

BUILDING A PAST: CULTURAL HERITAGE, IMAGINING,
AND MARKETING MEMORY IN ADANA

HİKMET İLHAN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2018

BUILDING A PAST: CULTURAL HERITAGE, IMAGINING,
AND MARKETING MEMORY IN ADANA

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

Hikmet İlhan

Boğaziçi University

2018

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Hikmet İlhan, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no materials that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of a thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature:.....

Date:.....20.03.2018.....

ABSTRACT

Building a Past: Cultural Heritage, Imagining, and Marketing Memory in Adana

This thesis examines the role of historical Adana Tepebağ houses in the imagination of social memory and cultural heritage by exploring how the houses are marketed as both emotional instruments and economic investments. It analyzes the functions of places and materiality by treating Tepebağ houses as material traces of the past where different narratives unfold. My research is based on interviews I conducted with the residents of Tepebağ neighborhood and with state officials in charge of the Culture Street Project in 2017. I pay special attention to the dynamic interrelation between personal and local narratives, and imagination and materiality. My thesis will contribute to the scholarship on history and place memory by showing how place memory functions as a destabilizing or supplementary tool against circulated narratives in social memory and historical accounts.

ÖZET

Bir Geçmiş İnşa Etmek:

Adana'da Kültürel Miras ile Hafızanın Tahayyülü ve Pazarlanması

Bu tez Adana Tepebağ evlerinin hafıza ve kültürel miras tahayyülünde oynadıkları rolü ve bunların hem duygulanım aracı hem de ekonomik yatırım olarak nasıl pazarlandığını ele almaktadır. Çalışma, Tepebağ evlerini farklı anlatıların ortaya çıktığı, geçmişin maddi izlerini taşıyan mekanlar olarak ele alıp mekan ve materyalitenin işlevlerini incelemektedir. Araştırmam 2017 yılında Tepebağ mahallesi sakinleriyle ve aynı mahallede yürütülen Kültür Sokağı Projesi'nin yetkilileriyle gerçekleştirdiğim görüşmelere dayanmaktadır. Özellikle kişisel ve yerel anlatılar ile hafıza ve materyalite arasındaki dinamik ilişkiyi ele alacağım. Tezim, toplumsal hafıza ve tarihsel açıklamalara karşı mekan hafızasının nasıl istikrarı bozucu veya tamamlayıcı olacağını göstermek suretiyle tarih ve mekan hafızası alanına katkı sunacaktır.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing a thesis is an effortful process that can be bearable and productive with the support and encouragement of certain people.

First of all, I am thankful to my thesis committee. I have to thank my advisors, Meltem Ahıska and Saygun Gökarksel, who answered my all questions and prompted valuable questions in my mind during the study. They were always patient in answering my questions. I want to thank Hülya Adak, Biray Kolluođlu and Nükhet Sirman for their precious comments that helped me build a consistent thesis. They opened new interdisciplinary ways for me through their comments and recommendations. I am thankful to Bülent Küçük, Didem Daniş and Olcay Akyıldız for supporting me in this journey.

I owe so much to my friends Abdülhamit, Harika and Yakup. They helped me access academic materials and deal with bureaucratic needs when I was not in Istanbul. I am indebted to my informants in Tepebağ who made writing this thesis possible.

Last but not least, I am thankful to my wife, Burcu. She put up with my hard times. She encourages me intellectually and fills my soul with love that makes the world a better place. Without her, this study could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Literature review.....	4
1.2 Transformation of Tepebağ since the late nineteenth century.....	13
1.3 Methodology.....	20
CHAPTER 2: PLACE MEMORY AND TEPEBAĞ HOUSES.....	24
2.1 A case of place memory: Tepebağ houses.....	24
2.2 Tepebağ houses and stories.....	34
CHAPTER 3: COMMODIFICATION OF HERITAGE AND IMAGINATION INVESTMENT: THE CULTURE STREET PROJECT.....	39
3.1 Need for a desirable past.....	42
3.2 Marketing of the past and the city.....	48
CHAPTER 4: HISTORY AND MEMORY CONFRONTATION IN ADANA....	52
4.1 Contradiction or consolidation? History and memory.....	52
4.2 National and local narratives at the crossroad.....	55
4.3 Remembering through perpetual forgetting.....	69
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	75
APPENDIX: ORIGINAL INTERVIEW QUOTES.....	81
REFERENCES.....	86

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As a person lived in Adana until the age of nineteen, when I talk to my friends from Adana about the attractions of the city they usually say that there are not many historical sites in the city although it is on a historical passage way and has an old history. No historical sites, churches, houses or anything else. Older residents like my teachers or friends do usually compare Adana with other Anatolian cities like Konya, Erzurum, Kayseri in term of having historical landscapes. Apart from four mosques (Ulu Cami, Kemeraltı Camii, Yeni Camii and Yağ Cami) and Taşköprü it is very difficult to find historical buildings in the city centre. The unique church in the city, *Bebekli Kilise*, has been seen as an enigmatic place of which door is always closed. Moreover, because of the invisibility or non-existence of Christian population in the city, as children we heard that it was a secret place for missionary activities. In other words, invisibility of non-Muslim communities made it hard to understand existence of such a church in the city at the same time. All of these reasons have created some gaps, absences in the history of Adana and its residents' imagination of past.

According to what we learned, Adana was a Muslim city since the Ramazanoğulları Principality and the only non-Muslim encountering in the city was the French Invasion after World War I. The independence day of the city depends on the end of this invasion. In those independence commemorations the past Armenian population of the city to whom treason is ascribed were presented as inner enemies of the Ottoman state and they faded away all of sudden, from both narratives and existence. However, this uncompleted image of Armenians gave some clues about

the violent past of the city where both Muslim and non-Muslim populations should have lived in a multicultural society. Both this multicultural background and repeatedly underlined ancient roots of the city, I thought, should have some traces such as historical artifacts of that lost times. For that reason, I tried to pursue the nature of Armenian Issue in the context of Adana city in terms of materiality and stories regarding them. However, this was not so easy because whenever I strived at following physical and discursive elements about the past Armenian community of Adana I faced the question that “Why are not there so many historical places in Adana?” Though it is one of the biggest cities of Turkey in terms of economy, industry and population, lack of historical places in Adana has been a principle issue by the residents of the city, and hence, it is almost impossible to study on such a subject which deals with old social and cultural nature of Adana. Though I have found some examples that deal with the Armenian past of Adana, such as *Demirciler Çarşısı Cinayeti* (Murder in the Smith Bazaar) and *Kanlı Topraklar* (Bloody Lands) which were written by Yaşar Kemal and Orhan Kemal respectively, it was very hard to find sources for what I have tried to analyze because what I have aimed is not to prove or contest accuracy of past events regarding the Armenian community of Adana and historical incidents but to focus on circulating discourses through material residues that might influence local memory and identity. In this vein Tepebağ houses which compose the only historical neighborhood of Adana, which have been restored and re-organized for two years, are the places that I can utter my questions about the relation between materiality, memory and commodification and marketing of memory.

Tepebağ is the oldest neighborhood of the city of Adana that locates on an ancient mound in the city centre. In addition to antiquity of the area, historical houses

that are called Tepebağ Houses in the district have become significant places for Adana in recent years. These houses are presented as the instances of traditional Turkish architecture and this feature of the houses makes the district important for claiming a Turkish history and identity of the city. However, the houses have some material traces of the multicultural nature of the past of Adana that sometimes become subjects through which contested memory is circulated against the homogenous history narrative. On the other hand, the Culture Street Project which has been run in Tepebağ that aims at restoring old houses and building an old typical Adana street reveals how places and place memories can be organized. This project, also, displays how urban transformations can create a need for old places for identity formation, which is itself a result of these processes.

Starting from this point of view, this thesis aims to compare and understand local history narratives and memories in the city of Adana regarding the past, and the non-Muslim communities especially Armenians that were once a crucial component of the town through examining meanings and interpretations of material traces from Tepebağ houses and the Culture Street Project. The material reality of the houses and traces that belong to them will be examined as the palimpsests of non-Muslim communities' existence. These traces, I argue, create both imaginary and discursive gaps about which some narratives are told in order to form a linear and consonant history. On the other hand, whether these material traces have impacts on dwellers on narrating the local history of Tepebağ or not is the other issue on which I will focus.

Based on aforementioned notions, some of my main questions that I have tried to answer in this study are as following: How do Tepebağ houses become materials for building local memory, thereby identity in Tepebağ neighborhood? How do residents of the neighborhood translate memorial values of those houses into

today's both national and local political and cultural conditions? How do physical remnants of a lost time and community become elements of various, whether corresponding or conflicting, memories and narratives in the region? Moreover, what do reasons make the district an attractive place for economic and emotional investment which causes commodification of the memory and history as it can be seen in the case of Tepebağ Culture Street Project which is presented as heritage policy? In what ways this process of re-organizing the places can influence the past and future imagination? However, I will try to explain some aspects of social memory and place memory before focusing on the details.

1.1 Literature review

Though there are alternatives usages for social memory like collective memory, public memory, I will use the social memory in order to underline how this type of memory is influenced by social structures and dynamics. What I mean by this term is the socially circulated and shaped aspects of some narratives about the past. In Halbwach's view, collective memory which can be interpreted as social memory in a sense is the tool to localize ourselves into a certain group through remembering some memories that identify the group in question (Halbwachs, 1992, p. 52). In other words, it functions as a common instrument of the group to bring people together. "We situate what we recollect within the mental spaces provided by the group" (Connerton, 1989, p. 37). Social memory, hence, is a key element to be included into a social group like family, village, neighborhood or a nation. For this reason, "acquiring a group's memories and thereby identifying with its collective past is part of the process acquiring any social identity" (Zerubavel, 2003, p. 3). It can be said

that social memory is a discursive product of a group which reproduces that group and it may include material apparatus like media, curriculum, places and material traces regarding a community or an event. However, social memory of a smaller group such as a neighborhood may differ from an inclusive group like national one in terms of narratives told in the group, since some local parameters and physical residues that bring us to place memory which is a type of social memory. Places can be seen “as an interactive social sphere through which power and presence is either negotiated or claimed by diverse cultural groupings, and of place as located site/sight” (Lloyd and O’Brien, 2000, p. XV.), where place memory may cause conflicting narratives.

When it comes to Turkey context, as Neyzi (2009) puts in words, “great interest upon identity and in conjunction with this in past in recent years” (p.3) is one of the main reasons which has accelerated memory studies in Turkey. However, national security discourse maintains its hegemony on the society which makes it very hard to speak on any topic regarding the Armenian Issue and memories regarding it. Moreover, “The burden of Armenian memory exemplifies Turkey’s schizoid relationship to the past in which public silence or denial coexists with what is largely an “open secret” (Neyzi, 2010, p.16) which means that the Armenian issue is a well-known problem but an undesirable topic to speak about. On the other hand, as Hodgkin and Radstone (2003) allege, “Memory, of course, does not operate only as an abstract (mental) system: it is generated by and channeled through an endless variety of media and artefacts” (p. 11). In this sense, materiality and places are relatively uncontrollable phenomena in terms of silencing memories which sometimes open ways to discuss open secrets, although it can be difficult to elaborate details about the matter in question because materiality and places intentionally or

not can turn out to be monuments and signs of some undesired events which bring us to the conceptions of intentional/unintentional monuments.

According to Alois Riegl, there are two types of monuments: intentional and unintentional monuments. Intentional monuments are those established to commemorate an event or a person. Unintentional monuments, on the other hand, do not have “the purpose of commemorating any specific event or person but still monuments in their irreplaceable value” (as cited in Çaylı, 2011, p. 5). Adana, as one of the last and “invisible enough” Armenian site in Turkey, can become a reminder of Armenian issue, but this is an undesirable phenomenon for a coherent national and local imagination. Especially places like Tepebağ houses can become witnesses of lives of “others” and they can venture past imagination as difficult heritages that must be handled. Difficult heritage is a term used for genocide, massacre or any undesired places by Logan and Reeves. Such places have particular characteristics whereas nation-states have peculiar policies about them. Logan and Reeves (2011) add:

Sometimes sites gradually change as memories of the past fade or are distorted; even sometimes, it is argued, sites should be actively changed where they merely aid the remembrance of the perpetrators of pain and shame rather than the victims... It is important, therefore, to determine what aspects of the past are being ignored or poorly represented in the interpretation of the heritage sites. But sometimes whole sites may be missing from the public consciousness and hence from heritage registers, perhaps because the public in question does not want to remember the values associated with such places (p. 2).

Regulation or destruction of such places and their difficult memories is one of the strategies used for history construction that omits contested narratives and realms of speech. In Adana case when the Armenian places are taken into consideration, it seems that there are three ways of organizing/forgetting place memory and creating public silence. First of all, demolishing buildings, as in the case of three churches and

Armenian houses in the city centre and building new structures on them, such as Central Bank on old church,¹*Adana Merkez Camii* (Central Mosque) on old Armenian graveyard, is a common strategy. Secondly, changing the function of the buildings; for instance, Armenian Orphanage was transformed into Adana Fen Lisesi (Adana Science High School). Thirdly, making Armenian name and history invisible is another way of causing Armenian past to be forgotten which is exemplified in *Bebekli Kilise* (Church) and Tepebağ Houses cases. While *Bebekli Kilise* was an old Armenian Church as the only open church in Adana, it was renamed and functioned as Latin Catholic Church after 1915 and the recently restored Tepebağ houses are presented as traditional Mediterranean Turkish settlements although the district was the main neighborhood for the Armenian people.

On the other hand, memory can be an instrument to manage identities and help to face past suppressed or traumas (Özyürek, 2007, p. 13) while it can be undesirable for grand narratives in some cases because of providing a path for a lost or forgotten time and relations. It must be considered that memory “narratives in public sites, then, can take many forms- they can be presented in images and displayed, condensed and congealed into monuments, represented in physical spaces or projected through storytelling” (Walkowitz and Knauer, 2004, p. 8). In this sense places can be sites where memory and narratives are embodied because “Places are spaces that have been inscribed with meaning, usually as a result of some past event or attachment” (Dyke and Alcock, 2003, p. 5). However, place memory is one of the most difficult fields to which some properties and narratives would be ascribed, for a place as a materiality can carry some traces of the original work with regard to both physical and emotional features. As Lowenthal (1985) claims, “physical residues of

¹<http://www.adana.bel.tr/turizm/>

all events may yield potentially unlimited access to the past” (p. 19). For this reason, places and thereby materiality are one of the main fields intervened and regulated by modern nation states which use national grandiose narratives to interpret them according to present conditions. In other words, places can be continually reshaped in order to construct or destruct traces of some events because of political desires.

According to (Ma 2009)

Place is not a natural given, but a human construct: hence it is open to monumentalization. By this term I do not designate size or quality of works, but the deliberate creation of places, buildings, artistic works, that themselves make memory, thus reaffirming identity in the present, and pass it on to the future (p.248).

In this vein, cities, streets and houses where a population lives in become spots of arranging a coherent local or national story. It must be alleged that national identity and politics regarding it is over-emphasized but, I argue, in a world where political system is constructed on nation-state and its apparatus, searching and analyzing the impacts of the national imagination is necessary. As Smith & Waterton (2009) claim, “The reason why debate has centered so much on the national is because the national level has, over the last two or three centuries, been so much more powerful and able to impose its identity than other levels” (p. 151) and “since at least nineteenth century, scholars and politicians alike recognized the fundamental connection between memory and nation” (Olick, 2003, p.1). So, it is indispensable to seek impacts of nationalism and national imagination in a world where every political and cultural change can find ways to influence thoughts and feelings through media and other apparatus of states. I do not claim that there is only one monolithic national narrative about past of the nation or a region because there is always variety in all discursive interpretations but it is true that one of these interpretations has become hegemonic in modern societies which is national history and it may sometimes use

places for its basis. What makes places attractive for the national level is the connection between identity and place memory. Places present embodied indications of narratives regarding identity. Hence, as Cattell and Climo (2002) argue

The sites of memory are important to truth claims, identities, and many other aspects of human life. They are important for social and cultural continuity within ethnic, religious, national, and other groups, and across generations, occupational categories and other identities (p. 18).

In other words, it can convey meanings that can create associations for social relations and identities through visualization (Sofaer, 2007, p.1). Using the term “collective spatial memory” properly instead of social place memory, Kemp (2011) argues “Collective spatial memories are inherently dynamic and productive, a vital component of individual and communal place attachment, identity, meaning and well-being in the present and over time” (p. 11). Places, also, may include a lost, imagined or desirable past in line with the existing political circumstances. What makes place important is its relation with past and present time which may result in conveying traces of an undesired past. It can be said that places can be construed as materiality which has leaks against widespread narratives and can open ways to understand the past because “Monuments and material culture more generally act as cultural tools in the processes of remembering and forgetting” (Wersch, 2002, cited in Smith and Waterton 2009, p. 47) and houses and buildings as parts of streets and cities can play important roles in shaping/re-shaping/de-shaping memorial and historical discourses as an inerasable signs of the past which may be sites of unrest in terms of violating generally accepted and imposed discourses. Though “these sites are portrayed, often entirely unproblematically, as places of representative of *national* history” (Smith and Waterton, 2009, p. 69) that can be considered as integrating and compatible elements of national history, they are one of the vulnerable issues that can influence subjectivity, belonging and national desires.

Especially places and cities can be crucial in regard to subjectivity and belonging to a neighborhood or a local community thanks to providing material basis for a common imagined history. As Ma (2009) argues about the ancient Greek city/polis and its functions, “Social memory allowed the polis to present stories about itself, and thus makes itself seen, and hence evident: it was constitutive of the collective subject. These constructions, without necessarily being lies, always entailed selectivity and forgetfulness -which imply a form of collective subjectivity” (p. 252), and this can be true for modern cities and societies that can be exposed to the encircling discourses.

However, it must be kept in mind that all of these do not mean that memory is an absolute negativity of dominant history or narratives because as Hodgkin and Radstone (2003) claim

The idea of memory as a tool with which to contest ‘official’ versions of the past, too, shifts from an opposition between the subordinate truth versus the dominant lie, to a concern with the ways in which particular versions of an event may be at various times and for various reasons promoted, reformulated, or silenced. This is not to deny that the dominant versions of the past are inextricably entangled with relations of power in society, but rather to refocus the question around the many ways in which conflict and contest can emerge (p. 5).

I argue that this aspect of social memory and privately of place memory and materiality can be seen in Adana Tepebağ houses context, too. In other words, memory can create varieties of narratives against dominant discourses but cannot be posited as other side of the same coin. At this point, conceptions of locus and memorial which are proposed by Connerton and based on experience rather than strict narratives can be useful to addresses some aspects of place memory.

Connerton makes distinction between locus and memorial in terms of several features but the most important difference between these two is whether the place is experienced by the people who are related with the place in question or they are

articulated for remembering some past events which includes forgetting as well.

