people start feeling threatened by the Gypsies? How were the power relationships shaped in the driving sector? In order to answer these questions we have to understand what being a driver meant against the background of the changes in the sector at the time of the attacks. The answers will reveal the issues of socioeconomic interest underlying the attacks.

527 See Narrative 122 in Appendix D.

528 See Narrative 123 in Appendix D.
Being a Driver and the Gypsy Drivers in the Town

The intensification of the relations with the big cities was an important factor that led to the attacks. The growing transportation sector changed relations between people, who were experiencing new economic relations as well as social transformations. In this environment, the transportation sector appeared as a competitive and profitable one as analyzed in Chapter Three. How did Gypsies carve out their position and what was their role in this transformation?

When the muhacir Gypsies arrived in the town in the early 1920s, they were not given any land. Unlike the local Gypsies, on the other hand, they did not have professions that were considered as traditional Gypsy-like, such as musicians and blacksmiths. Most of them had been shoe-polishers, porters, and petty workers. These jobs were even associated as Gypsy professions after a while as the other townspeople mostly worked in the agricultural sector. Some Gypsies also became petty merchants (zarîreci) who bought goods from the villagers and sold them in the town or the city. Others had started as truck drivers starting in the late 1950s.

Before the large-scale highways were built only a few drivers were active. The relation between urban and rural areas did not require regular mobility before the rapid urbanization period. This urbanization increased the number of highways and vehicles, as well as drivers to carry goods and people. In the town, the late 1950s and the early 1960s are still remembered as a period with few cars as already demonstrated in the third chapter. Cars first were owned by a very few state officials, like town’s governor (kaymakam), doctors and wealthy people in trade.

The mobility of the people was low. They were used to bring limited numbers of goods and only few people from the villages to the town mostly in urgent situations such
as birth, accidents or illness. Jeeps were popular for carrying people and some goods between villages, town and the city center. There were only five jeeps in the town in the late 1950s. People generally used donkeys and horses for transportation.

Among the goods exported from the town, timber was the main product. In those years, the people would take wood from the forest by using trucks as well, but there were only four to five trucks and they were very old. Kadir, who was the leader of the attacks, had started his business in the late 1950s after he sold his jeep and bought an open truck in 1959-1960 in a partnership. At that time, there were eight trucks in the town. In the 1960s, the roads in the mountain were very narrow and dangerous to drive. At the time, it was considered a job for crazy people. The job also required long and hard days on the road away from home when they would go outside of the town to transport the timber.

The reason why Gypsies became involved in driving and how they came to occupy an important place in the market was linked to these difficulties. The wood in the nearby mountain of Kaz was important to the town’s economy, as it relied mainly on agriculture. In the Ottoman times, a group of people called ‘Tahtacilar’ (Woodsmen) had been brought from the Toros Mountains to collect the wood in the mountain. They had cut the wood and made it ready for transportation. In the old times, the river was used for transportation. They used bulls to drag the trees to the river, placing the trees into the river and let them go all the way down to the town. Including my great-grandfather, some people were into the business with their bulls. Even after trucking, the bulls were still used to take the wood from places where a truck could not go.

---

529 Kadir remembered using his first jeep to carry doctors and judges for their jobs. Also, see Kadir’s life story in Appendix B.

530 Also see Peter Alford Andrews, Ethnic Groups in the Republic of Turkey (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1989), pp. 68-71.
The muhacir Gypsies entered the business when trucking started in the late 1950s. When I asked people about how the Gypsies became powerful in a prestigious profession, the answer was not surprising. They were just doing the dirty job at that time; as it was very tiring and dangerous due to lack of proper roads to the mountain. They explained that one was supposed to be a little mad to be a driver as the risks were considerable.

An old non-Gypsy driver of the 1960s, Tayfun, acknowledged the hardship of the job and how it has changed over time:

That time, driving was said to be a Gypsy art. Where you are in the evening, there you would wake up in the morning. Now, driving is not like that. We had a place on the way to Izmir, Kabakum, We were seeking to find a hasir [very rough matras] to sleep on and not come back home, the work was like that. Those times were hard. Now, is there any tough work? The vehicles are better. The roads are better. Now, the guy loads his truck, he sleeps, gets up in the morning and goes to Izmir in five to six hours.⁵³¹

Along with the changes in the country, the situation also changed in the town. In the 1960s rapid urbanization began. People also started to experience changes in their economic and social lives. Some would go to the city to work, others would learn about new products that came from the city in the town’s market. Thus, people became more mobile between the rural and urban areas. By the end of 1960s, the villagers already had started to come to the town to work there.

In 1964, a drivers’ association was founded in the town. The first drivers mostly had been born between 1929 and 1931. In 1964, there were thirty-nine registered drivers (seven of them were truck owners). The number of drivers increased every year.⁵³² Ramazan, who came into the town in 1967 from his village and started driving, as an

⁵³¹ See Narrative 124 in Appendix D.

⁵³² The data are taken from the registration book of the Drivers’ Association in Bayramic. In 1965, eleven new members came. In 1966, thirteen; in 1967, seventeen; in 1968, twenty; in 1969, eighteen; in 1970 seventeen; in 1971 fourteen; in 1972 twenty-eight; in 1973, twenty-nine; in 1974, thirty-two new members joined to the association. In 2010, the number of active members was 271 (263 indicated by Bayramic office) and passive (the number of drivers since the foundation but some are not active anymore) were 766.
assistant witnessed the heydays of the sector. He explained that getting a license was not easy; he had learned driving in the army as well as some others, but got his own in three years from Canakkale. He affirmed that driving was a profession with a high status at the time; even better than being a state official.