Connerton says that

There is, in other words, a certain matter-of-factness, a taken for grantedness, which distinguishes our experience of a locus from our experience of a memorial. A memorial has something in common with a work of art, in the sense that we assume that a work of art, a painting or piece of sculpture, is a more or less demanding message, explicitly addressed to us, something that asks of us a focused interest, a degree of concentration, even absorption...But we experience a locus inattentively, in a state of distraction (p. 34).

When Tepebağ houses are considered in this sense, it can be seen that the boundaries of locus and memorial become blurred due to changing dynamics in the neighborhood, especially after restoration processes called the Project of Culture Street. The houses are restored to build memorials concerning the past of Adana while they were/are locus for being home to residents for a long time. On the other hand, this transformation regarding experience may influence and be influenced by new economic relations at the same time because memorialisation policies are determined by new economic attempts that can have impacts on existing modes of both economic and social relations as well.

Beside aforementioned political and social changes, neoliberal policies after 1980s which include a progressive economic model that is based on priority for private sector and privatization of public services have accelerated. These neo-liberal policies have been re-shaped by the construction sector in the AKP government years, namely 2002-onward (Yeşilbağ 2016; Çavuşoğlu 2013; Candan and Maltaş 2016). This burst of the construction sector influences urban places as the centers of integrating into world economic system and force them to participate in competition, as Candan and Maltaş (2016, p. 6.) argue. As a result of this accelerating transformation, cities have become both fields of economic desires through financial investments like constructing touristic attractions and concrete symbols of the

narrated past that may erode the traces of material memories as well and policy of heritage marketing which is elaborated in the chapter 3 has become visible. Basing on this heritage policy, Adana Culture Street Project that aims the restoration and reconstruction of Tepebağ houses is an instance that displays this construction-reconstruction (and sometimes deconstruction) of the city places for arranging a historical place to make it attractive for financial reasons and locus of history making for a desired past which conceals some traces and details about unwanted groups that is the Armenian community in this case.

When it comes to consequences of the study, the research and work on this matter, I think, will contribute to the literature in three ways. First of all, through Tepebağ houses and the Culture Street the importance of materiality is brought to the stage. Over-emphasized Turkishness of the district and its history become too vulnerable when the past of the houses and the neighborhood is told in details. Therefore, historical places have become crucial uncanny “treasures” that create bizarre gaps, spaces in adopted narratives. They function both as constructive and deconstructive elements in the imagination of local and national unity. Thereby, this thesis is to show how materiality and place memory have become affective parameters in the creation and recreation of belonging to a landscape and nation by recalling the “others” once lived there.

Secondly, it will make contribution to the discussions about nostalgia and heritage marketing that has boomed in recent years especially because of new urban plans and neo-liberalism. The case of Tepebağ houses makes this “need” of nostalgia and heritage consumption, its motives and reasons clearer in the context of Turkey through the Culture Street Project which is conducted in the Tepebağ Neighborhood.

Moreover, I will try to show how heritage sites can be used for past and future imaginations and their functions in silencing subordinated memories.

Finally, it gives a chance to see how history and memory can consolidate each other whereas sometimes they contradict with each other at the same time. Hence this study presents an instance for the complex relation between history and memory which concludes with the cooperation and/or contradiction with the personal. Here what I will try to focus is not the rewriting or evaluation of the truth of the discourses and accounts regarding the Armenian people in Adana at the beginning of the twentieth century, the 1909 Adana Massacres and the 1915 Genocide, but the interaction or conflicts between what officially is imposed and told among the current settlers of Tepebağ regarding both these events and old Armenian community. It will be necessary to give information about the field and methods that have been used in the study before focusing on details.

1.2 Transformation of Tepebağ since the late ninetieth century

Tepebağ neighborhood has some traces of Adana which includes mainly old houses and some “undefined” debris that are associated with old Armenian settlements and churches. Because of the fact that I was in pursuit of relation between place memory and influences of traces, I have chosen Tepebağ houses to study the traces of the past Armenian community in Adana. It must be also noticed that this area, owing to its location and relatively high land position in the city, has become the founding district of Adana, and the district *Tepebağ Höyüğü* (Tepebağ Mound) and excavations here prove that it was once the centre of Adana city until recently.

Tepebağ as the centre of old Adana locates in the city centre and nearby Seyhan River. After the earthquake that happened in 27 June 1998 in Adana almost each house in this district was damaged and abandoned which makes the neighborhood a sparsely-populated area. As such, merely about 1500 people reside in the neighborhood according to the official records. However, not only the earthquake but also some economic and social reasons contribute to this situation. Though it is home to textile and sign painter's workplaces in the streets near main avenues, inner streets of the district is usually too uncanny as the deserted houses are spots for glue-sniffers and the quarter is insecure for the residents. These houses, therefore, have become undesired and fearful objects for being symbols of insecurity both reminding the Armenian past of the district and homing to glue-sniffers today. While Tepebağ has become the core point of the city in terms of economy, culture and history for a long time, it has been influenced by changing dynamics of the city as well. Therefore, looking at the transformation of Adana in brief will give information about both economic and social conditions of Tepebağ.

Adana, before the Ottoman rule known as Cilicia, was an Armenian land on which Cilicia Armenian Kingdom reigned in the course of 1080-1375. During the Muslim conquest nomads, especially the Ramazanoğlu tribe, had started to settle in Cilicia and helped the Memluks to gain this territory (Toksöz, 2015, p. 235). The Ramazanoğlu chiefdom became the major political actor in the region until it was annexed to the Ottomans in the sixteenth century. After being a part of the Ottoman Empire, Adana became an ordinary region that was a useless marshes land. With the beginning of the westernization and capitalist market in the Ottoman Empire in the first half of nineteenth century Adana became an important area with its vast plains which were appropriate for cotton planting. Not only economic but also

demographical dynamism was a distinctive feature of Adana at that era. When social nature of the region analyzed it can be seen that there were Greeks, Arabs, Armenians and nomad Turcoman constituted the population which is a typical instance for Ottoman cities where different ethnic and religious groups lived (Toksöz, 2015, p. 233). Economic development was a critical turning point in both Ottoman and Adana history because capital accumulation and nationalization of economy has been one of the principal fields reorganized for nation-building process in Turkey at the same time.² By the second half of the ninetieth century the Armenian community in Adana was the most prosperous group in the city that was a consequence of working as moneylenders, merchants and rural traders and this made them more visible in Adana and Ottoman context (Bloxham, 2003, p. 28). Especially agricultural progress in Adana made the city one of the most distinguished centers of the Ottoman Empire for investment and prosperity that resulted with diversity in cultural, social life. First signals of the crackling of this composition occurred in 1909 when massive assaults and fights took place between Muslims and Armenians.

In this thesis, my intention is not to evaluate causes and results of the 1909 massacres but to analyze its effects that had great impacts on organizing relations with non-Muslims, especially Armenians thereafter and the way it is remembered by the present community in the neighborhood. In this vein, April the 1909 incidents were the verge for the next conflicts and Turkish-Armenian (in fact non-Muslim) relations in Adana. The Armenian Armenians were the most influential group in

² It has been claimed that properties of non-Muslims were used as principal capital to form a “national economy”, and both in late Ottoman and new established Turkish Republic era this economy politics applied systematically. To follow discussions on this theme see:

Emval-i Metruk Olayı: Osmanlı’da ve Cumhuriyet’te Ermeni ve Rum Mallarının Türkleştirilmesi, Nevzat Onaran, Belge Yayınları, 2010.

Kanunların Ruhu: Emval-i Metruke Kanunlarında Soykırımın İzini Sürmek, Taner Akçam, Ümit Kurt, İletişim Yayınları, 2012.

The Armenian Genocide: A Complete History, Raymond Kevorkian, I:B: Tauris, 2011.

Adana until the 1909 incidents. These incidents started right after the 31 March Uprising which was held against the Second Constitutionalism in 14 April 1909 (According to the Rumi calendar it corresponds to 31 March). Toksöz (2015) says that

In those events called *turmoil* in official Ottoman dispatches, as *incident* in local sources, as *disaster* in Armenian and *massacre* in missionary and other recordings the number of victims reached –according to resource- varies between 15.000 and 30.000. Although there is difference between numbers, all these resources agree with magnitude of loss of life and property (p. 241).

Aside which party was responsible for that chaos and number of killed people, as Toksöz states, there was a huge death toll that made the incident the basis for relations between two parties that was based on distrust and mutual fear from that event on in Adana.³ Moreover this was the beginning of demolishing the Armenian churches and buildings which eventually erased the traces and memory of non-Muslims in Adana. The number and invisibility of non-Muslims' buildings in today's Adana show this transformed culture of the city which once was a place where different religious and ethnic groups lived in, as it is shown below in the figure 1.



Figure 1. Adana before 1909. Meltem Toksöz's Archive

³ Armenian author Zabel Yesayan as a member of Committee for Inspection of Cilicia Events by Patriarchate, in her book *Among the Ruins* tells the immediate situation after the massacre. This is a passage from the book: "Everywhere in ruin. Nothing mercied, all churches, schools, houses... all of them burned, all of them have become just mass of stones... among some of them building carcasses stand. A relentless, cruel hate has burned everything up to the Turkish neighborhood boundaries. And two minarets stand proudly in this fatal silence and vast ash piles." *Yıkıntılar Arasında*, Aras Publication, 2014, p. 38. What is important in this passage is the disappointment and anger toward what had happened there and the deeds of Turkish and graveness of the turmoil.

Though Adana witnessed a huge destruction during these incidents, the non-Muslim population continued to be a remarkable proportion in the population. Before the 1894-96 conflicts and massacres against Armenians, population of the city of Adana exceeded 30.000 which consisted of 13.000 Muslims, 12.000 Armenians, 5.000 Greeks and other ethnic and religious groups like Jewish, Levantines, American Missionaries in 1892 (Toksöz and Yalçın 1999, p. 443). Even after the 1895-96 and the 1909 massacre the Armenian community was a prevalent group in *Adana Vilayeti* (region). For instance, the number of Armenians was 74.930 in 1912 and they formed 11.2 percent of the total population of the whole province of Adana (Çomu, 2005, p. 48) but this number decreased to just 637 in 1922 (Çomu, 2005, p. 58). The main reason behind this dramatic decrease was the Decree of Deportation (*Tehcir Kanunu*) that was issued on May 27, 1915. Although 120.000 Armenians came back after Adana was occupied by French troops in 1918, they become almost invisible by 1922 owing to the Ankara Treaty (October 20, 1921) between the Turkish and French army and other factors like making Armenian identity covered by being Muslim.⁴ The end of French occupation was an ending for the heterogeneous character of Adana at the same time, for it caused massive flights of Armenians and Greeks from the region (Çomu, 2005, 48). With the establishment of the new nation-state, politics of a homogenous nation strictly has prevailed, and Adana and Tepebağ lost its multicultural nature in terms of non-Muslim communities from that time on. Population of Adana is 1.8 million by 2017⁵ and there is only one church in the city center that is open on certain days and hours because of being cautious against

⁴The case of Armenians who became Muslim has been debated recently and the situation and remarks in Tepebağ regarding this issue will be elaborated in the next chapters. By the way, it should be added that Armenians were not the only non-Muslim group in the region and their population was 518 in 1922 while there were 12.000 Greeks in 1914 according to Çomu, 58. Because of being the biggest non-Muslim community in Adana, history of Armenians has been debated recently while other social groups ignored. Çomu's work is a good example to review Greeks' situation and their place in Adana before 1923.

⁵http://adana.yerelnet.org.tr/il_ilce_nufus.php?iladi=ADANA, accessed on 02 June 2017.

possible attacks. Thus, it can be seen that religious diversity and visibility of non-Muslim community in Adana has perished though it has been a place of attraction for agriculture and industry as one of the biggest city of Turkey until recent times it loses this feature gradually.

The industrial development in Turkey which started in 1950s has affected Adana and Tepebağ as well. Due to shift of economic core toward the north and the west of the city and because of some difficulties about the application of preserving decisions, Tepebağ lost its values and was abandoned to its own fate that created a neglected district (Payaslı Oğuz and Aksulu, 2007). The earthquake on 28 June 1998 effected Tepebağ neighborhood severely and houses in the district that were made of adobe and masonry have become dangerous to settle in. However, they were kept by some people to be used as unregistered shops like kebab houses or places for glue-sniffers, and some examples of these houses can be seen in Figure 2, 3 and 4.



Figure 2. A Tepebağ House



Figure 3. A Tepebağ House



Figure 4. A Tepebağ House

All these social, demographical and architectural transformations have made Adana a poor city in terms of historical sites and local memory because materials are the remnants and registers of those who have lived in there previously and can play a crucial role to construct a local or national identity. When these registers disappear or are destroyed, not only they cannot find a place materially in a real environment but also it is almost impossible to imagine the community related to them. In other words, materials can be instruments for imagination and construction of a history and fill or empty a realm of memory. For instance, the fact that the Ramazanoğlu Chiefdom has been a critical past actor is mentioned frequently both during the field

study by interviewees and in the books and articles about Adana, because of the main historical attractions like *Ulu Cami* (Grand Mosque) and its *madrasah* complex and the Ramazanoğlu Palace. The Ramazanoğlu chiefdom has a more visible history and is emphasized by locals in contrast to the Ottoman Empire that ruled the region for approximately four centuries but built no remarkable constructions in the city. For this reason the decision about which part of the past and its artifacts will have prominence in an organization of place can directly influence what will be added to and omitted from the physical environment and what should be remembered and forgotten in narratives as well. The Culture Street Project in Tepebağ, in this regard, gives some clues about place and memory organization.

When I have decided to study on the role of Tepebağ houses in imagination and construction of a past and future of the district, I have found out that a street of Tepebağ named *Avukat Turhan Arın Caddesi* has been chosen for the Culture and Art Street Project by Seyhan Municipality. This gave me an opportunity to witness the construction and planning of the street and to meet the people in charge of the project at the same time. Now the district faces with a new re-construction process and the question is how this street and houses and their history will be organized, constructed and presented as the core of the historical city of Adana.

1.3 Methodology

In this thesis I have used in-depth interview method by meeting people from the neighborhood. These interviews are the main source for me to understand and analyze the imagination and memory regarding Tepebağ along with the discourse analysis which is the other tool that I have used in this study to examine both official

accounts like textbooks, travel guides of Culture and Tourism Ministry regarding Adana, and interviewees' notions.

I went to the field to talk to people firstly on December 2016 and then on February 2017. First of all, I started to observe the field to grasp a chance for understanding the circumstances of the abandoned houses and streets. After observing the site, I met an architect who worked on the project and he enabled me to talk to some residents in the neighborhood which means that while in some cases I have used snow-balling sampling through the architect, in some cases I met with some officials in a scheduled way and I have talked three of the residents randomly. I have interviewed people face to face except the only Armenian interviewee with whom I talked on the phone. Due to environmental and social condition of the district there are not too many young or teenagers in the neighborhood where almost all streets look like a deserted place. Because of the mentioned reason and the aim to be able to pursue traces regarding the Armenian past I talked to the elderly residents of Tepebağ of whom the youngest is fifty five years old. Just two officials are below forties. It must be added that only one person whom I have interviewed is female while all the others are male, for there are very few residents in the neighborhood and most of the people there are the workers or tradesman, and it was very hard to reach women because of the conservative nature of the district. The state of emergency also makes people restless to talk to a stranger. However, this unique female informant's accounts differ from male ones' explanations in terms of context and the way she expressed her experiences and this account gives some clues about memory transition and recounting in regards to gender.

The state of emergency, which was declared on 20 July 2016 after a failed coup and prevails from that day on and caused tens of thousands of dismissals of

civil servants and tens of thousands of detentions, has created a more insecure atmosphere to speak especially on such questions. That's why contacting to the residents via the architect made it easier for me to interview them. On the other hand, though I had an appointed meeting with the only Armenian interviewee, he cancelled it just one hour before the scheduled time saying that it is useless to talk about the Armenian memory and traces in Adana and I can use the online resources for this purpose. However, he did not explain the reason behind this cancellation which might stem from the distress due to the state of emergency in the country that could have influenced other residents' and civil servants' statements at the same time. Especially an archaeologist with whom I spoke and who is a civil servant insisted on me not taking notes about the interview or recording his voice. In order to respect their demands on this issue and to not reveal their identities I will not use the participants' real names in this study.

Formation and imagination of national or local identity and memory is a complex issue that requires the examination of economic, social and political conditions. Both for this reason and to understand the multilayered local dynamics of the district I touched upon local relations, economic concerns and their expectations from the Culture Street project while conducting interviews.

When it comes to organization of this thesis, in the following chapter materiality, Tepebağ houses as remnants of the Armenian population and memory will be focused on, and some discursive and emotional aspects of this memory that stems from materials will be handled. In this vein, the role of materiality to fill and create some gaps in the given narratives and how it can function as an element for a locality will be discussed.

The third chapter is about the commodification of memory and investment of future imagination through the Culture Street Project that is based on heritage policies and causes construction of a desired past and erasing of traces regarding non- Muslims and attempts to create material images for an imagined history. In this respect, nostalgia and tolerance discourses towards other peoples, especially Armenians, will be analyzed. Moreover, I will engage on the aim and possibility of gentrification of the district which is an indicator for commercializing of the historical places and the city in general.

In the fourth chapter, after discussing relation/conflict between history and memory, assimilation of the local narratives into national one both by language and political imagination will be reviewed. The impacts of emotion will be examined in this reciprocal relation. The role of archaeology, education and official tourism guides in consolidating official narrative and homogenous selective memory will be another focus. Selective memory will be analyzed through discussing forgetting of some crucial events like the 1909 massacres and the 1915 Events while some others are emphasized by the dwellers.

In the concluding chapter I will try to examine the nature of and interaction between the local and national narratives and both consolidating and conflicting power of material traces on this history and/or memory and along with the consequences of the study, some questions about the literature and future studies will be addressed.

CHAPTER 2

PLACE MEMORY AND TEPEBAĞ HOUSES

In this chapter the place memories produced and circulated through the materiality, and in Tepebağ case via historical houses and some other buildings, will be discussed as the main residues from the past Armenian community of Adana city. For that reason I am going to explore following questions: Why places and place memory are important for coherent national and local narratives? How do Tepebağ houses as materiality function in social memory in order to construct local narratives? In what ways the memory regarding Tepebağ houses is reflecting the traces of formal narratives? How can place and in this context Tepebağ houses be a field of struggle regarding the place memory?