Drivers are recalled as respected and feared men in the local society. Mainstream countrywide newspapers from the time of 1969-1970 also represented drivers as brave and respectful people. It is also indicated that it was not easy to find a good driver; experienced drivers therefore had a very strong bargaining position, including a high social status. They were said to be more prestigious even than their bosses. They were treated as kings in the coffeehouses. When they came in, people would stand up and greet them. They made good money. This reflected on their consumption trends. They would smoke first class cigarettes while even their employers smoked a lesser quality. The high status of drivers was a big attraction to newcomers. At the same time, in Turkey the service sector was improving and the previous elite was losing its power. Land no longer held the same power and prestige anymore. Thus the increasing power of the drivers was also one of the signifiers of this transformation in power and status allocation.

To become a driver, one first had to become an assistant and then learn the profession. Such assistants would serve their drivers all the time. The drivers would eat while the assistants waited for them outside by the truck. In case of a technical problem in the vehicle, the assistants would take care of it while the driver rested. The president of Drivers’ Association Nitki, who was an assistant at the time of the attacks, described the relations between drivers and assistants, and the power of drivers: “We could not come close to them and drink tea together. The boss would buy them a separate bag, if their cheese was in a bag, ours would be in paper. Back then drivers were kings, because

^533 I.e. the advertisement serials in Cumhuriyet in 1969-1970.
drivers and cars were scarce. With a driving license, you had a better status than the boss.\textsuperscript{534}

However, the reputation of the drivers was not always positive and some people in the town referred to them as ruffians whose morals were dubious. Some recalled them as spending most of their time in the meyhanes and disrespecting the social values in the town. The old secretary of the Drivers’ Association, Erman summarized the life styles of the drivers as going on the road, and drinking in the meyhanes. The main figure of the attacks, Kadir, for instance was referred to as the strongest among them. However, he was recalled as someone who used his power to steal his servant’s young wife and kill her later. Many people vilified him for his brutality and immorality.

The muhacir Gypsies were very good and desirable drivers which increasingly made many people jealous. In the 1960s, the large family of Dilaver Kocayar among the muhacirs Gypsies had become a relatively wealthy and respected one through the almond and dry goods trade. The family had five sons, three daughters and they were related in one way or another to the rest of the muhacir community. The estimated number of muhacir people in the town was almost five hundred at the time. Three sons of the family were engaged in the driving business. From the community, there were also good drivers like Bidon Hilmi, who was among the first drivers to acquire a license in 1958.

So by 1970, being a driver was a very attractive position, especially for people who came from the villages and wished to establish a new life for themselves with better living conditions. In addition to this, new opportunities were increasing in the sector and the available drivers and truck owners in the town, who dominated the sector, made good money. It was at this time that the muhacir Gypsies started to be perceived as more unpleasant and disturbing. Then, the rumor that the Gypsies were harassing Turkish

\textsuperscript{534} See Narrative 125 in Appendix D.
schoolgirls started in the late 1960s. The Gypsy neighborhood had been located on the way to the secondary school since 1944. This was the first time that Gypsies had been accused of these immoral acts. Ironically, it was also the same time that the leading muhacir Gypsy family had a disagreement over their partnership in a truck with the most powerful figure among the ruffians at that time, Kadir.

By that time, the other muhacir Gypsies’ occupations also were becoming increasingly attractive. The porters helped the tradesmen and the villagers carried their stuff in the bazaar on Wednesdays. Some would work with the helvaci families in making and selling of the desert that was produced by them. The women worked as servants, cleaners and babysitters in the rich townspeople’s and state officials’ houses. While these jobs had been shunned by the townspeople before, in the 1960s the situation changed. Once, portering for instance had been perceived as a Gypsy job and no Turk would do it. In the 1960s, however, the nature of doing business changed as the relations with the city intensified. The jobs that had been considered Gypsy-like also started to be perceived as relatively profitable and desirable, especially for the villagers who did not have strong ties with the land (who were not satisfied with their situation and who wanted to move to the towns) in the village anymore and lacked the relevant capital and skills.

While the socioeconomic relations were transforming the town and some townspeople and villagers had trouble in obtaining jobs, the resentment of the Gypsies’ power grew, and built on the historical construction of Gypsyness and nationalism in the town. Among the mob, some were only followers, some were upset by the immorality of the Gypsies, some joined out of nationalistic and anti-Gypsy feelings and

---


536 For the effect of changes in the balance of power in exclusionary riots, see Bergmann, pp. 166-167.
some out of boredom just to watch an extraordinary activity and participate in it. However the leading perpetrators initiated the attacks for specific reasons. The conflict over a truck between the leading perpetrator Kadir and main family Kocayar triggered the attacks. Thus, the truck manifested a symbolic meaning.

The Significance of the Truck

The Leyland truck that was bought by Kocayar family in a partnership with Kadir was a symbolically important object for the Gypsies as well as for non-Gypsies in the town. It symbolized the increasing power of a Gypsy family and community in general. At that time, people were fascinated by vehicles, since there were not many in town. The townspeople are still able to count who owned the limited number of trucks and jeeps. Thus, when a Gypsy family had bought a truck even in a partnership, which was also considered as the best option, it had attracted so much attention that the people still talk about it.

The muhacir Cevza described how the truck attracted people’s jealousy in the town as the symbol of wealth: “My uncles had bought a Leyland truck, but people in Bayramic just could not accept it. And that truck was so beautiful; it was red and white. My brother Fikret decorated it. I mean, it attracted attention; they were jealous of it. My uncle was little bit rich. He was rich as he was a tradesman.”