2.1 A case of place memory: Tepebağ houses

Tepebağ houses are historical buildings that locate on the Tepebağ Mound which has been a part of the city centre since the establishment of the city in the ancient times. It was the most important neighborhood of the city thanks to its being the center of dwelling and economy until early 1970s, as the interviewees underline many times. Despite the decline of cotton agriculture and textile industry it continued to be the heart of the city till 1998. In the interviews, the informants generally pointed out three historical events or facts as the landmarks of Tepebağ and the city when the history of Tepebağ was asked. First one is the situation of Adana during the Anatolian War; second theme is the golden age of Adana which they date from the foundation of the Republic to early 1970s and third one is the earthquake which occurred on 28 June 1998; and all of these three phases are associated with the

houses in a way by the residents because changing dynamics of the city have influenced the prestige, residents of the district and thereby the way of remembering the past of them.

Residents always tell the golden times of Adana when the memory concerning old Tepebağ is asked. According to what the informants expressed, the district was the most prosperous neighborhood in Adana where *agas* (landlords) and rich people lived. Therefore some sayings about Tepebağ were frequently mentioned by the residents in order to underline the importance of the neighborhood until recent times. These are some examples:

Old people used to ask: Do you have properties in Tepebağ? It was an idiom to underline the prestige of Tepebağ. (Kerem, see Appendix, 1)

There was a saying for the value of Tepebağ, which is “you should have a bride from Tepebağ”. (Ömer, see Appendix, 2)

Though Tepebağ lost its popularity by the 1970s because of the industrial decline, it was a vivid district of Adana until the devastating earthquake occurred in 1998. That earthquake has been significant for Tepebağ houses because it demolished or damaged most of the houses and made the district an almost deserted area in addition to emotional impacts on the dwellers. These are some examples from the residents that display how the earthquake took place in their minds and memory:

The earthquake occurred, everybody was scared, and they left. There are only four or five households here. (Halime, see Appendix, 3)

Officials of Adana did not care about Tepebağ. Especially after the earthquake these houses have been neglected and everybody left them. (Aykut, see Appendix, 4)

I have been living here for thirty eight years. After the earthquake here [Tepebağ] is finished. Now there are merely drunks, glue-sniffers around here. (Ali, see Appendix, 5)

Today, there is a scarce population in the neighborhood though its demography once again changes in terms of economic and social classes. Tepebağ houses which were the most prestigious settlements of the city are deserted or scarcely populated and these *agas'* old houses became the residents of poor people. Moreover, the influence of the Syria war and refugees can be seen in the region, as well, in the recent times. Celal, a retired teacher who works on advertising now, after complaining about the present situation of the district comparing with the past liveliness in Tepebağ expresses that

Then, poor people pour along the district. They do it especially in order not to pay money for transportation [because here is near the city center], and now Syrians come to here to reside. (Celal, see Appendix, 6)

So, when the history of the district and houses comes into question the earthquake and its effects which inscribed itself on minds, changing demography and lost prestige are remembered. However, what makes the houses remarkable for this study is that though they are desolated and most of them became ruins, these mostly damaged houses still continue to become the instruments for local memory and identity, and sometimes as concrete materials they might create some gaps in the widespread narrative regarding the houses reminding the Armenian past of them.

Even though from the beginning of this study the term Tepebağ houses has been used to describe the historical buildings in Tepebağ avoiding political discussions about the subject and because of not being an expert on the architecture, actually another term and/or description is frequently being used for them: traditional Turkish houses. This is a significant example of how the place memory is intervened through identifying the place with a certain nationality. Naming a place or an issue

usually gives critical information about the approach towards the subject in question⁶ because, as Connerton (2009) argues, “Place-names can be more than markers and delimiters of place, more than tokens used to mark out and negotiate positions in social interaction” (p. 10) and constructed relations with the communities that live or lived in the same area. Apart from the fact that the traditional Adana house concept is a new phenomenon imported and invented in modern times (Toksöz, 1999, p. 442), adding the word Turkish before the completion is remarkable in terms of underlining nationalistic desires concerning the history of the buildings. Both in the booklets prepared by the Culture and Tourism Moderate of the Province and some personal guides these houses are depicted as the instances of traditional Turkish houses.⁷ Likewise, the residents of the neighborhood generally name them as Turkish houses while they can be conflicted in some cases. Upon the question what he knows about the history of Tepebağ and the houses, this is the answer uttered by him:

Tepebağ, you know, is a place what is left from the Armenians...These are old Turkish houses. Old women used to look outside from the bow window. (Celal, see Appendix, 7)

However, it should be remembered that “they [the place names]cover the past of a place, half-hide a history” (Connerton, 2009, p. 10), and Celal’s accounts regarding Tepebağ and the houses is one of these inconsistent remarks that actually admits the hidden Armenian past but defines the houses as unique examples of the Turkish architecture. Similar shifts can be seen in some other examples and these may stem to cover cracks in the construction of the local and national imagination. However,

⁶ The discussions on naming regarding both Kurdish question and Armenian issue in Turkey show how naming a subject can be important. For instance, the message of the USA president is followed in Turkey every year not because of its content but for what term will be used for 1915 events. Moreover, for the state politics regarding changing place names into Turkish ones and its relation to memory see chapter 1.

⁷ The only exception in formal descriptions about the houses can be found on the website of the Seyhan Governorate which describes Tepebağ in this way: “It [Tepebağ] presents Armenian architecture through historical houses and stone made schools” <http://www.seyhan.gov.tr/turizm>

materiality finds a way to display its memory that can be unwanted by overwhelming narratives. Sometimes the residents directly associate the houses with the Armenians. Ömer, who is a retired tradesman that has lived in Tepebağ since 1955, after reciting the protests against the Sixth Shipping and its effects on Armenian people in Adana which resulted in departure of the Armenians in Adana I asked him what Armenians left behind, he answered:

Their houses. For example this house was bought from an Armenian by one of our brothers. They [Armenians] left and gone. You can see lots of such buildings here. (Ömer, see Appendix, 8)

[Is there any Armenian here now?] (Me, see Appendix, 9)

None. Because, well, let's not call it dissolution, perhaps it can be put in this way: with the decline of wealth and commerce they went to İstanbul. (Ömer, see Appendix, 10)

In this account, too, the houses become the means of place memory by reminding the silenced past of the neighborhood. The reasons behind that leaving are refrained and other details regarding the Armenians are ignored and the contrarian connotations about the issue are followed by silences. This attitude of rejecting or not speaking about the Armenian past of the houses is clear in the one of the expert's speech who is engaged in preservation, restoration and re-creation of the houses. For instance, when I asked him whether Armenians lived in those houses and there are any Armenian house in the neighborhood one of the officials who knows every detail of the houses as an educated archaeologist expresses that

I am opposed to this categorization. Somebody says Armenian used to live here, these houses belonged to them. It is too hard to distinguish the differences in the Ottoman. For example, let's say, the house was built in the Armenian style. But, perhaps the builder was a Muslim and he learnt the job from an Armenian and maybe a Muslim family lived in this supposed house. There was the concept of *tebaa* in the Ottoman Empire; it is not possible to categorize people as Turks, Armenians, Jews or Greeks. All of them used to live together, in the same district. We can only talk about the Ottoman style when the buildings become the matter of question. (Aykut, see Appendix, 11)

Although the archaeologist points out some remarkable facts such as the complexity of determining the disparities between the Muslim and non-Muslim houses, it is well known that ethnic and religious communities in the Ottoman Empire generally lived in their circles and neighborhoods and this is true for the city of Adana as well.⁸ The archaeologist, after explaining the situation in the Ottoman era, tries to combine all the peoples in the Ottoman identity which is a common strategy and discourse in recent years to underline the peaceful and tolerant atmosphere in the past while he points another kiosk as a Turkish house basing his notions on a crescent carved upon the door of the house. Moreover, after talking about the district in details, he shows me some ruins as possible relics of a demolished church on the same street, alleging that architectural design like oval walls are probably parts of the church. The archaeologist's accounts imply some details about the operation of the place memory through relics and houses as the material residues of the Armenian past of the region, and remembrance of the undesired past both in local and national context.

Aykut, the archaeologist, firstly finds it impossible to determine which buildings belong to Muslims or Armenians whereas with the ongoing in-depth interview he comments on almost each house, building on the street in detail and at the end of the conversation once more underlines that the houses will be restored according to the Ottoman Empire architecture when he notices he is out of the margins of the widespread narrative regarding the houses. In other words, Aykut, like every resident in the neighborhood, tells the history of houses and the Armenian community with a hesitation stemming from creating places in place memory and the past, and these buildings become main delimiters of formal and informal narratives

⁸ In articles and maps about Adana the neighborhoods of Adana are described in detail and it is clear that, more or less, Muslim and non-Muslim communities gathered in some neighborhoods or streets separately. For information about neighborhoods in Adana in the past and their features see (Saban 2006; Yörük 2012).

and constructed memories that remind past communities, especially Armenians. Similar case concerning place and memory can be found in Öztürkmen's research about the Black Sea town Tirebolu. She claims that "In the case of Tirebolu, objects of material culture, such as old houses, church remains, cemeteries, shops and gardens became important elements which stimulated narratives about past communities" (Öztürkmen, 2003, 180). In the case of Tepebağ, too, places trigger remembering and speaking about the Armenians, - as the once largest non-Muslim community of Adana, however, places are also the tools of infringements against the generally circulated narratives. In addition to these functions and operations of the place memory, it is remarkable that Aykut makes references how the houses become the pivot of conflicting stories about the Armenian past of the neighborhood by saying "Somebody says Armenian used to live here, these houses belonged to them" in the above quote. Thus, place memory and materiality resist against the given history of them and show what can be converted in the local memories. According to Mazzoleni (1993),

Buildings, streets, squares are just part of the habitat; the tip of an iceberg: the visible and tangible part. Behind and within this tangibility and visibility, there is something else which is difficult to represent with concepts and words because it belongs to a pre-logical field of experience, to non-verbal communication (p. 285).

Therefore, as Mazzoleni asserts about concrete materials, Tepebağ houses as material objects and memory places become the source against what they symbolize or used for in the grand narrative and they create some cracks in that imagination with the traces pointing the rest of the icebergs. The reminding and undermining nature of place and materiality can be found in the smaller parts of residues like a brick, as it does in one of the architect's remarks. When Kenan, the architect, gave some details

about the restoration process and aim of the Culture Street Project, the Armenian history of the materials comes into question all of a sudden

I mean the original material of the construction becomes visible after breaking the plaster on walls and we start to restore them. The bricks of that era are found and they are re-constructed. We gain the buildings in this way. We are doing scraper, I am curious to about what will be come up, mmm, well, its name is Armenian brick, an Armenian brick comes out. (Kenan, see Appendix, 12)

[Why is it called the Armenian brick?] (Me, see Appendix, 13)

The Armenian brick, the Armenians in the past, I mean it is called the Armenian brick as a product, but I ask myself the reason behind it, perhaps they were used by the Armenians but we do not call it in this way. The Ottoman Era buildings were made of stone and wood generally. I mean stone is the dominant material in those buildings. (Kenan, see Appendix, 14)

In this speech it is obvious that the memory regarding the Armenians of Adana is conveyed through a sort of brick which has been used overwhelmingly in the houses of Tepebağ. Thus, not only the houses but even a particular material from those buildings carries traces about suppressed memories and stories in the district. A brick becomes more than a stone which densely transmits remembrance and existence of an old community that is almost forgotten both in formal and informal memories and narratives. So, as in Aykut's case, physical residues, ruins become tools of contested memories and discourses relieving unconscious level of remembrance by creating links between past and present, overt and covert, what should be and what is actually remembered. It is interesting that, on the other hand, this violation of hegemonic narrative regarding the houses through the material and naming is noticed by Kenan who at first refrains from using the word Armenian to define the brick. Despite the fact that Kenan explains the progression of the restoration fluently, he hesitates when the word of Armenian comes into question that creates a gap in the coherent, widespread narrative. Even, as if it is a banned word, he repeatedly adds that this, the Armenian brick, is a naming used by locals but not by "them" which indicates that

the district is a locus for residing people where experiences and narratives transferred through walls. In Kenan's account it is not clear who they are but probably he refers to the experts like architectures. In this vein, Tepebağ houses which are presented as traditional Turkish houses as a part of national imagination and representation may yield contrary results as it is shown in a similar case regarding the rural English houses that are nationally valued and recognized but become spots of anti-narrative usually reminding poor people and slavery in that area in contrast to formally presented narrative (Smith & Waterton 2009, 71). It must be noticed that on the one hand, place memory creates gaps in the national narrative, and on the other hand such contested memory fill the spaces like the 1909 and 1915 massacres which are never mentioned as it was argued in the third chapter.

Some other aspects of last two accounts given by two officers who are not residents of the neighborhood but working in the restoration of a street of Tepebağ and some houses more than three months and know the locals intimately have made them different from other ones. These accounts give some clues about how contested discourses and memory regarding the houses circulated among locals and materiality and places became signs of an unspeakable past though those details about places and naming like the Armenian brick are usual usages in daily local language. Even though the residents do not talk about Armenians in detail in our interviews, it is clear that stories about Armenians and their old settlements are frequently circulating subjects which are well-known and told topics among the local people. This conflicting or heterogeneous nature of memories and discourses can be interpreted in terms of identity and belonging at the same time. These stories play the role of cement to bring local people together by creating the others of the local community

which in this case are the Armenians, because every person in the neighborhood constructs his/her own identity by referring the Armenians as the other.

The Armenians and their traces became local secrets through which local identity is confirmed because “Identity and memory are not simply something you ‘have’ but are something you experience and perform” (Smith & Emma, 2009, 48) and remembering and forgetting as performing tools of past and present imagination are fundamental elements of such an identity construction, and a bound neighborhood community has been constructed in such a way in Tepebağ. While these houses include potential threats against the hegemonic narrative, they are mediums of being a member of the local community by providing secrets and reminding struggle over who controlled/control the location. Because of the fact that “Many neighborhoods are defined as much by social, religious or ethnic group as by location. Identities are so much easier to define if they are negatively drawn against another locality, nation or group” (Forward, 2003, 157). Therefore, in the Tepebağ context, while the local community become bound through local secrets about the houses and places in the district they can be integrated into grandiose national imagination by not telling about the Armenian past of the city to the outsiders but underlining the Turkish roots and history of Tepebağ which may stem from the assimilating power of the official narrative about the nation. This mechanism of making local identity and memory consistent with the hegemonic narrative can be seen in some other academic works. In his study regarding the Romeika speaking people in Trabzon, Sağlam (2013) argues how the national identity is performed and preserved. For Sağlam (2013)

Not only the present is constructed in a secure way, but also the circuit of meaning is completed through the official history theses of the Republican

hegemony that attempt to organize not only the present, but also the past of the subjects (p. 66).

As in the case of Trabzon, the locals' way of thinking and construction relation with the past and present of Tepebağ, consciously or unconsciously, loses its inconsistent nature against the national narrative on the wider scale of community, e.g. the nation, and instantaneously topic changes and avoidance of using the word Armenian in order to describe houses manifests how it has been realized. In other words, Tepebağ houses are the main residues about which lost stories and memories regarding Armenians are told and in which struggles over narrating the past and memory come true in Adana even though they can have haunting memory as it will be discussed in the following pages.

2.2 Tepebağ houses and stories

Tepebağ houses function as the concrete materials through which local memory and identity are constructed and they are places of haunting memory that produces at the same time emotional effects on the settlers either by opening paths to tell stories about the traumatic experiences in the region or spreading fear which can be traced in the national security politics interwoven with neo-liberal policies which will be discussed in the following chapter. By the term haunting memory I mean the penetration of the Armenian past into the circulation of place and local memory despite the fact that the dwellers especially try to refrain from mentioning them when narrating the past of the district. This haunting memory is fuelled by terrifying stories and ghosts pervading over three certain places two of which are in Tepebağ: Bebekli Church, Tepebağ Secondary School and Adana Science High School. For example when Kerem, a machinery repairman whose family has lived in Tepebağ at least for a

century, talks about the Armenians in Tepebağ, he recounts horrible stories that were told him by his grandfather and elderly people in the neighborhood. Here is one of these accounts which can be regarded as the slightest one:

My grandfather held my hand. I was a third grade student at the primary school, I think. To celebrate a religious festival, my grandfather and I went to one of his friend's house. We went there. There was a stain beneath a window of the Tepebağ Secondary School. He asked me "Son, you know what this is?" The soil's color is reddish in Tepebağ, so I said that it must be mud stain. He said "No you are wrong. I will explain it but do not forget what I will tell you... It is said that Armenians had dangled our, we the Muslim Turks', heads from that window and blew their heads with swords... There had been a well in the schoolyard. Armenians threw the corps into the well. (Kerem, see Appendix, 15)

Both in this and some other accounts, these places have become the signs of the alleged Armenian brutality during the Anatolian War and memories in the neighborhood. This does not mean such places create emotions like fear but they reproduce such affects via being the signs of brutality and fear in the stories regarding them because "Fear does not come from within the subject, nor does it reside in its object: we are not afraid of others because they are fearsome. Through the circulation of signs of fear, the black other "becomes" fearsome" (Ahmed, 2004, 126).

Regardless of recounted incidents really happened in the past, and regardless of actually witnessing the incidents during the war places like the primary school building provide transmitting of stories from generation to generation by still living in the ghostly haunting memory. Such vivid accounts concerning Armenians and what happened to Muslim Turks which are repeatedly uttered by the residents operate like testimonies about the matter in question, they and can be powerful elements in identity making. As Ahmed (2004) asserts "the fetishisation of the wound as a sign of identity is crucial to testimonial culture (Ahmed and Satecey 2001) in which narratives of pain and injuries have proliferated" (32). In addition to those traumatic stories, some conspiracies told in the district play a role in creating

an insecure atmosphere both in the past and the present through stories like the story of a tunnel in the neighborhood, and also another place becomes the focus point of the stories: Bebekli Church, the unique church in the city.

It is interesting that Tepebağ's people always point out the Armenian origin of the Bebekli Church while in all of the formal introducing writings about the church it is presented as an Italian Catholic Church. However, the haunting memory regarding the church in which it turns out to be the starting point in all narratives about plots against Turks makes it possible for the locals to know a different, Armenian version of the church's history. Aykut, who is one of the officers working in the culture street project, warns me about to not believe what Serdar, the popular figure in the district and a treasure hunter who lives in Tepebağ since the late 1970s, would tell me about the neighborhood referring the tunnel legend:

He damages science, archaeology. What he tells does not correspond to the reality... Guys like him are very dangerous for such places. He talks nonsense saying Armenians had lived here, they had dug a tunnel from the Bebekli Church to Karataş [a coastal province of Adana locates on the Mediterranean Sea]. (Aykut, see Appendix, 16)

[You say there is not such a tunnel?] (Me, see Appendix, 17)

Of course, there is not. What they call as tunnel is actually a sewer system. (Aykut, see Appendix, 18)

Aykut firstly objects what Serdar tells about the tunnel legend explaining the true nature of the tunnel-like constructions. However, in the second answer he replaces pronoun "he" with "they" which manifests how widely the legend is known and told in the district. Though experts like Aykut explain the structure scientifically, ghostly memory is re-produced as it provides circulation of discourse of insecurity and vice versa. This insecure atmosphere in the past is related to the haunting memory has been penetrated in the present circumstances and security politics. Kerem mentions the tunnel and the church in this way:

I was a student at Tepebağ Secondary School. There was a tunnel in that school which reaches the Bebekli Church. All of these places have been used by Armenians during the Anatolian War. (Kerem, see Appendix, 19)

[I have heard about the tunnels, but is there something like that or is it a legend?] (Me, see Appendix, 20)

There is, of course there is such a tunnel. Moreover, men had used tunnels to go to the place which we now call Science School from the *Bebekli Kilise*. (Kerem, see Appendix, 21)

[Why is there a connection to the Science School?] (Me, see Appendix, 22)

It is said that this place was a church too. (Kerem, see Appendix, 23)

[An Armenian church?] (Me, see Appendix, 24)

Of course. They had organized secret plans or missionary activities against Turks. They still do. (Kerem, see Appendix, 25)

In this dialogue, too, the church is considered as the centre of the plots, and Kerem underlines that the threat prevails in the present as expressed in his last sentence. Even though there is not any evidence concerning the plots organized by the church against the present Turkish community, the informant presents the church as the core of disloyalty because of the ghostly memory circulating in the neighborhood. By doing this, the emotion of fear is re-articulated continuously through threats because “the language of fear involves the intensification of ‘threats’ which works to create a distinction between those who are ‘under threat’ and those who threaten” rather than explaining the source or reason of supposedly threats” (Ahmed 2004, 72). It is remarkable that other Armenian places that are not widely-known in the public come to the surface when such plots and legends are recounted. For example Science High School is defined as an old Armenian Church whereas it was an Armenian Orphanage built in the city after 1909 massacres. It became a sign of the past Armenian community and the Armenian-Turkish conflict.

The houses, the church and the tunnel legend become not only signs of fear and insecurity but also they reveal the unbearable burden for the past, local and

national identity construction. Place memory as a sign of ghostly memory always reminds the other local identity as it is associated with horrible stories and implies how the ghost is remembered. That's why "the ghost is primarily a symptom of what is missing. It gives notice not only to itself but also to what it represents"(Gordon, 2008, 63). In Tepebağ case, while the ghostly memory regarding the murdered Turks represents the distrust situation of the neighborhood and Turkey in wider context, Armenians are represented as agents of treason and cooperation with the outside powers that is associated with the today's political security discourses. However, continual reference to the Armenians reminds the missing of this people in the neighborhood and the city and formal narratives concerning Adana. So, the haunting memory related to the past Armenian community continues to take part in local memory paradoxically. The Armenian is not only the other who is a binary opposition of the Turk but an inseparable part of him/her in Tepebağ context. Moreover, this nature of the haunting memory comes with recognition of the lost time and relations through its emotional effects because, as Gordon (2008) claims, "The ghost makes itself known to us through haunting and pulls us affectively into the structure of feeling of a reality we come to experience as a recognition" (p. 63). All impacts of place memory in Tepebağ, I argue, stem from an inconsistent history of the district in which many gaps take place, and the way to cope with this issue will be explored in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

COMMODIFICATION OF HERITAGE AND IMAGINATION INVESTMENT: THE CULTURE STREET PROJECT

In the previous chapter it was discussed how places can resist against the common history and create gaps in the given discourse as materials and tools of place memory. This function of places can be reversed. In other words, places can be used as instruments of filling the blanks in the local and national narratives to organize a coherent imagination. In the context of Tepebağ and Adana city, the project of Culture Street or sometimes called by the officers as the Improvement (*sağlıklaştırma*) Project provides especially investment on place memory, imagination of both the past and the future of the neighborhood through the discourse of cultural heritage. In this regard, particularly the role of heritage on regulating place memory and related discourse will be focused on to search dynamics of imagination. Before going into details about the role of heritage for constructing a desirable past and reasons behind this need which collaborates the feeling of nostalgia and marketing the past, I will try to give some theoretical basis regarding the reason why the houses and generally heritage became important fields in recent years in Turkey, and literature of heritage and its impacts on shaping memory.

In this chapter, the material cultural heritage used for creating a historical area with the aim of displaying the past architecture of Adana city will be studied through the Culture Street project with which many Tepebağ houses will be restored and a historical street will be constructed. This project, in which six officially registered houses will be restored and outbuildings of other houses will be integrated into historical houses as the chief of the project utters, is being realized on the street

of *Avukat Turhan Arın Caddesi* that demarcates the neighborhoods of Tepebağ and Kayalibağ and lies across the whole Tepebağ from the north to the south.

The process of heritage arranging is significant in terms of making some local or national relations with the past and also making memory silenced or audible because “Many places of memory are built as overtly political projects intended to justify existing power relations or disrupt old ones” (Till, 2003, 297). As it was discussed in the previous chapter, Tepebağ houses and neighborhood are described as the indicators of Turkish history of the city and they are used as concrete proofs of Turkish roots of the district though some materials and houses resist common, formal discourses. Why do such places become tools of proving the origin and authenticity of Tepebağ, and Turkey in general, recently? What has made Tepebağ important for the history and memory of Adana all of a sudden though it was an abandoned and neglected neighborhood especially after the 1998 earthquake?

Timing is an important aspect to make some events or places remarkable in terms of their values. For instance, in his article about the debates around The Great Mosque of Cordoba Ruggles (2011) explains why the pre-Islamic remnants of the structure come to the surface in this way:

“..the reason why this collection of Roman and Visigothic materials has been brought now, instead of 75 years ago, is not a newly kindled interest... but rather a deployment of that archaeology against growing Muslim claims on the building as a site of prayer and identity. (p. 57)

Though the reason regarding making Tepebağ visible for the history of Adana is different, the timing plays a crucial role in this case as well. The discussions on the Armenian issue in Turkey and Armenians in Adana in recent years that are elaborated in the introduction are principal factors that have encouraged the residents and officers to prove Tepebağ has been a purely Turkish location from the

Ramazanoğlu Chiefdom onward. Claiming a Turkish identity and history for the past of Tepebağ, therefore, is one of the important reasons that make the district striking for Adana. However, not only this changing political atmosphere but also economic transformation in Turkey especially after the AKP has come into power in 2002 which has created an economy based on the construction sector that transforms the nature of cities making them as large construction sites (Yeşilbağ, 2016; Çavuşoğlu, 2013; Akçay, 2016;) due to the large profits by which entrepreneurs in the sector rising threefold (Candan and Maltaş, 2006) causes need for restoring or creating heritage sites in cities. This wild urbanization, I argue, makes the cities resemble to each other and damages authenticity of them that results in loss of unique identity of the cities. The loss of uniqueness brings forth the commodification of the city through tourism attempts that consider the place as the core of history and past consumption as heritage places in relation to the identity making or performing. Tepebağ and its historical houses have become the heritage site of Adana in this sense. In other words, both political debates around identity, relations with other communities and transforming economy which allows marketing the city and history consumption are facilitators making Tepebağ the place of interest with regard to the heritage politics and place memory. However, it must be noticed that when deciding on which parts would be preferred or not as part of the heritage and narratives regarding them these heritage sites face the processes of selection. Because “The legacies and relics inherited from the past are not randomly preserved, but they are selectively chosen and have survived many political upheavals and been shaped and reshaped by the politics of the past and present” (Timothy and Nyaupane, 2009, p. 42). So, heritage is “...the active construction of the past” (Rowan and Baram, 2004, p. 5). The central and targeted element in the heritage selection and arranging is the

identity and thereby memory, regardless it is based on political or economic grounds because heritage opens ways for a secured identity in this economically and discursively chaotic time. As Forward (2003) claims

Whether we are discussing the family photograph album or the national park, a major outcome of conserving and interpreting heritage, whether intended or not, is to provide identity to that family or that nation. There may be other purposes as well, such as legitimation, cultural capital and sheer monetary value, but the common purpose is to make some people feel better, more rooted and more secure (p. 147).

In addition to providing a secure present in terms of identity and memory, heritage has been the field of imagination investment concerning the past and the future which directly influence the local narratives regarding Tepebağ and its place memory; because arranging of the materials and houses in Tepebağ case come with the forgetting, for “The modern production of spaces tends to generate cultural amnesia” (Connerton, 2009, p. 136). I think “modern production of spaces” can be used both for radically transformative urbanization of the cities with the impetus of neo-liberal development and for the re-organization of historical sites like Tepebağ, and in both situations cultural amnesia pointed by Connerton is realized by eradicating or changing places which conclude with a need for a coherent past as it is going to be discussed in the following pages.

3.1 Need for a desirable past

In Tepebağ, the residents repeatedly underline that there is not any or so many historical places in Adana. This lack of historical materials is construed as absence signs of a great history and seen as a major problem by the residents when I ask them what they know about the historical sites of the city. Moreover, they explain this situation with a tone of complaint by making comparison between some foreign or

Turkish cities and Adana. For that reason they generally see Tepebağ as an opportunity to fill this material gap in the history of Adana, and Tepebağ is considered as an important heritage site by them. Celal answers the question about the importance of Tepebağ in this way:

For example, my friends were to come to Adana. They are painters from the Gazi University. As the day of meeting arrived, I pondered which places I should show them in Adana. There are not any historical artifacts in Adana. If Tepebağ houses would have been restored we could go there. There is such a deficiency in Adana, in terms of history I mean. For instance, when you go to Moscow or Vienna or İstanbul you can see the historical stone-made buildings, smelling history; but there is not such a thing here... (Celal, see Appendix, 26)

[Will restorations be crucial in terms of what you said?] (Me, see Appendix, 27)

We will be able to say there is a history of Adana. We will be able to say the historical houses were like these ones because you cannot find such historical houses outside Tepebağ. Here is the old Adana. Every city has an old neighborhood, that neighborhood distinguishes the city from other ones. (Celal, see Appendix, 28)

Celal refers other cities to show the importance of material heritage which brings the histories of cities on the scene and in his opinion Tepebağ can play this role in the history of Adana. What is more striking is that he considers old neighborhoods as the places in which identities of cities embody and make cities different from each other. So what makes a city distinctive from other ones is its unique material feature. Celal's notions concerning the city identity and history imply the need for a desired past that can show the rootedness of the district and the people at the same time. Thus, identity of the city/place and the people shape each other. Similar account is uttered by another resident:

When you go to Ankara or Safranbolu you can visit historical places. They have made very beautiful places. (Ömer, see Appendix, 29)

In this and some other examples, making comparisons to display the absence of historical places in Adana is a remarkable point because this lacuna in the city is

implicitly related to feeling of belonging to the neighborhood and the city. In this vein, organizing heritage places can play significant role to create a coherent narrative about the past and belonging because as Smityh and Waterton (2009) argue,

The memories and experiences created and reinforced by heritage performances help bind communities and other social and cultural groups through the creation of shared experiences, values and memories, all of which work to help cement or recreate social networks and ties (p. 44).

From this point of view, it does not matter whether the heritage is genuine or based on reproductions of the artifacts because the principal objective of arranging the places is to manifest an embedded landscape and narrative for imaginations through images as it was exemplified by Ömer who said that historical places were made in Safranbolu and Ankara. Not only Ömer but also some other people from the district know that historical places are re-created in Tepebağ.

Both the officers and the residents in Tepebağ imply that the heritage which will be displayed is just a sum total of images which facilitates imagination regarding the neighborhood and Adana. I call this relation and interaction between image and imagination as *image-nary* because images are used as tools for an imaginary or imagined past and future. In other words, images become field of fabricating and maintaining new imaginations. Likewise, organizing these images and places is the principal goal in the process of renovating the heritage site in Tepebağ. For instance, one of the architects of the project, Kenan, explains the process of the Improvement of the Street as follows:

I guess there are forty six or forty seven houses of which facades that locate on the street and we are going to reconstruct them. (Kenan, see Appendix, 30)

[Will you restore only the facades?] (Me, see Appendix, 31)

Yes, just facades. Well, in fact, the reason is political, how I can say, if all of the four facades are repaired, it would cost too much money for the municipality. Therefore, we are just arranging facades that directly take place

on the street. This is the purpose of the street improvement. (Kenan, see Appendix, 32)

Necati, the chief of the project, expresses similar notions regarding the street:

There are six registered historical buildings on this street [the culture street]. We want to restore them. Apart from the registered ones, we are now working on the facades of other buildings. (Necati, see Appendix, 33)

So, it is clear that a harmonious street is planned and this completeness in images will help to imagine a past without gaps. This investment on imagination is uttered not only by the officers but also the residents of the district. Kerem expresses this need of image-nary construction saying that

This place [where he works] is not a historical building. But if you make the appearance more beautiful, a tourist will say this is the founding neighborhood of Adana and there were such houses in the past. The houses should be re-constructed in accordance with the original buildings. (Kerem, see Appendix, 34)

Constructing houses just as images for imagination of the past, hence, is a known and desirable phenomenon. This aspect of images for imagination investment is related with not only the past but also the future. Kerem expresses how the past of Adana will be considered by outsiders in the future by referring functions of replica buildings. He thinks that the empty field of the imagination concerning the city will be filled in this way. This process of re-constructing places provides accomplishing feeling of rootedness. The concern about feeling rooted in terms of belonging to a place can be seen in another account by Kerem:

We want to restore the historical Turkish houses in accordance with the original works because when the next generations see these buildings they will say our ancestors were the owners of here and they created artifacts. We need to preserve these places. (Kerem, see Appendix, 35)

In addition to seeing places as tools for future imagination, this account gives information about the national nature of heritage by underlining Turkishness of the artifacts.

Organizing and presenting heritage material contain the selection of some works while ignoring others. This feature of heritage makes it a controllable field in which some traces and narratives are subordinated because "... heritage is *not* a known thing –nor is it a thing at all. Rather it is mutable and intangible and means different things to many different people and communications" (Smith and Waterton, 2009, p. 43). However, the discourse about heritage and narratives regarding places is embodied in material heritage forms. Underlining the Turkishness of the Houses means to ignore the material traces of the Armenian past in Adana because in the case of Tepebağ the only exhibited heritage belongs to Turkish-Muslim community which ends up with muting non-Muslim communities. So, organizing places for a desirable remembrance about the Turkish past of Adana results in forgetting non-Muslims, especially the Armenian community. Emphasizing Turkish-Muslim nature of the places in Tepebağ can be seen in the archaeologist Aykut's answer regarding the originality of the buildings:

We try to renovate the buildings in accordance with the original works, I mean the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Ottoman architect. As possible as like the original works. We will not fabricate anything. (Aykut, see Appendix, 36)

Emphasis on the Ottoman era and architecture in the restoring and reconstruction processes is a way of making non-Muslims invisible in the heritage site. Aykut, who says that it is impossible to determine which places belong to Muslims or non-Muslims, emphasizes the Ottoman architecture in general objecting any other alternatives by expressing that they will not fabricate something. Such a narrative toward the heritage makes it a homogenous area while "...all heritage is multi-faceted, multi-sensual and multi-emotive with each experience and encounter prompting an array of interpretations, perspectives and responses that both collide and complete" (Smith and Waterton, 2009, p. 57). However, arranging heritage sites

may result in erasing multi-faces of heritage places and intervening place memory as in the case of Tepebağ. Additionally it should be noticed that paying attention only to the Ottoman era and architecture can be construed as nostalgic view about the golden times of the past. In this vein, the role of archaeology in reshaping the heritage is crucial because as Siberman (2000) argues, “The emotional power of archaeology in Israel, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Cyprus, Turkey, Greece, and the regions of the former Yugoslavia, for example, is that they all implicitly link the present to a particular golden age” (p. 257). Referring a golden age with a nostalgic view contributes consolidation of identities which are regarded as eroded in the neo-liberal world. This need for a desired past is fulfilled by the reconstructed historical places. As Lowenthal (1985) expresses, “since ‘people love nostalgia and firmly believe that’ what is old ‘is necessarily good’, developers capitalize on proximity to historic dwellings” (p. 4). Hence, reconstruction of historical places has been used for the need of feeling rooted and secured by addressing a better past. In this way historical heritage becomes a tool which influences emotions of the people. In Tepebağ, too, people consider the reconstruction of the heritage site as a contribution to show old golden days of the nation.

So far, emotional and discursive sides of heritage arrangement have been discussed in this chapter. It is argued that heritage places in Tepebağ can play crucial roles to construct a desired past and future opening ways for imagination and feelings investments. However heritage has effects not only at the emotional but also at the economic and capital levels. Presenting these places as part of the modern economy and tourism is the other aspect of heritage marketing as it will be construed in the following pages.

3.2 Marketing of the past and the city

In the previous pages it was discussed how the heritage places are marketed for a better past, future and identity imagination as investments on national and local belonging and emotions regarding them. In addition to this emotional marketing, the heritage place has been also used and designed as the elements for profit making projects. Both in the introduction chapter and in the first pages of this chapter the neo-liberal nature of Turkish economy and the importance of the construction sector were discussed. Making the heritage site in Tepebağ a field of tourism and profitable area can be regarded as a consequence of that economic transformation. However, degrading the value of a heritage site can change its real function. For example, though it is said that the original works and neighborhood culture will be revived in Tepebağ, what is planned and uttered by the officers contradicts with this purpose.

Two officers describe the future situation after the project in this way:

After the work is finished, these places will be used as boutique hotels, special home cooking, handcraft shops and so on. (Necati, see Appendix, 37)

I think cafes will be run. There are similar examples in other cities. Small shops that publicize Adana, handcraft places will run here but there are some people who say that here is my residence and I will live here. (Kenan, see Appendix, 38)

Changing the functions of the buildings, presenting the area as a touristic district obviously has impacts on the residents in Tepebağ because the traditional neighborhood relations in the quarter, the nature of the neighborhood will have been ignored for the sake of touristic value and new production-consumption relations will have been established in the neighborhood. For that reason old residents of the neighborhood that maintain old economic relations may be seen as undesirable people as it is obvious in Kenan's account. It is true that "the commodification of the past is part of a trajectory on which more and more aspects of social life and

localized resources become objects of consumption” (Uzi and Baram, 2004, p. 6). However the social and cultural features of the past are utilized to create a heritage site in Tepebağ on the one hand, some existing properties of the quarter are overlooked on the other hand. So, economic shift makes use of some aspects of the past to construct a market. In this way, the Project is presented as a crucial initiative for Adana by constructing both a new economy and a desired past. The current security problem of the neighborhood is another tool which is utilized to emphasize the importance of the project.