All of the Gypsies mentioned the truck as the object that triggered the attacks. Some locals tried not to name it at first. They would instead repeat the non-Gypsies’ dominant way of telling the story in the town that emphasized the misbehavior of the muhacir Gypsies in harassing non-Gypsy girls. However, if they realize that I already

537 See Narrative 126 in Appendix D.
knew the issue and the names, they would talk more freely and would refer to the truck being the most prominent cause of the attacks. Otherwise, even including the truck in their stories was like taking sides and rejecting the dominant local discourse on the events based on the Gypsies’ misbehavior. For the Non-Gypsies, it did not turn up in the conversation very often. It demonstrated individual interests, competition over share and power primarily in the transportation business. One of the perpetrators, Huseyin Kiltas, disclosed the significance of the truck: “What it came down to was the Leyland. They were partners in the Leyland. Dilaver had a son. What was his name…? Cornuk Fikret, from the old drivers. And I think he was a partner with Kadir. To take the truck from his hands… I think Kadir was the only assolist [head vocalist-leader].”

Rana, the oldest daughter of the leading family Kocayar rejected the dominant narrative on the reasons that triggered the attacks as caused by the misbehavior of the Gypsies. Instead, she indicated that it was just used to cover the real reason that the townspeople had became jealous of them as they had become wealthier and bought a truck:

As if they were looking at the schoolgirls. Hahay, it is a lie. When did they look at schoolchildren! It is a lie! They got jealous of us. […] My father was very rich. Then he bought a Leyland. Kadir said, ‘Brother Dilaver, let’s be partners’. [My brother] Fikret was his old friend. They gave money [and became partner]. It was an open truck. My brother Husam was an assistant driver. My other brother was driver, too. They incited him [Kadir] by saying that they [her brothers] would cheat.

All Gypsies in the town repeated the narrative about the truck although some might emphasize other aspects. Bidon Hilmi from the muhacir Gypsies who was related to the Kocayar family through marriage and worked as a porter and a driver described in detail the underlying factors and discontent that triggered the attacks. He was beaten badly during the attacks; however he did not specifically mention his own beating:

538 See Narrative 127 in Appendix D.
They stoned us, you know. The reason was that Dilaver Kocayar was a partner of the truck, the Leyland, the open truck that brought deliveries from Istanbul for the tradesmen. The driver was our Fikret, Dilaver’s son. Kadir was his partner. Dilaver and Kadir were partners. That is why they got jealous; displeased about this. Write it like this. To get this truck from their hands, they made up rumors about either making passes at secondary school girls or looking at women from the roof of the hamam, then they made the people use these as excuses. They gave alcohol to villagers in the meyhanes including the rich people of Bayramic. The Cook Riza called the minister Rafet Sezgin. They asked what to do about the Gypsies harassing their girls. And Rafet Sezgin said, “stone them, but they should not bleed”. From the villages, maybe 600-700 people came. They attacked all of the muhacir’s houses in Bayramic. Breaking the doors, windows, stoning the houses, beating the people, they did everything. Then in front of the municipality, at the same night, the attorney rebuked the people who had assembled there, which was considered as an insult. They did not pay attention to the attorney either, they did not listen him. They beat the attorney in front of the municipality. He escaped with great difficulty. The security sources could not do anything against them either. They got frightened, they could not hold, not even touch them. It has been forty years. They did not let us take buses to go. We could not go anywhere out of fear. They beat us on the way. We hid in the neighbors’ houses. Eight to ten people looked in the Turks’ houses and said, “if you are hiding the Gypsies, give them up.”

The truck and the discontent over the rising opportunities in the transportation sector had made the Kocayar family into the main target of the leading perpetrators. Then, the attacks extended first to the other muhacirs and eventually to the local Gypsies. It accelerated to the point that the Gypsies did not see a way out except to leave town. A powerful Roman family called Yuksel in Biga, a town nearby, sent buses to take the Gypsies away. A few non-Gypsies from the town also helped them to get out of the town. Various struggles were waiting for the Gypsies in exile though. Most went to places where they had relatives or at least acquaintances to help them. Most went to Ezine, the nearest province, and Canakkale, the nearest city. However, some also went to other places such as Bandırma, Ayvacık, Izmir, Istanbul and Ankara. For most, it was not easy at all. They had to start a new life from scratch.
The Forced Dislocation: From Drivers’ Fight to Gypsy Hunt

“It was like how the grain grew, we did not question it, some conflicts happened and the Gypsies just left.”\textsuperscript{539}

“Obviously, as a ten-year-old-boy, I couldn’t have done anything, besides, my mother would not let me. But I know today that I was one of many people—my age is of no importance—who did not react at all. The remainder of the trip passed as if nothing happened... The entire society behaved this way. For decades this matter was covered under a veil of silence.”\textsuperscript{540}

The Gypsy category with all the negative images and prejudices it conveys may blind us to the process and the dynamics that transformed “our Gypsies” into “evil Gypsies.” It is also crucial to understand how the people who were considered to be Turkish and included in society more or less became reduced to being only Gypsies. This process of stigmatization, and creating a ‘master status’ excluded Gypsies from Turkishness. It makes clear how and why the categories become functional and what role they played in the attacks. In this study, I applied a multilayered analysis, which focused on the historical constructions of the stigma, on more structural forces and on the role of agency.

In my reading of the forced dislocation, my approach diverged from studies that focus on ethnic violence per se. This is related to the critical position I take on the usage of categories. I appreciate many ethnic violence studies, but find the essentialist focus on the category of ethnicity problematic in most works. It reifies ethnicity as a pivotal element that determines people and their relations while I am more interested in why the category of ethnicity could become so salient. I therefore fully endorse the analysis of

\textsuperscript{539} See Narrative 130 in Appendix D.

Brubaker and Laitin’s on the ethnic violence literature: “Today, the ethnic frame is immediately and widely available and legitimate; it imposes itself on, or at least suggests itself to, actors and analysts alike. This generates a coding bias in the ethnic direction. [...] Today, we—again, actors and analysts alike—are no longer blind to ethnicity, but we may be blinded by it.”

Laitin and Brubaker point at the ethnicization of violence as a coding bias that arose especially after the cold war. With this bias, they emphasize, certain events are interpreted as ethnic while ignoring all other dynamics. Thus, ethnicity appears as a new phenomenon in studies of political violence and nationalism, and replaces the ideological framework that was so central in the period of cold war between capitalism and communism.

The premise of persistency in categories as if they are intrinsic to the people and their relations replicates itself within the ethnic violence literature. However, along with Brubaker and Laitin, there are several scholars who criticize the coding bias in ethnic studies and stress that ethnicity and ethnic conflicts are myths that prevent further perceptions of underlying dynamics, with the dominant effect of automatically ethnicized interpretations. Instead they point at the significant role of economic dynamics. Some conflicts have a direct economic cause and only gather ethnic significance later on. Some are perceived as ethnic although they depend much more on class relations. Steinberg,

---


for instance, shows how ethnic conflicts conceal class based ones. “Indeed, whenever ethnic divisions occur along class lines, there is the likelihood, or at least the potential that ordinary class conflict will manifest itself as ethnic conflict, in reality as well as appearances.”

Brubaker’s further critiques the ethnic violence literature and evokes such inversions in ethnically defined conflicts:

How conflict and violence are seen, interpreted, and represented depends significantly on prevailing interpretive frames. Today, ethnic and national frames are readily accessible, powerfully resonant, and widely understood as legitimate. This encourages actors and analysts alike to interpret conflict and violence in ethnic rather than other terms. Analysts are thereby prone to overestimate the incidence of ethnic conflict and violence by “coding” as ethnic instances of conflict or violence that might have been coded in other terms [...] Actors, in turn, can take advantage of this coding bias, and of the generalized legitimacy of ethnic framing to mask the pursuit of clan, clique, or class interests. The point here is not to suggest that clans, cliques, or classes are somehow more real then ethnic groups, but simply to note the existence of structural and cultural incentives for strategic framing.

Underlining class relations, thus, does not mean that ethnic relations are insignificant. In reality, it is not actually that easy in many instances to distinguish the ethnic/racial hierarchy from other power relations, because the lack of recognition of an identity is often caused by the unequal distribution of resources. Instead a multidimensional analysis that distinguishes different power mechanisms and hierarchies allows a better understanding of their convergences. In the case of Gypsyness, overt ethnic discrimination is inextricably linked to lower class positions. The forced dislocation showed how some townspeople activated the exclusive category of


545 For a discussion on historical interplay between ethnic status hierarchy, and political and economic empowerment of blacks in United States, see George M. Fredrickson, *The Comparative Imagination On the History of Racism, Nationalism and Social Movements* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), pp. 90-93. For the specific debate on misrecognition and misdistribution, see Butler, “Merely Cultural?”
Gypsyness against their neighbors as socioeconomic relations were shifting. For them, the improved class position of Gypsies violated the ethnic/racial hierarchy. It was not that they finally found out that they were Gypsies and that Gypsies were evil, but their increased power mobilized the anti-Gypsy stereotype with aim to restore the ethnic hierarchy and put them in their place. Before the attacks, their Gypsyness had not been used as a problematic category nor was it seen as mutually exclusive with Turkishness. However, when new opportunities in the sector in which Gypsies were dominant emerged along with job seekers from the surrounding villages, it appeared as a functional category to legitimize violence that excluded Gypsies from the economy.

It is important to note that townspeople could not so easily define what made someone a Turk and another a Gypsy. Gypsyness was not considered as the complete antithesis of Turkishness either. This ambiguity nevertheless quickly disappeared during the attacks. The people who had once been confused about the boundaries between them and the Gypsies in the town, all of a sudden attacked their neighbors in the name of Turkishness versus Gypsyness. This poses the question what particular dynamics at that moment made them accept the imposed rigid dichotomy. The unambiguous articulation of the Gypsy threat dominated the stories about the attacks. What made the Gypsy threat so tempting was its power to conceal the personal interests and power struggles at the time. Putting the blame on the Gypsy, the terrorization of the protectors and other interpretations legitimized not only the actions of perpetrators at the time, but also made townspeople remember the incidents within this framework. This representation is also crucial for the ongoing perceptions and fear.

Some well-grounded works on anti-Semitism are helpful for us to understand mechanisms pertaining the demonizing and attacking socially constructed “others.”

Although our case diverges from anti-Semitic violence with respect to the historical

546 See Hughes “Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status” for the concept of “master status”.
context, international scope and extent of brutality, there are striking similarities when it comes to the quality, the logic and exclusive constructions, ways of legitimization, and the role of authorities. In analyzing the events, the work on anti-Semitism has proven very useful as help to understand how groups can be constructed as a threat and under what conditions people resort to collective violence against a stigmatized group. In this scope, I found the multilayered approaches of Van Arkel\textsuperscript{547} and Bergmann\textsuperscript{548} very well articulated for the analysis of my own case.