Tepebağ houses have not been restored until recently because of the conservation development plan which had been issued just a few months of before the earthquake and banned any intervention to the buildings in the region (Payaslı Oğuz and Aksulu, 2007, p. 2008). It was not allowed to construct new buildings or reconstruct the old ones while old historical buildings fall to pieces one by one. For this reason the district becomes sparse-populated day by day owing to the situation of the deserted places. The residents have underlined this fact repeatedly:

I have been living in Tepebağ for twenty five years. Here gets more and more, mmm, dispossession (*mülksüzleşme*). I mean the houses have wracked but new ones have not been constructed because Tepebağ is a protected area. (Celal, see Appendix, 39)

Nobody cares about here. It is said that the government will acquire here and then they say there is no money. We want to mortar our walls but we need permission to do it but they do not allow us. Here is a neglected place. (Ali, see Appendix, 40)

Because of these bureaucratic problems these deserted houses have been neglected and they have become the places for glue-sniffers. That is why the neighborhood is regarded as an insecure district both by the residents in Tepebağ and other dwellers in Adana. Deserted houses and streets, glue-sniffers in the region make Tepebağ an uncanny and unattractive area for the people. Therefore, the officers of the Culture

Street Project claim to extinguish this trouble and create a more secure Tepebağ through the project. Necati, the chief of the project explains the reasons behind this plan in this way:

And of course these places [the historical sites] become areas of corruption in the city centre. There is every sort of drugs and so on. The district cannot be used anymore. We want to annihilate this situation and integrate this neighborhood into the city of Adana. This is our principal aim. (Necati, see Appendix, 41)

Security, indeed, is an apparent problem in Tepebağ and many settlers of the district complain about the situation. However, this fact has been used to justify what is done in Tepebağ through the Culture Street Project which includes the gentrification of the neighborhood by changing the functions of the houses into boutique hotels and new touristic shops. Hence, economic relations and cultural features in Tepebağ have been changed for the sake of a tourism economy. On the other hand, economic transformation and attitude influences not only economic relations but also place memory as well.

Considering and presenting a heritage site as a touristic area can create some gaps in the narratives regarding places. As Dwyer (2000) argues, “tourism economies and practices may result in simplified narratives about the past at politically progressive memorials” (cited in Till, 2003, p. 297). In the case of Tepebağ Culture Project, tourism economy emphasizes the Ottoman past of the neighborhood referring to a golden age of the Turkish-Muslim history while the non-Muslim, the Armenian existence in the past is ignored. Thus, material traces regarding the Armenians and other communities that were excluded from the formal and widespread discourses and material indicators regarding them have been disappeared. In this way, the place has become a field of not only economy but also memory design, so as Young (1989) argues, “Heritage works to help ‘organise’

public and social memory” (Cited in Smith and Waterton, 2009, p. 47). Tourism economy, future and past imagination, national discourse concerning the history and local memory have been interwoven in this way. However, it must be noticed that “‘culture’ as terrain in which politics, culture, and economic form an inseparable dynamic” (Lowe and Lloyd, 1997, p.1), and heritage as a part of culture may cause to resort politics and national history narratives, as it will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4
HISTORY AND MEMORY CONFRONTATION
IN ADANA

Traces and memory regarding the Armenian population in Adana become less visible and effable when it comes to public sphere and these sources are less audible and even unknown by the locals or residents of Adana; because official narratives are circulated by every medium of the ideological apparatus like schools, media, museums. These official narratives play an important role in shaping what should be remembered or not, and suppress the minor and alternative voices, so it results in omitting Armenians and memory regarding them from the history of Adana. In this context in which people are surrounded by official narratives, place memory and Tepebağ case may create some spaces/gaps in the given history regarding the city. Thus, history and memory have become sites of struggle against each other while they consolidate one another at other times. After elaborating the relation between history and memory, alternative methods to find ways for the silenced memories and tools that support the spread of the homogenous history account, we will see how memory and history can influence each other in the accounts regarding the Armenians of Adana.

4.1 Contradiction or consolidation? History and memory

The contradiction or conflicting relation between history and memory is discussed by many thinkers and scholars (Nora 1989; Walkowitz and Knauer 2004) in recent years because it is the field of controlling past which is, as Till(2003, 291-2) claims, related to power relations and economic-political places. That's why importance of an

historical incident can change owing to present sociopolitical conditions. For example, with the rise of Ottomanism in the recent years in Turkey, the Battle of Kutul Ammare,⁹ which occurred between the Ottoman and the Britain troops during World War I is celebrated and presented as a great victory against the British while it has not been known by the citizens just few years ago. In other words, some events become more or less important as the frame of political struggles or alleged threats against national interests change. As Hulton (1993) claims “It is a context from which ideas and events cannot be separated, for tradition preserves and updates what is significant in the past over time” (p. 159) and this dynamism of present conditions shapes the historical narratives and memory as well. The process of history and memory making for the nation, supposedly, shows the way for a secure and better future for the members of the nation. As story of nations, Munslow (2007) expresses that “All histories have very practical present, and future-oriented dimensions are always situated in its mode of its expression” (p. 25). Therefore, sense of continuity in national histories is regarded as an important element to prevent any gaps or spaces in narratives. In other words, history is a field of struggle for power and a determinant factor of power relations that excludes some events and people.

That’s why, discontinuities and gaps in historiography have been criticized by historians themselves in recent years to find new ways for oppressed voices of minorities (Hulton, 1993, p. 166), and place memory and materiality can be used as new instrument to follow traces of untold.

However, what we remember or not is deeply related with what we learn at social spheres like family, school or media as Neyzi (2009, p. 2) asserts, on the other

⁹ The confusion about right spelling of this battle itself shows that how this is an unknown event until recent years. It is variously spelled and pronounced as Kuttül Amare, KutülAmmare, KutulAmere.

hand, it can give chance to hear personal and untold sides of generally accepted histories. According to Neyzi (2010)

Ordinary people are tremendously influenced by such macro discourses and tend to internalize and incorporate them in their accounts. At the same time, individuals and communities also develop their own syncretic accounts of the past, which may differ, conflict with, and coexist with hegemonic accounts (p. 10).

In this process of merging of national and personal history narrative and memory, especially school textbooks and the official curriculum impact the way of imagination and construction of the past on which future-oriented and security-based possibilities are invested, as it will be discussed and exemplified in this chapter. Moreover, it must be noticed that though people mainly are receivers in this process, they can be agents at the same time by performing dominant discourses over individual ones as citizens in order to locate themselves as subjects of a nation or a local group, for remembering can be defined as re-remembering as well (Meyerhoff 1992, 22, cited in Cattell and Climo, 22). In this sense, Halbwachs (1992) argues

What makes recent memories hang together is not that they are contiguous in time: it is rather that they are part of a totality of thoughts common to a group, the group of people with whom we have a relation at this moment, or with whom we have had a relation on the preceding day or days. To recall them it is hence sufficient that we place ourselves in the perspective of this group, that we adopt its interests and follow the slant of its reflections. Exactly the same process occurs when we attempt to localize older memories (p. 52).

Hence, personal and social memories can be used or accorded with both local and national narratives in order to be or feel as a member of a desired group which might be a neighborhood or a nation, and some clues of this operation will be examined in the following part.

4.2 National and local narratives at the crossroad

In this thesis, my aim is to analyze interrelations between official and daily/local accounts regarding the situation of the Armenians in Adana in the past through the materialities, not to evaluate truth or wrongness of the narratives regarding Armenian-Turkish conflicts happened before the Republican era as it was expressed in the first chapter. For this reason, even though there are many academic works (Günay 2009, Hatipoğlu 2014, Tonga 2015) that have local narratives and may influence and be influenced by content of the curriculum, the instruments which may directly touch upon daily life like textbooks, tourism guides about the district and because of being familiar with and in the middle of an archaeological site and studies, the role of archaeology will be focused in order to examine the fusion between official and unofficial narratives.

4.2.1 Role of education in history making and memory

Official histories of nation-states that are embodied in formal education systems and curriculums are leading narratives based on what is crucial, sublime and heroic for nations and they contribute to the discourse that claims how old the roots of nations are, which requires and means continuity. Moreover, history can function as investment to give feel of belonging or separateness drawing a certain time-framing to which people associate themselves (Feuchtwang, 2000, 65). Beside this feature of history making, the Turkish curriculum and lessons like History and Citizenship have great impacts on citizens because “it can be said that the national education ideology is almost the monopolizing power in educating students and socializing the people according to its own norms” (Kaplan, 1999, p. 337). Especially the aforementioned

classes are mainly based on security concerns that aim to educate citizens against both inside and outside enemies, and this security politics have been escalated after the 1980 coup. As Üstel (2004) argues

When the lessons of Citizenship and Human Rights are taken into consideration the most remarkable point is the maintenance of indoctrination pedagogy which is in line with ‘the soul of 12 September [1980] coup’. The main property of this soul is ‘the conception of order and security’ that is based on a political and social conservatism. (p. 288)

The Anatolian War is usually exemplified in the curriculum in order to show the insecure atmosphere in the past which is frequently associated with today’s circumstances and threats. The peoples in the Ottoman Empire like Armenians, Greeks, Arabs are presented as the collaborators of the outside powers such as Britain, France and Russia in this sense. When it comes to the Armenian people particularly the conflicts in the East part of the Ottoman Empire come into scene. Incidents in Erzurum and in the East part of the Ottoman during World War I are referred frequently in the textbooks when the Armenian issue is taught and Armenians are described as collaborators and traitors against the Turks and Muslims. For example, Tonga (2015) defends that Armenian issue is not explained well in school textbooks and it must be more elaborated to raise more conscious generations while every year in April this issue is heated up (p. 872). Though this issue is analyzed in seventh, eighth and tenth grade in some books like (Ülker 2014, MEB 2014a, 2014b, 2014c) as Tonga makes it clear, he thinks this is insufficient to educate children regarding the problem. However, regardless the Armenian Issue is told enough or not in the curriculum, the Armenians are depicted as the enemy or supporters of the enemies who made the French and Russian invasions possible. Here are some examples from one of these textbooks presented by Ülker (2014)

Doğu Anadolu Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti (Organization for Defense of Rights in Eastern Anatolia): It was established in İstanbul. It had branches in Elazığ and Erzurum. It struggled to prevent the occupancy of the Eastern Anatolia by Armenians.

Kilikyalılar Cemiyeti (Organization of Cilicians): It was established in İstanbul. It struggled against invasions in Çukurova and joint lands. It defended that Çukurova is a Turkish land, it resisted against the invasion of Çukurova by French and Armenians. (p. 32)

In these two and other examples, what is common is the justification of deeds during the war because of disloyalty and to create an insecure atmosphere both in the past and now and by associating Armenian issue with French and Russians in the course of World War I and their alleged atrocities in both Southern and Eastern Anatolia. It must be noticed that such stigmatization and depiction are circulated through the education system. It must be also added that in the ceremonies of The Day of Liberation of Adana which is celebrated on 5 January in all the schools in Adana the same discourse is performed as a part of education.¹⁰

During my study when I asked the informants the past situation of Armenians in Adana and why there are not any Armenians in the district now, they generally referred to the Anatolian War and said that Armenians betrayed both the Ottoman and Turkish Republic. Celal's response, one of the interviewee who is a retired teacher, was this:

Armenians took side with them [French troops] they celebrated the invasion of Adana by the French. When [Turkish] militias seized Adana, Armenians ran away as possible as they could. I mean they betrayed [us]. You know that they did same thing with Russians in Erzurum. It is said that there was a vivid life here, at Tepabağ, I mean after the Armenians. (Celal, see Appendix, 42)

¹⁰The significance of 5 January, The Day of Liberation, is performed not only in schools but also in state offices. In these ceremonies, too, the collaboration of Armenians with the French troops in invasion is underlined, and it is also associated with the present Kurdish problem implying the same insecure situations in Turkey. For example, Hüseyin Sözlü's speech, the mayor of Adana Municipality, in the ceremony of that day in 2016 was served under this title: "The Mayor Sözlü Has Warned the Kurds Reminding the Armenians." <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/baskan-sozlu-ermenileri-hatirlatip-kurtleri-adana-yerelhaber-1147690/>, 05 January 2016, accessed on 30 September, 2017.

In this account, the dangerous state of the country is emphasized and the informant claims that Armenians supported enemies ignoring Turkish interests. Surprisingly, the conditions in Erzurum, according to history textbooks in schools and official discourse, come to the surface to make a comparison with the Adana case. In other words, a local narrative is bound to a national one. The impacts of such a general discourse can be seen implications in the next account which Kerem expresses:

Armenians had lived in Tepebağ until the war. Before the Anatolian War they [Armenians and Turks] had lived together very well, I mean they did it for millennia. Turks were called *Ummah* and Armenians were named as *millet* (people) by the Ottoman rulers. They had lived together, nothing bad happened between them. Then, bad intentions of Armenians came up. Armenians started to murder Turks which caused the Armenian-Turkish problem. By the way, Adana had been invaded by the French and Armenian took side with French troops. What a bad situation, we had not applied religious discrimination against them, as well. But we had been stabbed firstly by them. (Kerem, see Appendix, 43)

Here, once again a local event is associated with a wider national context which has created we vs. they dichotomy and by saying that Armenians betrayed Turks the evacuation and forced migration of Armenians is justified as it is the case in the textbooks because the reason behind the disappearance of the Armenian community in Adana is not explained and it continues to be an open secret. In order to go into details I asked Kerem whether he knows or not that Armenians had lived in the district and his answer was not different from what he told before

Of course there were Armenians in Adana once. You cannot say all Armenians are bad people, there were some Armenians who had good neighborhood relations with Turks but after a while the Armenian-Turkish hostility occurred and those rebellious Armenians collaborated with the French in order to seize our country. (Kerem, see Appendix, 44)

The realm of local once again is pushed into national one and formal codes about the Armenian issue are revealed as the speech continues. This tone of speech is kept even when the personal memories about Armenians are uttered:

There was an Armenian photographer, his name, his studio's name was Foto Reko. The owner of that shop was Armenian. And there was a dentist Armenian, Manuel Eraslan. Well, they were very good people against us. Now, some Kurds established the PKK, the ASALA is finished, the PKK has emerged, this is a plot played by outside powers and missionaries. This is what I think/I think so. For example there is not a Kurdish issue in Turkey... They want to make the Turkish and the Kurdish enemies against each other. All of these are the plots organized by the outside powers. (Kerem, see Appendix, 45)

The account above, I argue, includes remarkable features in terms of conflict of national-local narratives, suppression of local memory and discourse of insecurity in Turkey. Kerem talks about old Armenian neighbors at the beginning with a nostalgic voice and suddenly the mode and course of speech changes into a national historiography. A local memory regarding the Armenian neighbors is muted by the huge national one when Kerem immediately comes back to the discourse of disloyalty, insecurity. Hence dominant history discourse plays a suppressive role to dominate the local memory which is substantiated by personal memory as if the national history is a witnessed or personally lived phenomenon. As Nora (1989) says, "...conquest and eradication of memory by history has had the effect of revelation, as if an ancient bond of identity had been broken and something had ended that we had experienced as self-evident- the equation of memory and history" (p. 8) and boundaries of history and memory interweave with each other in favor of the national historical narrative regarding Armenians in Tepebağ case. In fact, this interwoven nature of two fields with the various instruments and because of the degree of acceptability in the public makes individual and thereby contested memory invisible and inaudible. According to Nora (1989), "at the heart of history is a critical discourse that is antithetical to spontaneous memory. History is perpetually suspicious of memory, and its true mission is to suppress and destroy it" (p. 9) and the louder and suppressive voice of the history over memory can be seen in these examples.

In Kerem's account, another interesting element regarding the national discourse is that he mentions Kurdish question all of a sudden while he was speaking about Armenians in Adana. By doing this, he implies similar insecure conditions in the past and the present, and as a subject loyal to Turkish nationalism he testifies his national belonging. As Sağlam (2013) claims, "... the increased visibility of Kurds in Turkish socio-political scene has deeply entrenched Turkish nationalism by fueling subsequent investment in, circulation of, and performances of nationalism" (p. 7). In this case, too, it is obvious that Kurdish question is mentioned while it is out of the topic as an instrument for circulation of nationalism and insecurity concepts, and it functions as a sticky object as it was discussed in the previous chapter. So, the Kurdish question becomes a parameter in order to underline the severity of the Armenian Issue.

It should be added that such a way of changing the topic can be used to avoid talking about an undesired issue. Changing the topic, intentionally or unintentionally, is a general strategy when the informants talk about the past presence of Armenians in the neighborhood. Upon my question about if there are any stories in Tepebağ regarding Armenians Ali, a retired religious man who has lived in the neighborhood for thirty eight years, responds:

I do not know stories but they say so. They say, once Armenians had lived here. Here [Tepebağ] is a pile. (Ali, see Appendix, 46)

[What do you mean by pile?] (Me, see Appendix, 47)

It is a mound. It is not natural, it had been constructed. (Ali, see Appendix, 48)

At the beginning, Ali started to give information about Armenians but the topic has been changed and both by using pronoun "they" and not going into details he de-personalizes what he told, refraining from telling personal memories and notions,

which may be the result of the state of emergency which has created a suspicious atmosphere among people or it may be to maintain silence over the past that can be an alternative for hegemonic discourse. In other words, the topic is considered as a taboo issue which weakens national imaginations and subject position both in the local and national context and it can be observed in the case of Kerem and Celal while it is considered not mentionable or just a rumor that circulates in the neighborhood as can be seen in Ali's account.

Serdar, another resident from the district who has lived there for thirty seven years and has worked on treasure hunting both in the neighborhood and some other regions of Turkey changed the subject when we talked about the past Armenian population of the city. With the questions whether Armenians lived in Tepebağ and he knows anything about the subject he answers:

Of course, Armenians had lived here, we had lived together in peace. This is history. We had lived with Armenians in the Ottoman era. Do you know the Central Bank? The Central Bank was established on a place that was a church once. There is a historical mosaic there which is under preservation. When the Bank was constructed, the mosaic was preserved. This is Islamic money, and this Roman one, these are dead money, invalid. (Serdar, see Appendix, 49)

In this dialogue too, the stream of speech has been changed as Armenians come into question after just mentioning the Armenian-Turkish situation in the Ottoman era, which is usually a circulated discourse both in the curriculum of schools and daily life. Thus, in all accounts it is obvious that social and personal memories are influenced by social, economic and political circumstances (Cattell and Climo, 2002, p. 4) which include national history discourse as well. On the other hand, it can be given as an example for what Neyzi (2010) calls as "open secret" (p. 16) for the Armenian issue in Turkey.