Van Arkel approaches anti-Semitism within its historical dimension. He takes the historical construction of anti-Semitism from early Christianity and contextualizes how anti-Jewish attitudes played out in practice. He explains how the genocide became possible and stresses that 20\textsuperscript{th} century anti-Semitism was a historical construction with deep historical roots. Another important question is why in certain periods and certain areas Jews were scapegoated and not another group. Arkel’s study of anti-Semitism guides us to answer such questions by highlighting the historical construction and the functionality of categories.

Similar to our case, Van Arkel points at the longstanding good relation between Christians and Jews. He lays out the three necessary conditions for anti-Semitism that led to violent attacks: stigmatization, social distance and terrorization. If we check these conditions in our case, we see striking resemblances. The historically constructed Gypsy stigma in itself was not sufficient but had to be mobilized during the violent attacks. Institutional legitimization of the stigma (in Van Arkel’s case by church and state) was also present as the Gypsies were religiously condemned and the object of discriminative state policies.

\textsuperscript{547} Van Arkel, “The Growth” and Van Arkel, \textit{The Drawing}.

\textsuperscript{548} Bergmann, “Exclusionary Riots.”
When a Gypsy and a Turk were engaged in an everyday communication, they were caught in predetermined identifications and hierarchies. Even though there could be friendly relations, there often was no ‘open interaction’. At the end of the day many non-Gypsies felt that Gypsies had to “know their place.” Intermarriages were an exception and many people kept their social distance although they were part of society. They did the low class and undesired jobs, married within their community and thus did “not violate the peace” in the society. The relations most of the time were limited to public spaces, with few private and more intimate interactions. The Gypsies’ close relationships usually were limited to their family and intermarriages even between Gypsy communities were low. This led to what Van Arkel called “labeled interaction” between Gypsies and non-Gypsies due to structural social distance, meaning: “whatever the social intercourse, it takes place within the pattern of predetermined social roles.”

However, I argue that there was still a space to negotiate in face-to-face relations, until it was destroyed during the attacks. This negotiation space had allowed people to construct close relations, work together and even share their private spaces, albeit on a limited basis. Although there have always been hierarchies between the categories of Gypsyness and Turkishness, a Gyspy person was not totally excluded from Turkishness as the categories had not been mutually exclusive. As discussed in the second chapter, the construction of Turkishness also allowed a negotiation space with its multilayered characteristics. Along with the ambiguous place of Gypsyness laid out in chapter four, the Gypsies of the town had developed their own strategies in their relations with others; the local Gypsies emphasized their commonalities with other townspeople, whereas the muhacirs expressed a form of modern citizenship in line with the Turkish state.

549 Van Arkel, The Drawing, p. 159.
550 Also discussed in Chapter Three, we saw ambiguity regarding Gypsies even in the Ottoman records.
As Van Arkel also suggests, when social control is moderate there are more possibilities for transcending the labeled interaction and “blur” the boundaries. In our town, it was enabled due to proximity in geographical space and socio-economic occupations. The local Gypsies knew their place by limiting themselves to traditional Gypsy professions, but most of them lived very close to non-Gypsy neighbors, served them and developed friendly relations, although mostly within the borders of labeled interactions that depended on the premise of the superiority of Turkishness and the Turkish way of doing things. The muhacirs, on the other hand, undertook professions that had a low status, but that were not necessarily regarded as Gypsy-like, but that offered attractive perspectives for the future. In time, they had also developed close interactions especially in their occupational networks that included people who were somewhat outside the town’s mainstream (like Driver ruffians who were not recognized as decent and well-behaved townspeople). Along with the emerging transportation sector, and the increasing possibilities to earn good money and prestige, the muhacirs had started transcending the labeled interaction by working closely together with non-Gypsy colleagues and thus offsetting the delicate balance in hierarchies between Gypsies and non-Gypsies. This imbalance and the blurring of boundaries that went with caused uncertainties in the town as people started crossing lines that for a long time had been firmly drawn. From the perspective of the perpetrators they were losing relative power. This shift is very similar to the conflicts that arise out of changing power balances due to increased assimilation as studied by Fearon and Laitin, and Olzak. Bergmann’s approach to exclusionary riots helps to analyze our story from this point.

551 Alba and Nee, Remaking the American Mainstream.

The term “exclusionary riots”, used within Bergmann’s three theoretical approaches, is extremely applicable to our case. The first approach is the intergroup hostility in which changing power relations are enough to motivate the perpetrators. The second approach is the frame analysis which shows how a social problem or threat regarding the targeted community can be constructed as a threat and thereby legitimize the violence by blaming, demonizing and/or criminalizing the stigmatized group. The last approach regards the theory of social control, and explains how people can attribute positive function to the violent attacks and how they are represented as necessary actions to keep the social peace envisioned by dominant groups. All these approaches are applicable to our case to some extent. However, I diverge from Bergmann’s account when it comes to the way the category of the Gypsyness was constructed in our local context. Bergmann defines groups more strictly, as entities with fixed membership. In our case, however, the construction of the group was fluctuating until the conflict between Kocayar family and Kadir escalated, due to the personal competition. Until that time, however, they more or less could still members of the same group. Hogg and Abrams stress that self-conceptualization follows group identification. If a disagreement between two groups occurs, for instance, and if the groups are defined by sex, the
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553 For the emphasis on the fruitless of the differentiation between riot and pogrom, see Paul R. Brass, “Introduction: Discourses of Ethnicity, Communalism, and Violence.” In Riots and Pogroms, edited by Paul R. Brass (London: Macmillan Press, 1996), pp. 1-55, pp. 32-34. Brass points at the wide usage of the terms riots and pogroms that assume differences in organization and planning. He himself stresses the mutual presence of “outbreak of active lawlessness” that is connected to the definition of riot and “official planning or collusion” that is attached to pogrom in the realization of many violent acts. Bergmann et al. give clues how to differentiate exclusionary riots from other collective violent instances: “The exclusionary riot may be distinguished from other forms of violence along a range of criteria. The assumption that the minority group constitutes a collective threat makes the exclusionary riot different from a lynching, which, while operating from general prejudice, is directed at a single member of a minority. The extreme asymmetry of power in favor of the rioters distinguishes exclusionary riots from other forms of rioting, such as food or race riots. The low level organization makes them different from vigilantism and terrorism, and the comparative absence of state participation sometimes, but not always, distinguishes exclusionary violence from large-scale massacres and genocide.” (Bergmann et al., pp. 12-13)

554 Bergmann, p. 163.

category of sex will become salient, while if it had been ethnicity that would be salient. Thus, the economic disagreement between Kocayar and Kadir activated their preceding differences over the category of Gypsyness along with a call for social order. That found a relevant atmosphere due to the increasing competitions for jobs as due to the political context that provoked ethnic Turkishness.

The historical context is highly relevant to understand current or more recent forms of exclusionary violence. Although the prejudices often are present in particular societies, for it to develop into acts of violence, certain contextual conditions should be fulfilled. For the tension to turn out to be an exclusionary violence act “[…] opposing interests and individual conflicts have to be “collectivized” into an ethnic antagonism. This occurs when the dominant ethnic or national group perceives a collective threat to its group position from an out-group.”

In a slight contrast to this model, in our case the group formation was reinforced in the process of threat building, whereas preceding the escalation boundaries between groups were much more fluent and blurred. Moreover, the more rigid and fixed group definition was not shared by all townspeople, because they considered the Gypsies a part of town society and therefore protected them. The target was not a homogenous entity either in itself or in the eyes of the non-Gypsies. As in the town, people were aware and did distinguish between various sorts of Gypsy groups, the local Gypsies were initially left in peace and only attacked during the second wave. The reason was that they were not seen part of Muhacirs and were culturally and religiously more integrated. Although during the second wave of attacks townspeople tended to lump together local and muhacir Gypsies into one homogenous category, most local Gypsies were still not treated in the same way as the muhacirs and some were even left in peace. To understand

---
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why muhacirs were primarily targeted, their closeness to the wealthy families was relevant, as I will explain below.

For the dynamics of a conflict, “changes in the balance of power” are crucial. This is the case when people who perceive themselves as the majority feel that they are losing their attained status, prestige and/or economic power to people they regard as a minority.\(^{557}\) A common reaction is that they then act against a “[...] perceived threat through illegitimate competition, disregard of cultural norms, or feared crime [...] to “punish” the minority or to restore the old order.”\(^{558}\) This echoes most of the non-Gypsy narratives on the Gypsy threat and their explicit attempt to put Gypsies in their place by the violent attacks. In this case, constructing the Gypsy threat was crucial to motivate people against the Gypsies. As a result the personal and group interests of the townspeople in the transportation sector (drivers, assistants and vehicle owners) and the demands of the newcomers from the villages in the professions for easy access, given their limited networks, capital and available skills, converged.

As we have seen, before the attacks, the socioeconomic power of the Gypsies had increased due to the socioeconomic transformations, symbolized by the Leyland truck that muhacir family Kocayar bought in partnership with Kadir, a well-known ruffian in the town. Other muhacir Gypsy positions, in the service sector and trade, had also improved. This was itself probably perceived as a threat by townspeople who saw their relative position as ethnic Turks decline in comparison to the Gypsies. Moreover, Kadir was an ambitious man who tried to take advantage of new opportunities in the sector. This relative decrease and new opportunities in the sector along with the needs of unemployed newcomers from the villages reproduced the prejudice around Gypsyness. The rumor about the Gypsies’ behaving improper towards Turkish girls, on the other

\(^{557}\) See Bergmann, p. 166-7.

\(^{558}\) Bergmann emphasizes this collective violence as a means of social control by following Donald Black, p. 167.
hand, whether it really happened or not, reinforced the threat by portraying Gypsies’ not only as gaining socioeconomic prestige and status but also as a threat to Turkish women and competitors of Turkish men.

The narratives around the Gypsy threat also manifest an obsession about women as belonging to the Turkish family and the Turkish nation. In cases of conflicts and war, the female body is often treated as an arena for masculine honor and prestige along with nationalistic territorial claims. Thus, women of certain communities or nations and their bodies easily become the symbol of the nation in which alleged or real violations are treated as if the nation itself is attacked and under siege. The Gypsies’ making passes at the Turkish girls was seen as a violation of the national border and the territory of Turkish men. Thus, the men of Turkish society referred to this alleged improper and in their eyes insulting behavior as a threat to their honor, whereas female agency was entirely lacking in this scenario. The actual attackers were men and the supposedly abused women remained anonymous; nobody knew anything about them not even whether they really existed or not.