It must be noticed that the evacuation or disappearance of Armenians in the city is not referred by any informant in any of the accounts above which creates spaces and discontinuity in narratives. Merely the situation of Armenians during the World War I and Anatolian War is given while pre-war or post-war context is not mentioned which is identical to the content of the curriculum regarding Armenians. For instance, the textbook of 11th grade history class (MEB 2015) which gives only a half-page place for Armenians under the title of *1915 Ermeni Olayları* (1915 Armenian Incidents) tells the incidents in this way:

Under the guidance of volunteer troops composed of Armenians from the Ottoman and Russia, the Russian army entered into the Ottoman lands which was followed with the fleeing of Armenians in the Ottoman army who subsequently joined the Russian army... With the instruction of “If you want to be freed, kill your neighbor first” by the Armenian Committees [Dashnaksutyun and Hınçak], insurgent Armenians attacked defenseless villages of which men had gone to the battle and they killed people... 27 May 1915, the Decree of Forced Migration. The Armenians who caused danger in their regions were sent to Syria, one of the safer provinces of the Ottoman. The Ottoman state has taken measures for the deported Armenians though the state was in an ongoing war. Their taxes have been delayed, and they were allowed to take the properties they want. Officials were assigned in order to protect them from attacks on roads, and the state established police stations to provide safety of life and property. Moreover, the Decree of Return was issued for the deported Armenians when the war ended (p. 172).

In this passage, neither the background of the conflict with Armenians nor the situation after the war is mentioned. Treason and justification of deeds because of war conditions are in line with what the informants argue, and hence all of these become open secret that must not be elaborated. This heroic, defensive attitude concerning the issue in the schoolbooks and curriculum makes it difficult to discuss the topic not only with residents of the district, but also as Adak (2016, p. 15) argues with even many graduate students who come from this education system that prevails silence regarding Armenians. For this reason while I wanted to talk about Armenians in the region one of the informant asked me why I am interested in this subject with a

suspicious gaze. Moreover, surprisingly while this and other textbooks refer the events as 1915 Armenian Incidents, none of the interviewees used such a naming or word of migration, as if Armenians just disappeared.

As it was pointed out in the second chapter, there was only one female resident with whom I could talk about both the past and present of Tepebağ. Although dialogue with her can give some clues about the nature of memory and history circulation in terms of gender, the sample is restricted with only one woman. Upon the questions what kind of a difference there is between the past and present situation of the district Halime (80) answers:

There were 30 households here in this street, now only three. There is nobody here. If I hang myself here [in the street] no one would say let's cut the rope to take down the dead body of the grandma. I used to ask paprika paste from neighbors. I was dropping the paprika sack here to make paste, and then, I used to call neighbors for help. Before they came here, I prepared bulgur salad to eat together... This is not the old neighborhood, not the same neighbors at the same time, my son. (Halime, see Appendix, 50)

[And it is said that there were Armenians here?] (Me, see Appendix, 51)

I have heard nothing about that. I have been living here for 52 years, I have not heard. (Halime, see Appendix, 52)

It is interesting that when the history of the district comes into question, the male informants speak in a wider context with a reserved approach like in the formal narrative and they depict the Armenian incidents vividly which they did not witness while the female informant knows or hears nothing about the issue. Halime gives information about the close circle and recent past using an intimate language and she presents a contested narrative over the male ones which sometimes imitate the national and popular discourse which can stem from wishing to show themselves as sufficient or competent members of the nation. As Connerton (1989) puts in words "... it can be readily admitted that in most cultures the memories of men and women will vary because their education and occupations are different" (28). It must

be taken into consideration/considered that this woman is the only illiterate person in this research which might show how education forms the way and relation with the local and national imagination as a citizen. In other words, while the males use a macro narrative about history and tell the Armenian Issue sometimes in line with the prevalent narrative, the female interviewee gives a micro account in terms of time and place by recounting the events she personally witnessed.

4.2.2 Archaeology and tourism guides as instruments of selective memory

Whether archaeology just like curriculums at schools is an instrument of dominant history discourse and whether the archeological works affect people's perception of past is focused here, as there is also an ongoing archeological excavation work at Tepebağ.

Archaeology and its goal as a discipline has been defined variously by many scholars, such as “the investigation of human past” (Gamble, 2001, p. XIII), or “a story we tell ourselves about ourselves through meditation upon the archaeological record.” (Brumfiel 1987, p. 513 cited in Hodder 1995, 147) in which “human behaviors in the past is explained” (Grant, Groin and Fleming, 2008, p. 110). In other words, archaeology is considered as the discipline that seeks to understand the past through materials and recordings. On the other hand, it is a deeply criticized field by some archaeologists seeing it as an instrument for political interests and nationalism. Some argue that “...archaeology is a politicized discipline, for the state needs the remote past to justify its authority and to exercise its rule” (Kohl, Kozelsky and Ben Yehuda, 2007, p. 2) and it has been used as “a mean of legitimacy of present” (cited in Kevin 1995, 174 Shank &Tilly, 1987, p. 15).

In Turkish context, there are conflicting criticisms regarding the preserving and studying on archaeological sites. Özdoğan (2004, p. 119) rejects “*selective destruction*” [his own emphasis] of antiquities in Turkey and national motives behind it, others criticize it as nationalist-oriented (Kohl, 2007, p. 4). Tepebağ as an archaeological site shows some marks of how archaeology can help to construct a desirable past and its effects on history, recollecting and local memory by creating a basis for both formal and informal tourism guides, advertisements of local administrations and writers respectively.

The Armenian past of Tepebağ is frequently disregarded in the literature of archaeology of Adana. For example, in the Congress of Excavation Results by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Şahin (2015), after giving brief information about historical artifacts in Tepebağ, says that there are four layers of historical era in the Tepebağ Mound which are

- 1st Layer: The Republican Period
- 2nd Layer: Ottoman-Medieval Period
- 3rd Layer: Byzantium-Roman Period
- 4th Layer: Hellenistic Period (p. 197).

It is remarkable that neither the Armenian Kingdom which falls into medieval period mentioned in this categorization nor the Armenian buildings come to the surface when it comes to explaining the past of Tepebağ. Though Şahin speaks of St. Mariam Church, demolished in 1960, on which the Central Bank of Adana was erected (p. 194), she does not point out the builders or community of the church, Armenians, while she explains other historical artifacts in detail. This process of archeological preference on what parts or periods of the past and materials should be chosen or not is a key element that shapes historical narrative and effects memory. In

this respect, Smith and Waterton (2009) allege that “the way in which archaeological heritage can be discovered, defined (spatially and conceptually), recorded, mapped, put on a register or any other list, and finally, managed and conserved, makes heritage both knowable and controllable” (42). This insight of archaeology contributes the invisibility of Armenians in the history of Tepebağ which manifests itself in the circulated discourse and narrative of the district as well. On the other hand, archaeological terms and classifications are crucial because tourist and city guides are developed basing on them.

On the website of the Directorate of Culture and Tourism of Adana, neither the Armenian Kingdom of Adana nor the Armenian population, their historical sites is mentioned.¹¹ However, in the brochures for tourists that have been published by the directorate the Armenian Kingdom is referred briefly and yet Armenians are not mentioned again except Armenians’ collaboration with the French troops during the Anatolian War. In the same vein, the Bebekli Church which locates the western part of Tepebağ is presented as originally a Latin Church until 1915 ignoring its Armenian history. Both the website and the brochure of the Directorate of Culture and Tourism of Adana and Ramazanoğlu (2012,p. 70) which is a well-designed city guide do not touch upon the Armenian background of the church. Omission of Armenians from the history of Tepebağ can be seen in some informants’ explanations which are exemplified in following pages.

It is remarkable that upon the question what they know about the history of Adana there are three reference points that people talk about: a very distant past like thousand years ago, the Anatolian War which was discussed previously and the economic boom based on textile and agriculture industry in Adana in 1960s and

¹¹<http://www.adanakultur.gov.tr/TR,60729/diger-tarihi-yerler.html>. Accessed on 10 February 2018.

1970s. Regarding the first, point residents try to date Adana to a distant past to show its ancient feature sometimes referring some civilizations as archaeologists do. I do not claim that archaeology directly shapes people's views about history but I try to pay attention to the circulation of a discourse with its gaps in a neighborhood in which archaeological and historical inquiries made before the public. For instance Serdar, who is interested in treasure hunting and pointed by the neighbors as the learned about the past of Tepebağ, responds:

The history of here, there is 5-6 thousand years old history here. I have heard that a 3500 years old work of art has been found in the excavation area. They dig some places and ruins of old buildings come to light, I personally observe there, they are ruins from the Byzantium period, Roman period. (Serdar, see Appendix, 53)

Serdar does not mention the Armenian past of the city which can stem from the silence regarding the issue or considering it less significant as in the case of archaeological excavation result report. Underlining the antiquity of the field to show the importance of Tepebağ for Adana is repeatedly uttered by the locals. Celal, another inhabitant of Tepebağ, makes similar references while speaking on history and importance of district for Adana:

Being the first settlement in Adana, having the Taşköprü Bridge which was built 2000 years ago makes Tepebağ an important place for Adana. (Celal, see Appendix, 54)

Thus the antiquity of Tepebağ is underlined by Celal. Likewise, by referring the district as the “founding neighborhood of the city” Ali, the retired religious man, emphasizes the role of Tepebağ in Adana history. In addition to Muslim states like the Ottoman Empire and the Ramazanoğulları Chiefdom, the non-Muslim eras like Byzantium and the Roman state periods are considered as the indicators of a culturally diverse and rooted history of Adana. Hence, though ancient roots of the city, past civilizations and their traces find a way in the daily narrative about

Tepebağ, the Armenian Kingdom and Armenians do not come on the scene at all.

The only exception is Kerem's account in which a story about capturing of Adana by the Ramazanoğulları Chiefdom is told:

If we go to the old times, there had been the Armenian Kingdom in Adana, and our Ramazanoğulları were under their sovereignty... Armenians were afraid of a powerful Turkish army. As a result, Ramazan Oğlu took Adana from them. Before being a Turkish country, they [Turks] established good relations with the king [of Armenians]. They asked his girl in marriage. The celebrations were done. Many barrels of wine. This is the legend. They brought wine abundantly. Armenians drank wine till they were drunk, because they loved wine. After making them drunk, our men slaughtered them and captured the state. (Kerem, see Appendix, 55)

Through this passage we understand that a legend about the Armenian Kingdom and more importantly a narrative concerning the past of Adana Armenians before the War of Independence circulated among the residents that is not told in public frequently and is not found in any writings about Tepebağ and Adana which proves it as a local legend.¹² On the other hand, depicting Armenians as coward, drunk people that could not resist against the "a powerful Turkish army" displays some marks of circulating stereotypes regarding non-Muslims in media and movies like *Kara Murat*, *Kahpe Bizans* and *Fetih* in which conquest of Anatolia and Istanbul are told and non-Muslims and evil are associated with wine. Although Kerem's explanation has traces of the dominant discourse regarding the Armenians, it is a remarkable story because of presenting a dissonant voice against the archaeological and discursive categorization of Adana history by mentioning the Armenian Kingdom which was captured by the Ramazanoğlu Chiefdom. So, the legend which is a crack against archaeological categorization and an alternative narrative for memory and

¹²When I carried out research about the past of Adana I found a book which tells a very similar story about the capture of Adana by the Ramazanoğlu Tribe. Baki Tonguç(1943). *Adana'nın Fethi Destanı*. İstanbul Publishing House.

history shows how memory and history can interwoven both at national and local level bearing the traces of national discourse about the issue at the same time.

4.3 Remembering through perpetual forgetting

In the previous pages it is analyzed how Armenians are remembered and told in Tepebağ contexts as the traitors against the Turkish community when the Armenians is discussed as a part of the past of Adana in a selective way. Interviewees referred a term many times in order to emphasize how Armenians' deeds resulted in such a turmoil which influenced Turks during the Anatolian War and that is mentioned in the novels which was referred at the beginning of this chapter: *kaçkaç* (fleeing).¹³

This is an event occurred right after the invasion of Adana by the French troops that resulted in a massive migration of Muslims towards the Taurus Mountains. Kerem talks about the fleeing in this way:

What I know about Tepebağ is that, dwellers of this neighborhood took women and children to the highlands in the fleeing days, they are militia. Our grandfathers, uncles, all of them are militants. They [Armenians] waylaid our people, killed all of them in farmhouse. The Armenian massacre in Fevzipaşa, you know... Those rebellious Armenians collaborated with the French Troops during the invasion. They killed our innocent people. They burnt our children and babies in heaters, they ate our children's brains. Our grandfathers told all of these events, Armenians committed every type of offence. (Kerem, see Appendix, 56)

Some other informants, too, gave similar accounts about the fleeing and in the novels of Yaşar Kemal and Orhan Kemal this traumatic event is told repeatedly as well.

This event is told as an instance of the Armenian brutality during the Anatolian War. Such terrifying stories about the Armenians' deeds are continually expressed by the people of Adana. For example, when I was a student in high school the photos of

¹³It literally means Run away, run away! and will be referred as the fleeing henceforth.

alleged deeds were shown us to prove the “Armenian Atrocity” (*Ermeni Mezalimi*).

So, the fleeing and its effects on the Turkish-Muslim community of Adana are uttered to show the graveness of the Armenian Issue. On the other hand, one of the informants, Celal, told the incident in a very different nature:

It is said that Tepebağ was a district of Armenians until the fleeing incidents which took place in 1911. This is an event occurred between Turks and Armenians in 1911. I do not know it very well but if you look at the history you can see it. After then, Armenians left here, they ran away. (Celal, see Appendix, 57)

In this account there are remarkable points that are transformed by the informant: both date and agents of the event have been changed. This reversed story resembles the death of Luigi Trastulli discussed by Portelli (1991). In this case, in addition to changing of the case, Luigi is presented as a man died in anti-NATO protest while eventually he lost his life in a strike. Regarding this transformation Portelli (1991) says that

The collective, community mode would be the proper collocation because here is where the event carries the most weight. At this level, however, its only possible meaning is precisely the one that the narrators are trying to avoid: a message of collective powerlessness and defeat. Placing Trastulli’s murder in the mode in which it belongs, would reopen the wound (p. 21).

Likewise, alternation of both the date and the context of the fleeing may reflect desire for a powerful position in the past and to heal a wound in addition to impacts of heroic national discourse regarding the past. Presenting the Turkish party as a fleeing one can be regarded as humiliating and for this reason the story may be reversed. However, it must be noticed that the fleeing is retold by the dwellers in various versions whether it is true or not while some great events in terms of demographic and economic aspects like the 1909 and the 1915 massacres are never mentioned.

Though it comes from story, history usually does not explain all stories regarding an event. On the contrary, it makes one version hegemonic while destroying other ones. According to (Mickley & Legassic, 2000) "... history, like politics, is constituted as much through these mechanisms of "not telling" as by the ways of telling" (p. 7). This feature of history makes it one of the main tools of forgetting some incidents. In the context of Turkey, too, as Ahıska (2010) asserts, "hegemonic militant forgetting as backbones of history" (p. 4) shapes what should be remembered or not as it was discussed in the introduction. In Tepebağ, remembering of the fleeing in contrast to forgetting of the 1909 Adana and 1915 massacres displays how undesired events can be silenced or effable. However, not mentioning the situation of Armenians both before and after the fleeing creates a gap and reminds the discontinuity in the narrative. Therefore, as Kollouğlu (2005, p. 28) puts in word "Acts of remembering are always already acts of forgetting..." Forgetting of this grave-or in Cavalli's terms crucial events, points the importance of the events with regard to its impacts both on the nation and history. As Cavalli asserts "the crucial event performs the symbolic function of closing past accounts and opening a new era." (cited in Kolluoğlu 2005, p. 29). Thus, perpetual forgetting of these ruptures in question marks a new era for the social memory and history for Adana which lacks of Armenians and non-Muslims in general. On the other hand, personal memories can destabilize hegemonic narratives though social memory can be immensely influenced by huge, formal narratives.

In Tepebağ three informants gave contested accounts about the Armenians of Adana although they did not talk about the 1909 and 1915 Incidents. Upon my question, whether there was a cultural diversity in Adana in his childhood or youth, Ömer, who introduces himself as a leftist man, responses:

Adana was like Antakya and Mersin. Nobody said they were Armenian, there was not discrimination in Adana (Ömer, see Appendix, 58)

[Were there Armenians in Adana at that time?] (Me, see Appendix, 59)

Of course, there were Armenians here. Then, something related to the USA happened here. I was a child. A battleship came to Turkey, to the Bosphorus. It was The Sixth Shipping event. An uprising occurred... There was an American Consulate here. The people attacked the Consulate. It was not about the Armenians, it was a reaction against America. But then the Armenians left here. (Ömer, see Appendix, 60)

It is interesting that the word diversity reminds Ömer the Armenian community though I did not mention the Armenian people and he underlines that there was not discrimination towards Armenians in Adana. Ömer recounts the diversity and tolerance in Adana in 1960s with a nostalgic tone and reveals how the Armenian people were inscribed on local memories. Moreover, this account shows that there was a considerable population of Armenians even in the late 1960s while the widespread notion is that Armenians left the city totally after the Anatolian War. Also, socio-political conditions of Adana in 1960s and impacts of anti-American protest on the Armenian community of Adana are brought on the scene which implies that the Armenian people were seen as the collaborator of the great powers even in the late 1960s. This informant's political attitude, too, may create a difference in terms of a memory on margins even outside of social memory. However, Ömer is not the only person who presents a marginalized voice also Kerem gives a similar account by mentioning old Armenian residents, Foto Reko and Manuel Eraslan. These two personal memories display alternative way of thinking about the past of Adana and its demography and they become little cracks in the general imagination of the history of Adana by confirming once existence of the Armenian community in Adana until recent times. According to Cattell and Climo (2002), "personal narratives can aid the reconstruction of nearly forgotten social institutions, demonstrate continuities and changes in memory and identity over time and reveal individual and

collective reactions to historical events” (p.22), as it is exemplified in both Kerem’s and Ömer’s accounts.

Another account that can be regarded in the same vein in terms of being a crackling voice is related with the present situation regarding Armenians in Adana, actually Islamized or secret Armenians of the city which is uttered by Serdar. This is the unique explanation about the converted Armenians in Adana. After saying that Adana homes to various ethnical and religious communities Serdar adds that:

There are many Armenian converts from Kozan to Tufanbeyli. (Serdar, see Appendix, 61)

Serdar’s account shows how the memory regarding the Adana Armenians and the reasons behind this conversion, massacres are implicitly remembered but pushed into silence in Adana. However, the subject of converted Armenians is being discussed more and it is becoming a more visible issue in recent years both on media and academic circles¹⁴ and Serdar’s account manifests how this is a widely-known phenomenon in Adana.