The attacks, however, were also the outcome of a psychological process in which townspeople and recent immigrants from the surrounding villages became increasingly insecure because of the loss of power. This applied especially to the villagers, who due to changing reactions of agricultural mechanization and rapid urbanization were struggling for new opportunities in nearby towns and cities. Their narratives of victimization were not fabricated, as they probably really did feel victimized and threatened. Bergmann draws attention to perpetrators’ psychology in such violent attacks: “A participant in

559 I.e. Drezgic; Heng and Devan; Nagel; Parla and Yuval-Davis.

exclusionary violence operates within a friend-foe schema as a victim of an injustice, discrimination, or aggression and reacts, under certain circumstances, with violent forms of social control.\textsuperscript{561}

Many studies on riots, pogroms, and violent attacks demonstrate the acts and often leading role of the elites.\textsuperscript{562} By taking the lead they would manipulate the crowds for their own interests.\textsuperscript{563} In our case, however, the role of the elites is somewhat different and less easy to define. At the time of the attacks, the elites were already losing status and the dislocation of the Gypsies therefore can be seen as a manifestation of the transition in the local power relationships, not only pertaining to the Gypsies, but in general. The core perpetrators were not the real elites of the town in political or economic terms, but they surely hoped to gain by the socioeconomic transition that the country went through. The increasing status of these (male) drivers and businessmen in the transportation sector made it possible to mobilize the petty merchants, people who worked in the service sectors and villagers who experienced harder conditions but who also were attracted by the new opportunities in the economic transition. Whereas the traditional elites were the property owners who protected the Gypsies they employed, the perpetrators saw themselves as the new elite so that the attacks should also be interpreted as the manifestation of a new class of homini novi that was eager to capitalize on their recent social mobility and replace the old order.

The perceived leader of the attacks, Kadir, pointed at his economic and social power before the attacks and how it had increased afterwards. He had many relations with the villagers and was regarded as a powerful person. He also emphasized his close

\textsuperscript{561} Bergmann, p. 166.


\textsuperscript{563} See Brass, p. 11.
relationship with the security forces and the power of his word in the town in those times. Starting with the 1970s he became the strongest among the transporters and in the town he was the second person with respect to the amount of taxes paid. Thus the attacks on the Gypsies and the rise against the old elites were part of one and the same power struggle. Although the story was portrayed as an ethnic conflict, in reality it was related to a transition in power.

The functionality of the stereotype\textsuperscript{564} appears as a very important phenomenon in this story. The eviction of Gypsies widened the opportunities of townspeople and villagers in the transportation and service sector. Thus, while the Gypsies had dominated the drivers’ sector, now the leading figures that were already in the transportation business dominated the sector entirely. At the same time, some other professions, such as shoe polishing and portering, which were not very profitable but sufficient to integrate into the town’s socio-economic life, became available to the newcomers.

Therefore, the dominant discourse on the attacks as “Gypsy incidents” used by many townspeople concealed such interests, and veiled the connection between violence and power holding. The crowd, on the other hand, also pursued its own motivations in the attacks. It would be misleading to portray them only as pawns that were manipulated by the (rising) elites. Many of them had their own motives and reasons to attack the Gypsies, whether their reasons corresponded to those of their leaders or not. Apart from the general atmosphere of insecurity that they felt during the socio-economic transition in the 1960s, the rumors concerning the immorality of the Gypsies, their perception of the violence as a struggle for power partly determined and colored their motivations.

Hogg et al. pointed at similar scapegoating and displacement in violent cases as follows:

\[...\]Frustrated majority-group members who cannot easily aggress against (or identify) the frustrating agent displace their aggression onto relatively defenceless minority groups, especially if there is a consensus about the appropriateness of

\textsuperscript{564} As Van Arkel argues, a stereotype should be functional to be active.
antipathy towards that group. [...] in support of their theory, Hovland and Sears showed how increased lynching’s of blacks in the United States between 1882 and 1930 were linked, presumably via the mediation of frustration, to a decline in cotton prices experienced by white farmers.  

At the time, the politics and economy did not provide a secure environment for the villagers and townspeople and the pull of the cities increased frustrations about blocked social mobility. In this context, the representation of the Gypsies as a threat might have functioned as an easy target to vent one’s frustrations within the general feeling of insecurity that the villagers and townspeople felt during the modernization of the country.  

Moreover, the prevailing political atmosphere that was stimulated by the government at the time, which as Bora and Canefe stressed the centrality of Turkishness, encouraged violent expressions of ethnic nationalism. As repeated by the muhacir Gypsies, the current government’s role was crucial in intensifying stigma and the social distance. The populist politics that rose in significance in Turkey during the late 1960s made village men as the main target of their campaign and created a negative image of early republican intellectuals and elites. The connection between this populist critique and the nationalist emphasis was strengthened in this period by picturing villagers and peasants as the core of the nation and stressed the idea of national loyalty as a condition to be considered as a reliable citizen. This stress on nationalist and conservative articulations and “the [ordinary people] as real owners of the country,” provoked a feeling of injustice of villagers and small townspeople, especially against the bureaucratic elite and intellectuals.  

---
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Apart from the discontent with Gypsies and the personal interests involved, the attacks should be seen as part of a hidden rebellion against the elites and bureaucrats who embodied the dominant class and the modernization ideas of the founding state. Furthermore, the nationalism of the time reinforced ethno-national feelings over other identifications, which were based on e.g. citizenship, local ties and religion. The nationalist statements of the time that provoked sudden and uncontrollable explosion of ordinary people out of frustration with their subordination provide an important context for our case. Such statements legitimized and naturalized the violent expressions of the perpetrators. They also played an important role in the representations of several lynching attempts as natural in the country in later years.  

In addition, the feeling of fighting against inadequate and failing state authorities, and presenting oneself as the legitimate executor of state’s real will was pivotal in the attacks. The perpetrators beat the attorney who decried the illegitimacy of their actions, while the police joined the mob in stoning the Gypsy houses. While the state may seem absent in the violent attacks of the townspeople, it was indeed not that passive. None of the perpetrators was punished for the attacks, and the actions of security forces and governing authorities were insufficient; permitting and even joining the perpetrators. Many townspeople felt that most state authorities agreed with the violence against the Gypsies and that they helped the security forces by doing the right thing, although the latter of course by law should have protected the Gypsies.

Many perpetrators engaged in anti-Semitic violence narrated similar feelings such as believing “this action was of course wished ‘from above’” and “no one can and will punish […] them for the attacks.” Van Arkel not only pointed at the lack of strength

569 Bora and Canefe, p. 661 also see Tanîl Bora, “Line Acilimi” (Opening out for lynching), Birikim 249 (January 2010), pp. 3-5.
570 Bergmann, p. 168.
among state authorities, but also explained how in many cases state functionaries joined the mob and thus empowered the attackers and helped in terrorizing those people who (would have) opposed violence against Jews. Or in the word of Van Arkel: “Fear of punishment compels participation.”571 In our case, the terrorization mechanism was mentioned in some ordinary people’s narratives as they revealed their feelings of powerlessness to stand against the perpetrators. Even now some protectors were afraid that their role as protectors would become known, some 40 years after the attacks. Non-Gypsy townspeople who were seen as too close to Gypsies and protected them were terrorized by verbal and physical threats by the perpetrators. Even ordinary townspeople who had no business with Gypsies felt terrorized during the attacks, because the risk of becoming an outcast and a traitor of the local society was very real and as a result few people dared to stand up against the leading figures.

The well-known American historian Jan Gross, who studied anti-Jewish pogroms by their Polish neighbors during and immediately after World War II, emphasized the significance of actual experiences and real interests against the background of the Nazi occupation. However, he argued that not Nazis but the perception of self-interest, and mechanism of social control and terrorization largely explain why Polish people killed their Jewish neighbors: “And so, understandably, those who do not conform become social outcasts.”572 They can even be stigmatized and labeled in the same way as in Gross’ example of a protector’s son who was called a Jew by other children.573 The fear of becoming an outcast forces people to hide their true feelings even if they help the persecuted minority, as is clear from Gross’ meticulous reconstruction of the pogroms in

571 Van Arkel “The Growth”, p. 278.
572 Gross, Fear, p. 251.
573 Gross, Neighbours, p. 131.
Poland. In our case many townspeople described similar fears about standing up for the Gypsies, the threats that they faced and, like Salih, ongoing hesitancy to reveal their help to the Gypsies. Silence has been crucial in this case to understand the prevailing power relations, fear, pain and hesitancy of the actors involved. Green’s account on the power of silence as social control is illustrative in this respect: “Silence can operate as a survival strategy; yet silencing is a powerful mechanism of control enforced through fear.”

Gross makes another related and crucial point on the violence and its effects on the people’s feelings and rationalizations. The influence of the bare experience of violence and its terrifying effect went beyond terrorization as such: “Jews were so frightening and dangerous, in other words, not because of what they had done or could do the Poles, but because of what Poles had done to the Jews.” This type of rationalizing violence (witnessed or performed) prevents to question such acts and at the same time justifies the passivity of the bystanders. The traumatic experience thus leads to the inability and fear of the people involved to face the hard facts of the attacks. Gross’ investigation of anti-Semitic violence in Poland shows the importance of terrorization and the ongoing legitimization of the pogroms decades later. Also in his story, the violence is seen as logical and natural, and the leading perpetrators are left unpunished by the state: “Evidently, an anti-Jewish riot was a nonevent in the eyes of those who administered law and order. No one bothered pursue or identify the instigators of those events, or the officers of the law whose professional (mis)conduct incited the passion of the mob.”

---
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In our case, the attorney was reassigned to another city and no one was punished for the exclusionary violence against the Gypsies. Also in similar cases, unpunished perpetrators were accepted as the norm in Turkey. Several state authorities furthermore naturalize this kind of violence with statements that stress the Turkish people’s nationalist sensitivity. Bora pointed at the tendency in the last ten years to regard lynchings in Turkey as normal, especially against Kurdish people. This form of nationalist discrimination of the Kurds, he emphasized, dehumanizes people who are perceived as the enemy and traitors. Our case exemplifies a similar attitude, but then against Gypsies and as our narrators themselves drew many parallels between different incidents against minorities who were all encoded as “national enemies.” This dissertation is therefore not only a reconstruction of how Gypsyness historically has been constructed, how the stigma became functional and was reproduced along with personal interests and power struggles in relation to the socioeconomic transformation in the country. It is also about unquestioned and legitimized violence against people who are classified as opponents or enemies to the national body and social order. This perception could be traced in many interviews including that with the governor of the province at the time, who emphasized the insignificancy of the attacks and at the same time normalizing them. Very similar to Bora’s critique, the attacks were represented as inevitable, as if it was a natural disaster. Moreover, not the perpetrators but the Gypsies were blamed for the attacks. State authorities used such feelings as a technique of governance. In parallel to this, the perpetrators’ recognition of their violence as legitimate was assured by such polities that proclaimed to put the interests of ‘ordinary Turks’ first.

To conclude, the Gypsy stigma is no longer as active and functional in the town as during the attacks. For some time anti-Kurdishness has replaced it and when the Kurds were attacked in the town in 2009, nobody was surprised. Nobody stood up

against it and not a single perpetrator was arrested. People had already told me about the probability of attacks on Kurds a year before the outburst took place. Although the violence was not extreme, some narrators from the town indicated that a bigger attack would probably happen, as the discontent with the Kurds was still very much alive. Some muhacir narrators, on the other hand, drew attention to the role of the security forces who suppressed the collective action against the Kurds: “probably it is due to political interests that the government avoids a big issue right now [compared to their dislocation 40 years ago].”