Consequently, even though some events regarding Armenians like the fleeing, the conversion, their existence in the city until 1970s are mentioned by the dwellers of Tepebağ, the great ruptures of the 1909 and the 1915 massacres that have influenced the city of Adana demographically, socially and economically are still a secret in the public and they are not expressible in the most intimate conversations and personal recounting. The absence of these ruptures in memoirs and accounts, also, create discontinuity in the common narrative about the past of Adana. Therefore

¹⁴ For news regarding the issue see “100. yılında sürgün yolunda-8: Adana'nın 'gizli' Ermenileri” <http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/100-yilinda-surgun-yolunda-8-adananin-gizli-ermenileri-1339890/> published on 21.04.2015 accessed on 30.03.2017
Also, Conference on Islamized Armenians which was held on 2-4 November, 2013 in İstanbul is a remarkable meeting about this issue.

the dominance of national history over local memory once again reveals itself by suppressing local narratives about the past of the city. However, some personal memories and accounts manifest some details about the situation of Tepebağ Armenians during the Republican Era, especially 1960s, and imply reasons behind the invisibility of Armenians and memory regarding them in Adana that spoils the grand narrative concerning the Armenian issue.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

History is one of the main fields that is intervened and organized by several agents such as nation-states and this intervention mainly targets both local and national memory because memory contributes what should be or not remembered in order to construct an identity and belonging for the members of nation. Therefore, memory plays the role of the cement to create a coherent and an emotional narrative about a local group or a nation. In this vein, especially places as material proofs of history can be a vital point to confirm or undermine the desired history and memory. In this thesis what I have tried to explain is the relation between place, memory, and history. For this reason the role of places in the imagination of past and future through Tepebağ houses context has been discussed by focusing on how the Armenian community is remembered or forgotten in the narratives told in the district. As it can be seen, Tepebağ Houses as sites of place memory have dynamic links with identity, history, politics and economy. I argued that as material entities Tepebağ houses are grounds for propelling new stories and memories regarding the past of Adana since they compose a historical site where the Armenian community lived once.

I think that physical residues can be important deposit and carrier for narrations about local memory and identity as it is exemplified in the Tepebağ houses context where the residents still live in and influence and are influenced. This nature of place memory creates a common sense regarding the past, and being a part of the local group among the group members while it opens ways for talking about the past Armenian community at the same time. It is obvious that narratives about the past Armenian community of Adana and feelings regarding them are attached to the old

Armenian houses. The place memory reproduced and re-circulated by the houses gives some clues about the gaps in the local narratives providing contested stories about the fate of the Armenian community in the region. Memories and stories about Armenians come to light when the history of the houses is discussed though the “Turkish House” phrase has been used to identify those houses as an extension of nationalistic discourse towards places and history. Even a sort of brick is named as the Armenian brick in Tepebağ, showing how the memory regarding the Armenian community influences the daily speech and narratives in the neighborhood. The Armenian past in the district pervades in these materials as a ghostly memory inscribed on places. The houses become traces of the Armenian community of Adana. On the other hand, especially the houses are associated with supposed conspiracies, suppressions and massacres during the Anatolian War, and thereby the houses become signs of fear and insecurity in the district. Therefore, the houses as sources of place memory in Tepebağ provide constant circulation of insecurity discourse and threat against the Turkish identity while, on the other hand, they fill some cracks in the formal history and local memory by reminding some details about the Armenian people who resided in those houses. In other words, the houses become scope of emotions that prompts both nostalgic and terrifying feelings towards the Armenian community at the same time. Therefore places can be instruments for a silenced or not effable past revealing contested personal and local memories as it can be seen in Tepebağ. One remarkable aspect of this field, I think, is that some of the houses are resided by people that put the area into the process of an ongoing transformation and experiences which can make the houses, in Connerton conceptions, locus because the people experience the area and houses currently. However, it is very difficult to label this neighborhood absolutely as a locus since it

faces radical changes in terms of architecture and place memory that puts Tepebağ into scope of memorial, again in Connerton's words. Therefore, in Tepebağ locus and memorial merge and boundaries between them blur through the Project of Culture Street in the neighborhood.

In addition to creating a memorial place for Adana's history, the Project of Culture Street is thought as the concrete heritage site for Adana which aims at revealing the past of the city. It is apparent that the process of memorialisation in Tepebağ to build a Culture Street for the sake of heritage conservation includes only the Turkish-Muslim past of the district excluding non-Muslim cultures. Underlining the Ottoman nature of Tepebağ through the Culture Street which implies a harmonious society conceals some great events like the 1909 Adana Incidents. In order to show such a harmonious, trouble-free society in the past the historical houses in Tepebağ are used as investments on this imagination. The houses are organized as images that make such an imagination possible. In addition to marketing the houses as indicators of a golden age in the Turkish history for this imagination, the Culture Street Project in Tepebağ manifests also how rapid urbanization that eradicates the unique identity of the city creates a need for a desirable past for the residents who want to feel more rooted and secure through such a visible and displayable heritage site. On the other hand, making this historical site a tourism centre results in an oversimplified narrative regarding the history of the district by featuring the Turkish characteristics of Tepebağ, and this makes the subordinated memories more invisible. So, the impacts of transforming economy that is based on the construction sector can be seen in the context of Tepebağ which result in commodification of heritage and the past with regard to history production and consumption. It must also be noticed that such profit making-based construction and

tourism policies change the production and consumption economies in the neighborhood by influencing old neighborhood and working relations along with the gentrification of Tepebağ. Nevertheless, as it is discussed in the previous chapter, this logic of commodification creates contradictions in itself by prompting some memorial moments which sometimes lead to conflicting narratives between memory and history.

The role of history to make memory inaudible or to integrate local memory into the grandiose national history accounts can be seen in the Tepebağ case. This assimilation or coherence process of the local memory into national narrative is possible via instruments like archaeology, the curriculums at schools and official city guides. These mentioned instruments lead people to make their personal and local memories compatible with the national history to consolidate their belonging to the nation. For example, when I asked the residents what they know about the Armenian community of Adana they usually told that the Armenians betrayed Turkish people and acted under the control of the great powers as they did in Erzurum and Eastern Anatolia. In this way the local context is associated with the wider context which has been taught in the formal curriculum at schools. Not only the context regarding the Armenian past but also the discourse which is performed by the residents has similarities with the national history. It is also possible to find marks of formal tourist guides and archaeology in the residents' accounts concerning the past of Tepebağ. Formal history, in this way, dominates on the local memory and narratives. However, sometimes local memory becomes a counter narrative against the history in Tepebağ. Personal memories about the last Armenians in the region who lived there until the early 1970s manifest how memory can create leaks in the widely-known history that erases the Armenian people from the national discourse. In addition to what is told

about the Armenian community of Adana, what is untold is significant in order to demonstrate how the Armenian Issue has become, in Neyzi's words, an open secret that is known widely but should not be talked about in public. The 1915 and the 1909 Adana Incidents were not mentioned by any informants of the study though supposed suppressions against the Turks by the Armenians, the Fleeing Event and Armenians who lived in Adana until the early 1970s have been described in detail. These two important ruptures, the 1915 Genocide and the 1909 Adana Incidents, in terms of the existence of Armenians of Adana create gaps in the narratives regarding the past of Adana because dynamics behind the demographic and economic change in Adana are not explained by the dwellers. However, it does not mean that the Armenian community is not talked about among the residents of Tepebağ because this gap is filled by the tales regarding Armenians and those tales play a role for holding the local community together against a common enemy, the Armenian people. Therefore, legends and secrecy about the past community contribute to belonging feeling to the locality of Tepebağ. Tepebağ houses and the place memory regarding them are the main sources of such legends, and they create an alternative scope for a hegemonic history understanding.

Throughout the study, I have explained how place memory is a complex concept and can have dynamic relations with the policies regarding the past and future in the context of Tepebağ houses. Though history and formal narratives can change because of today's circumstances, place memory maintains the role of being a contested narrative and creating some leaks in the given history. However, as it can be seen in Tepebağ houses context, place memory may fill some gaps both discursively and materially by reminding and carrying some traces of past. Nevertheless, it must be noticed that this is only one case that tries to examine such

an interrelation which may require more detailed and comprehensive studies to support or challenge theoretical backgrounds of the debate. So we should keep asking those questions: Can we find similar traces in some other cities of Turkey in heritage policies? What are the other reasons behind the increasing past consumption in Turkey? My thesis has been a preliminary exploration of such traces by focusing on place-memory and haunting materiality, but we may think further through these traces in order to understand the question of relation between places, past consumption and identity. On the other hand, impacts of such places on people's daily life and their memories regarding the city can be analyzed in a wider context in terms of places.

APPENDIX

ORIGINAL INTERVIEW QUOTES

1. (Kerem): Tepebağ'da mülkün mü var der eskiler. O kadar itibarlı bir yermiş.
2. (Ömer): Paran olmasın Tepebağ'dan gelinin olsun derlerdi... Yani çok lüks bir yaşam yeriymiş burası.
3. (Halime): Komşu çoktu. Zelzele oldu, herkes korktu, gitti. Şurda 4-5 tane ev kaldık.
4. (Ali) : 38 senedir burada oturuyorum. Depremden sonra buranın özelliği bitti yani. Burada affedersin sarhoşlar, baliciler, onlar sürüyor şimdi buralarda.
5. (Aykut) : Adanalı yetkililer zamanında buralara sahip çıkmadığı için buralar özellikle depremden sonra boş ve bakımsız kaldı.
6. (Celal): Buraya da tabii fakirler hücum ediyor, dolmuş parası vermemek için, yol parası. Şimdi bir de Suriye'den gelenler hücum etti.
7. (Celal): Eski Tepebağ anlatıldığına göre, Ermenilerden kalan bir yer burası biliyorsunuz... Eski Türk evleri bunlar cumbalı. Yaşlı kadınlar o cumbalardan çıkıp sokağa bakar.
8. (Ömer): Evleri, mesela şurayı satın alan abimiz, bir Ermeni'den satın almış. Bırakmışlar, gitmişler. Böyle çok yapıya rastlayabilirsin.
9. [Şu an var mı peki Ermeni?]
10. (Ömer): Yok. Çünkü, mmm, ayrışma demeyelim buna da daha refah, ticaretle, burada ticaret bitince İstanbul'a gittiler.
11. (Aykut): Ben bu ayırımı karşıyım. Bazıları diyor ki efendim burada Ermeniler yaşıyormuş, şurası Ermenilerin falan. Osmanlıda bunu ayırt etmek çok zor. Çünkü diyelim ki ev Ermeni tarzında yapılmış. Belki evi yapan kişi bir Müslüman ve Ermeni bir ustanın yanında işi öğrenmiş ve orada bir Müslüman aile oturuyordur. Osmanlıda tebaa diye bir olay var öyle Türk, Ermeni, Yahudi, Rum diye ayırmak mümkün değil. Hepsi bir arada yaşıyor, Osmanlı tarzından bahsedebiliriz ancak yapılar söz konusu olduğunda.
12. (Kenan): Yani sıva söküldükten sonra yapının kendi özgün malzemesi ortaya çıkıyor, sonra restorasyona başlıyoruz. O dönemin tuğlalarını bulup derz işlemi yapılır. Bu şekilde yapıyı elde ediyoruz. Sıva raspası yapıyoruz, ben de merak ediyorum acaba altından ne çıkacak. Sıva raspası yapıyoruz sonra o döneme ait, mmm, Ermeni tuğlası olarak geçiyor, Ermeni tuğlası çıkıyor.
13. [Adı neden Ermeni tuğlası?]
14. (Kenan): Ermeni tuğlası, o dönemlerde Ermeniler, yani yapı olarak Ermeni tuğlası deniliyor ama ben de kendi kendime soruyorum, belki Ermeniler kullandığı için Ermeni tuğlası demişler ama biz söylemiyoruz yani. Osmanlı dönemine ait yapılar genelde taş ve ahşaptan. Yani taşa ağırlık veriliyor.
15. (Kerem): Büyükbabam elimden tutmuş, ben de ilkokul üçte falandım. Bir arkadaşının evine bayram ziyareti yapacaktık. Gittik. Çıktık. Tepebağ

ilkokulunun duvarının penceresinin altında öyle bir leke oluşmuş. Oğlum dedi bak, bil bakayım bu ne lekesi? Dede dedim çamur bulaşmış, buraların torağı kızıl olur, çamur bulaşmış dedim. Bilemedin dedi, ben söyleyim ama unutma. “Ne?” dedim. Zamanında, dedi, Ermeniler biz Müslüman Türklerin kafasını pencereden sarkıtlarmış, kılıcı vururlarmış, kafa bir tarafa düşmüş, vücut da arkaya düşmüş. Bu okulun bahçesinde de kör bir kuyu varmış, o kuyuya cesedi atarlarmış.

16. (Aykut): : O bilime, arkeolojiye zarar veriyor çünkü. Anlattıkları gerçeklerle örtüşmüyor. Adam defineci. Hapis falan da yatmış kaçak definecilikten. Onun gibi adamlar böyle yerler için çok tehlikeli. Yok Ermeniler şunu yapmış, Bebekli Kilise’den Karataş’a kadar tünel kazmışlarmış.
17. [Öyle bir şey yok mu yani?]
18. (Aykut):Yok tabii de. Tünel dedikleri kanalizasyon sistemleri aslında.
19. (Kerem): Tepebağ ortaokulunda okuyorum, o okuldan Bebekli kiliseye tüneller var. Bu kurtuluş savaşı döneminde hep Ermeniler kullanmış bunları.
20. [Öyle bir şey gerçekten var mı yoksa efsane mi o?]
21. (Kerem): Var, var. Artı o Bebekli Kilise’den şimdiki Fen Lisesi dediğimiz Cemalpaşa’daki yerin altından adamlar giderlermiş yani.
22. [Fen Lisesi’ne niye bağlı?]
23. (Kenan): Orası da kiliseymiş.
24. [Ermeni kilisesi mi?]
25. (Kerem): Tabii. Türklere karşı gizli eylemler yapıyorlarmış veya misyoner faaliyetler. Halen de yapıyorlar.
26. (Celal): : Mesela Adana’ya arkadaşlarım gelecek, bunlar Gazi üniversiteli ressamlar. Buluşma günü yaklaştıkça ben şey yapıyorum içimden, yani ne gösterecem onlara diye düşünüyorum, Adana’da gösterilecek bir tarihi eser yok. Tepebağ’da birkaç ev restore edilirse edilseydi ya da o zaman daha şey olacaktı oraya götürecektim. Böyle bir eksiklik var Adana’da, tarihi eser açısından. Mesela bir Moskova’ya gittiğinizde, Viyana’ya gittiğinizde; İstanbul’a gittiğinizde o tarihi taş yapılar, kokan tarih burada yok.
27. [Restorasyonlar o açıdan önemli olacak mı?]
28. (Celal): Çok önemli olacak. Bir tarihi var diyebileceğiz artık. Tarihi evler böyleydi diyebileceğiz. Çünkü bu tarihi evleri başka yerde bulamazsınız Tepebağ’ın dışında. Burası eski Adana. Her şehrin eski bir ----mahallesi olur, onu diğerlerinden ayırır.
29. (Ömer): Yani Ankara’ya gidiyorsun, Safranbolu’ya gidiyoruz geziyoruz tarihi yerleri, o kadar güzel yerler yapmışlar ki...
30. (Kenan): Burada bir de tam aklımda değil ama 46-47 yapının sokağa bakan yapının cephesini ele alacağız.
31. [Yola bakan kısımları mı yapılacak sadece?]
32. (Kenan): Evet sadece yola bakan kısımları. Ya aslında bunlar biraz siyasi, nasıl diyelim, komple dört tarafı yaptığında belediyenin harcamaları var, masrafa

giriyor. Ondan dolayı sadece yola bakan kısımları yapıyoruz. Sokak sağlıklaştırmadaki amaç bu yani.

33. (Necati): . Bu yol üzerinde altı tane tescilli yapı var. Bu tescilli yapıları da onarmak istiyoruz. Tescilli olanların dışındakilerin dış cephe çalışmasını yapıyoruz şu anda.
34. (Kerem): Şu an oturduğumuz bu mekan tarihi bir bina değil. Ama dış görünümünü güzelleştirdiği zaman, bir turist falan geldiği zaman ya işte bak Adana'nın kurucu mahallesi, böyle evler de varmış derler. Aslına uygun yeniden yapılması gerekir evlerin.
35. (Kerem) Tarihi Türk evlerinin aslına uygun yapılması bizden sonraki kuşakların da atalarımız buraların sahibiymiş demelerini, eserlerini bırakmış demelerini arzu ediyoruz. Bunları korumamız lazım.
36. (Aykut): Biz 19.yy sonu ile 20 yy. başı Osmanlı mimarisine uygun bir şekilde yapmaya çalışıyoruz. Olabildiğince aslına yakın yani. Uydurma bir şeyler yapmayacağız.
37. (Necati): Bu çalışmalarımız bittiğinde buranın yani butik otel, özle ev yemekleri, el sanatları ve benzeri şekilde kullanılabilir hale gelmesi, amacımız bu.
38. (Kenan): Kafeler falan yapılır şuralara, örnekleri diğer illerde var, güzel kafeler, Adana'yı anlatan küçük mekanlar, artı ufak el işleri yapılan yerler. Ama tabii şu da insanlar bu benim malım diyor, burada yaşamaya devam edeceğim de diyor.
39. (Celal): 25 yıldır ben burada yaşıyorum. Giderek şey yapıyor yani mülksüzleşiyor, yani arada evler yıkılıyor, yenisi yapılmıyor, sit alanı olduğu için.
40. (Ali): Bakan yok ki. Hükümet alacak diyorlar, verecek para yok diyorlar, sıva yaptıracak olsak izin istiyorlar, yaptırtmıyorlar. Bakımsız bir yer bura. Kendi haline bırakılmış. Buradan bir şey olmaz.
41. (Necati): Ve tabii bu bölgeler şehir merkezlerinde çöküntü alanı haline gelmiş durumda. Burada işte her türlü uyuşturucu ve benzeri şeyler var. Kötü amaçlı kullanılamıyor artık şu anda. Onu da ortadan kaldırıp burayı Adana kentiyle entegre bir şekilde kullanmak. Asıl amacımız o.
42. (Celal): Onların yanında yer alıyorlar, düğünler yapıyorlar seviniyorlar Fransızlar Adana'yı işgal etti diye. Milisler de Adana'yı işgal edince tabii tabana kuvvet kaçıyorlar. Yani ihanet ediyorlar. Aynı şeyi Erzurum yöresinde Ruslarla yapıyorlar biliyorsun. O zamanlar çok güzel bir yaşantı olduğu söyleniyor burada, Tepebağ'da. Hani Ermenilerden sonraki yaşantı.
43. (Kerem): Kurtuluş Savaşı döneminde. Ondan önce çok iyi yaşıyorlarmış, yani yaklaşık bin yıl Ermeni- Türk yaşamışlar, Türklere ümmet denilirmiş, onlara millet denilirmiş padişah tarafından. Ama iki toplum bir arada yaşamışlar, en ufak bir şey olmamış, problem olmamış. Sonra Ermenilerin kötü niyeti, Ermeni sorunu varmış gibi Türkleri katletmeye başlayınca Türk Ermeni düşmanlığı başlamış. E bu arada Fransızlar Adana'yı işgal ediyor, Ermeniler hemen Fransız'dan yana taraf oluyor. Yani nedir bin yıldır kardeşin olanı dün gelen, belki din kardeşi olabilirsin, din ayrımı da yapmamışız. İlk hançeri de ilk onlardan yemişiz.

44. (Kerem): Çok eskiden tabii ki varmış, Ermenilerin hepsi kötü diyemiyorsun, komşuluk ilişkileri çok iyi olan kişiler vardı fakat Türk-Ermeni düşmanlığını o zaman, o asi Ermeniler Fransızlarla işbirliği yapıp ülkemizi ele geçirmek istemişler.
45. (Kerem): Adana'da eskilerden kalan fotoğrafçı vardı, şey, Foto Reko, buranın sahibi Ermeni'ydi, dış tabibi Manuel Eraslan... bizlere karşı çok iyi insanlardı yani. Mesela şimdi günümüzde de bazı Kürtler PKK'yı kurdu, ASALA bitti, PKK başladı; dış güçlerin, misyonerlerin oyunu bu. Öyle düşünüyorum ben. Mesela Türkiye'de Kürt sorunu yok. Biz onlarla hısım akraba olmuşuz, kız almışız, kız vermişiz ama Abdullah Öcalan için vatan haini olanlar var, yani bunu Kürt meselesiymiş gibi gösteriyorlar. Türk'ü Kürt'e düşman etmek istiyorlar. Bunlar hep ülkemiz üzerinde oynanan oyunlar.
46. (Ali): Bilmiyorum da öyle diyorlar, zamanında Ermeniler oturmuş diyorlar. Zaten bura dolma bu Tepebağ.
47. (Serdar): Ermeniler yaşamış tabii, iç içe yaşamışık, bak bunlar hep tarih yani. Ermenilerle Osmanlı dönemi iç içe yaşamışık. Merkez bankasını biliyon? Merkez bankasının olduğu yer kilise yeri yani. Orada şu anda korumaya alınmış mozaik falan var... İnşaat zamanı korumaya almışlar. Bu İslami para, bu da Roma parası, yani ölü para bunlar.
48. (Halime): Kimse kalmadı. Bak şu eskicilerin yerinde 30 tane ev vardı orada. Ama şimdi boş. Yavrum bak bir tane şurada var, üç katta bir kişi oturuyor, Çiçek. Şurda assam kendimi kimse demez ki bir bıçak atak da şu neneyi düşürek. Şurda gider biber alırdım, salçalık biber. Şurada dökerdim biber çuvalını, komşuyu çağırırdım. Bir de onlar gelmeden ortalığı toparlardım, kısır hazırlardım. Şimdi bir çuval biberi akşama kadar yapamazsın, biri gelip ellemez ki. Eski komşuluk yok. Komşu da yok yavrum. Yok, kimse yok.
49. [Bir de Ermeniler de varmış buralarda?]
50. (Halime): Ben duymadım. Ben 52 senedir buradayım, ben duymadım. Ben 80 yaşındayım. Burada hiç duymadım.
51. (Serdar): Buranın tarihi, yani 5-6 bin senelik bir tarih var. Şu anda kazı yapılan yerde 3500 senelik eser bulunduğu kulağıma geliyor. Bazı gecekonduların altını kazıyorlar, eski yapıların kalıntıları çıkıyor, ben kendim gözlemliyorum, onlar da Bizans dönemi, Roma dönemi kalıntıları yani.
52. (Celal): : İlk yerleşim yeri olması. Taşköprü'nün 2000 yıllık bir tarihinin olması, onun da bir ucunun Tepebağ'a gelmiş olması... Tepebağ'ı önemli yapıyor.
53. (Kerem): Adana'da daha önceye gidersek Ermeni Krallığı varmış, bizim Ramazanoğulları da onların egemenliği altında. Sadece Ramazanoğulları değil onların yanında 11 kurucu aile daha varmış, içlerinde Avşarlar da var. Ama boy beyi Ramazan oğlu. Ermenilerle alışveriş, bu tarafa geçmeler falan. Ermeniler çekiniyorlar tabii güçlü bir Türk ordusuna karşı. Netice itibarıyla Ramazan oğlu Adana'yı bunlardan almışlar. Daha Türk yurdu olmadan iyi ilişkiler kurmuşlar kralla. Kralın kızını istiyor. Düğün dernek oluyor. Boy boy fiçı fiçı şarap. Efsanesi bu. Bol bol şarap getirirler tabii Ermeniler şarabı sevdikleri için kendilerinden geçene kadar içiyorlar. Bizimkiler bunları sarhoş ettikten sonra hepsini kılıçtan geçiriyorlar, sonra devleti ele geçiriyorlar.

54. (Kerem): Benim bildiğim Tepebağ'la ilgili, bizim buranın sakinleri kurtuluş savaşı döneminde, kaç kaç döneminde kadınları, çocukları yaylaya götürecekler, kendileri çete zaten, kuva-i milliye çeteleri. Dedelerimiz, amcalarımız hep çete. Yolda önlerini kesiyorlar, bir çiftlik evinde hepsini katlediyorlar. Fevzipaşa çiftliğindeki Ermenilerin katliamı... O asi Ermeniler Fransızlarla işbirliği yapıp ülkemizi ele geçirmek istemişler, masum insanlarımızı, çocuklarımızı, el kadar bebelerimizi fırında yakarak öldürmeleri, çocuğun beynini kelle paça gibi yapıp beynini çıkarıp yemişler, dedelerimiz hep anlatırdı, bunların yapmadığı zulüm kalmamış.
55. (Celal): Eski Tepebağ anlatıldığına göre, Ermenilerden kalan bir yer burası biliyorsunuz, kaç kaç olaylarından sonra 1911'de.
56. [Kaç kaç olayı nedir tam olarak?]
57. (Celal): Adana'da 1911'de Ermenilerle yaşanan bir olay bu. Ben de çok ayrıntılı bilmiyorum ama tarih açılıp bakılırsa görülür. Sonra Ermeniler burayı terk ediyor, kaçıyorlar gidiyorlar yani.
58. (Ömer): Adana bir Antakya, bir Mersin gibiydi yani. Yani sen Ermeni'sin sen busun Adana'da hiç olmadı.
59. [O zamanlar var mıydı burada Ermeniler?]
60. (Ömer): Vardı tabii. Sonra burada bir Amerika şeyi oldu, ben çocuktum, bu savaş gemisi şeye geldi, Boğazlara. 6. Filo. Ben çocuktum. Bir ayaklanma oldu. Dışarı baktım insanlar meşalelerle yürüyordu. Ondan sonra, yani 60 yahut 61'den bahsediyorum.
61. (Serdar): Kozan'dan Tufanbeyli'ye kadar bir sürü Ermeni var.

REFERENCES

- Adak, H. (2016). Teaching the Armenian Genocide in Turkey: Curriculum, methods, and sources. *PMLA*. 131 (5), 1515-1518. doi <https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2016.131.5.1515>
- Adana Büyükşehir Belediyesi (2017). *Mimari*. Retrieved from <http://www.adana.bel.tr/turizm/>
- Adana İlçeleri Nüfusu (2017). Retrieved from http://adana.yerelnet.org.tr/il_ilce_nufus.php?iladi=ADANA
- Adana İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü. (20147). Diğer tarihi yerler. Retrieved from <http://www.adanakultur.gov.tr/TR,60729/diger-tarihi-yerler.html>
- Ahıska, M. (2010, 14-16 October). Eruptions and thresholds of memory in Turkey. In *Aferim yavrum: Little gestures of cooperation 1*(1) (pp. 7-22). Retrieved from https://issuu.com/silvina.der.meguerditchian/docs/aferim_yavrum_dialogue_forum_ligh
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bloxham, D. (2003). Determinants of the Armenian Genocide. In Hovannisian, R. G. (Ed.). *Looking backward moving forward: Confronting the Armenian Genocide* (pp. 23-50). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Candan, H., & Maltaş, A. (2014). Kentlerin yeni açmazı: Girişimcilik bir çare mi yoksa sorun mu? In *Proceedings: The 6th International Congress of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 537-542). Bishkek, Kirghizstan: IUAA.
- Cattell, M. G., & Climo, J. J. (2002) (Eds.). Introduction. In *Social memory and history* (pp. 1-36). Oxford, United Kingdom: Altamira Press.
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Connerton, P. (2009). *How modernity forgets*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Çavuşoğlu, E. (2013). Kadim İdeoloji Korporatizme AKP Makyajı: İnşaata Dayalı Büyüme Modelinin Yeni Osmanlılıkla Bütünleşerek Ulusal Popüler Proje Haline Gelişi. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6266567/Kadim_%C4%B0deoloji_Korporatizme_AKP_Makyaj%C4%B1_%C4%B0n%C5%9Faata_Dayal%C4%B1_B%C3%BCy%C3%BCme_Modelinin_Yeni_Osmanl%C4%B1c%C4%B1l%C4%B1kla_B%C3%BCt%C3%BCnle%C5%9Ferek_Ulusal_Pop%C3%BCler_Proje_Haline_Geli%C5%9Fi

- Çaylı, E. (2011, 11- 14 May). *Everyday functionality as commemorative-value: Turkey's sites of atrocities (1960-1997)*. Paper presented at The International Conference on Materiality, Memory, and Cultural Heritage.
- Çomu, A. E. (2005). *The impact of the exchange of populations on the social and economic life of the city of Adana* (Unpublished MA thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Denzin, N. K. (1983). A note on emotionality, self, and interaction. In *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 89, no.2. pp. 402-409.
- Dyke, R. M. V. and Alcock. S. E. (2003) (Eds). *Archaeologies of memory*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Feuchtwang, S. (2000). Reinscriptions: Commemoration, restoration and the interpersonal transmission of histories and memories under modern states in Asia and Europe. In Radstone, S. (2000). (Ed.) *Memory and methodology* (pp. 59-77). Oxford, United Kingdom: Berg.
- Forward, P. (2003). *Heritage: Management, interpretation, identity*. London, the UK and New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gambetti, Z. (2007). Linç girişimleri, neoliberalizm ve güvenlik devleti. *Toplum ve Bilim*, No. 109, Summer 2007, pp. 7-34.
- Gamble, C. (2001). *Archaeology: The basics*. London, United Kingdom, and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gordon, A. (2008). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Grant, J., Gorin, S., & Fleming, N. (2001) *The archaeology coursebook* (3rd edition). London, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Günay, N. (2009). 1909 Adana olaylarından sonra yapılan yardım çalışmaları. *Akademik Bakış*, Volume 2, Issue 4, Summer 2009, pp. 113- 123.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. (L. A. Coser, Trans.) Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hatipoğlu, S. (2014). Doğu sorunu kapsamında Adana Ermeni olayları, *Yeni Türkiye Dergisi*, 60/2014. pp. 1-17.
- Hodder, I. (1992). *Theory and practise in archaeology*. London, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hodgkin, K., & Radstone, S. (2003) (Eds.). *Contested pasts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hulton, P. H. (1993). *History as an art of memory*. Hanover, Virginia: University Press of New England.
- Kaplan, İ. (2009). *Türkiye’de milli eğitim ideolojisi* (5th ed.) İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Publication.

- Kemp, S. P. (2011). Place, history, memory: thinking time within place in Burton, L.M., Kemp, S.P., Leung, M., Matthews, S.A., Takeuchi, D.T. (Eds.). *Communities, neighborhoods, and health: expanding the boundaries of place*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Kohl, P. L., Kozelsky, M., & Ben-Yehuda, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Selective remembrances: Archaeology in the construction, commemoration, and consecration of national pasts*. Chicago, Illinois and London, United Kingdom: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kolluođlu Kırılı, B. (2005). Forgetting Smyrna fire. In *History Workshop Journal*. N.60. pp. 25-44.
- Kuran, İ. (2010). *The practise of renaming places in Turkey: an anthropological perspective on spatio-temporal politics* (Unpublished MA Thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Lloyd, F., & O'Brien, C. (2000). (Eds.). Introduction. In *Secret spaces, forbidden places* (pp. xv-xxii). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Logan, W., & Reeves, K. (Eds.). (2009). *Places of pain and shame: dealing with difficult heritage*. London, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lowe, L. & Lloyd, D. (1997). (Eds.). *The politics of culture in the shadow of capital*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Ma, J. (2009). City as Memory. In Boys-Stones, G., Graziosi, B., & Vasunia, P. (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of Hellenic studies* (pp. 248-259). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Mazzoleni, D. (1993). The city and the imaginary. In Carter, E., Donald, J., & Squires, J. (Eds.) *Space and place* (pp. 285- 301). (J. Koumantarakis, Trans.). London, United Kingdom: Lawrence & Wishart London Limited.
- Milliyet (5 January, 2015). *Başkan Sözlü Ermenileri Hatırlatıp Kürtleri Uyardı*. Retrieved from <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/baskan-sozlu-ermenileri-hatirlatip-kurtleri-adana-yerelhaber-1147690/>.
- Minkley G., & Legassick, M. (2000). "Not telling": Secrecy, lies, and history. *History and Theory*, Vol. 39, No. 4, Theme Issue 39 pp. 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2678046> Page Count: 10.
- Munslow, A. (2007). *Narrative and history*. New York, NY: Palgrave macmillan.
- Nalcı, A. (2015). Yüzüncü Yılında Sürgün Yolunda -8: Adana'nın 'gizli' Ermenileri. Retrieved from <http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/100-yilinda-surgun-yolunda-8-adananin-gizli-ermenileri-1339890/>.
- Neyzi, L. (2009). *Nasıl hatırlıyoruz? Türkiye'de bellek çalışmaları*. İstanbul, Turkey: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

- Neyzi, L. (2010). *Speaking to one another: Personal memories of the past in Armenia and Turkey*. Bonn, Germany: Institut für Internationale Zusammenarbeit Des Deutschen Volkshochschul-Verbandes (dvv international).
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de memoire. In *Representations: 26 Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory*. pp. 7-24. Retrieved from http://www.timeandspace.lviv.ua/files/session/Nora_105.pdf.
- Özdoğan, M. (1998). Ideology and archaeology in Turkey. In Meskell, L. (Ed.). *Archaeology under fire: Nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Öztürkmen, A. (2003). Remembering through material culture: Local knowledge of past communities in a Turkish Black Sea town. In *Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 39, No.2, April 2003*, pp. 179- 183.
- Özyürek, E. (Ed.) (2007). *The politics of memory in Turkey*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Payashoğlu Oğuz, G., & Aksulu, I. (2007). Adana Tepebağ'daki yerleşim dokusunun incelenmesi, koruma sorunları ve öneriler. *Journal of Faculty of Engineering and Architecture of Gazi University. Vol 22, No 2*, pp. 207-216.
- Portelli, A. (1991). *The death of Luigi Trastulli and other stories: Form and meaning in oral history*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Povinelli, E. A. (2006). *The empire of love: Toward a theory of intimacy, genealogy and carnality*. Durham, United Kingdom: Duke University Press.
- Ramazanoğlu, G. (2012). *Adana'da tarih, tarihte Adana*. İstanbul, Turkey: Etik Yayınları.
- Rowan, Y., & Baram U. (2004). Introduction. In *Marketing heritage: Archaeology and the consumption of the past* (pp. 3-10). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Ruggles, D. F. (2011). The stratigraphy of forgetting: The Great Mosque of Cordoba and its contested legacy. In Silverman, H. (Ed.). *Contested cultural heritage* (pp. 51-67). New York, NY: Springer publishing.
- Sağlam, E. (2013). *Living with the specters of the past: An insight into identity, subjectivity and memory in Trabzon* (Unpublished MA thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Seyhan Governorate (2017). Turizm. Retrieved from <http://www.seyhan.gov.tr/turizm>
- Siberman, N. A. (2000). Promised lands and chosen peoples: the politics and poetics of archaeological narrative. In Kohl, P. L., & Fawcett, C. (Eds.) *Nationalism, politics, and the practise of archaeology* (pp. 248- 262). Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Smith, L., & Waterton, E. (2009). *Heritage, communities and archaeology*. London, United Kingdom: Duckworth.
- Sofaer, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Material identities*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Şahin, F. (2015). Tepebağ Höyük 2014- 2015 yılı kazı çalışmaları. In Özme, A. (Ed.) *T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü 37. Kazı sonuçları toplantısı, Volume 2*, Ankara, Turkey. pp. 191-208.
- Till, K. E. (2003). Places of memory. In Agnew, J., Mitchell, K., & Toal, G. (Eds.). *Companion to political geography* (pp. 289- 301). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Timothy, D. J., & and Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. London, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Toksöz, M., & Yalçın, E. (1999). Modern Adana'nın doğuşu ve günümüzdeki izleri. In Kafescioğlu, Ç., & Thys-Şenocak, L. (eds.). *Aptullah Kuran için yazılar (Essays in honour of Aptullah Kuran. İstanbul, Turkey: YKY*.
- Toksöz, M. (2007). Adana Ermenileri ve 1909 "İğtişası", *Tarih ve Toplum, Spring 2007*, Issue 5 (245). pp. 147-157.
- Toksöz, M. (2010). Multiplicity or polarity: A discursive analysis of post-1908 violence in an Ottoman region. In Singer, A., Neumann, C. K., & Somel, S. A. (Eds.) *Untold histories of the Middle East: Recovering voices from the 19th and 20th centuries* (pp. 214- 229). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Toksöz, M. (2015). Çukurova'da sosyoekonomik dönüşüm ve 1909 Adana katliamı. In Adanır, F., Özel, O. (Eds.) *1915: Siyaset, tehcir, soykırım* (p. 233-244). İstanbul, Turkey: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Tonga, D. (2015). Ermeni Tehciri'nin 100. senesinde öğretim programlarımızda Ermeni Meselesi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Volume: 8, Issue: 21, December 2015*, pp. 871- 907.
- Üstel, F. (2008). *Makbul vatandaşın peşinde* (3rd ed.). İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları.
- Walkowitz, D. J., & Knauer, L. M. (2004). (Eds.). *Memory and the impact of political transformation in public spaces*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Yesayan, Z. (2014). *Yıkıntılar Arasında*. (K. Y. Gavrilof, Trans.). İstanbul, Turkey: Aras Yayınları.(Original work published in 1911).
- Yeşilbaş, M. (2016). Hegemonyanın harcı: AKP döneminde inşaata dayalı birikim rejimi. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, Volume 71, Issue. 2, 2016*, pp. 599-626. Yörük, S. (2012). Adana şehrinin tarihi gelişimi (XVI-XVIII. yüzyıllar) *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Volume 21, Issue 2012*, pp. 287-308.

Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time maps: Collective memory and social shape of the past*.
Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.