www.turkishstudies.net/social

Turkish Studies - Social Sciences

eISSN: 2667-5617

INTERNATIONAL BALKAN UNIVERSITY
Sponsored by IBU

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

Experiences of First Generation Lausanne Exchange Migrants: Çatalca Region*

Birinci Nesil Lozan Mübadillerinin Deneyimleri: Çatalca Bölgesi

Ahu Paköz Türkeli*

Abstract: The Lausanne convention concerned approximately two million people, and most of them were forcibly denaturalized from their homelands. Today, being one of the top immigrant-receiving countries, the importance of the 1923 Lausanne Peace Treaty and "Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations" continues for Turkey. The experiences of the first-generation migrants attracted attention worldwide however, the stories remained mostly untold until the 1980s. There are numerous studies and books made later on, but mostly the migrants around the Istanbul area are not entirely analyzed until very recent times. This article examines the experiences and thoughts of the first-generation Lausanne Treaty Exchange migrants in and around the Catalca area in Istanbul based on data from the fieldwork made for my 2016 dated Ph.D. thesis "Influences of 1923 Population Exchange on Second and Third Generation Migrants" (Paköz Türkeli, 2016), face to face in-depth interviews with 25 people and oral history books; through the perspectives of second and third generation Exchange migrants. After providing a literature review and short information on the history of the events and region included in the treaty with the examples from the interviews, the article will provide the theoretical framework of the study. The article will focus on the experiences and thoughts of first-generation migrants during the migration process and afterward. Their feeling of otherness and measures to overcome this feeling will be pointed. It will also reveal their double-sided attachment and affinity to the lands they lived/left. The study will also use excerpts from the Ph.D. thesis. The data in the research can be especially useful for migration and generational studies.

Structured Abstract: Today, being one of the top immigrant-receiving countries, the importance of the 1923 Lausanne Peace Treaty and "Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations" continues for Turkey. Although internationally the topic attracted the attention of many research areas, on Turkey's side the topic remained relatively silent until the last two decades. Moreover, most of the studies were conducted with highly biased feelings mostly right after the forced migration process was over. Due to official documentation problems and difficulties in finding first-hand sources, most studies did not include interviews. These studies also fail to show the outcomes in a long-term process and fail, to a great extent, to show the following generations' practices, views, and feelings towards these experiences. When the literature is analyzed, one can easily recognize the abundance of research about the topic among the Greek migrants when compared to the Muslims (Yıldırım, 2006a: 50). This study is also an attempt to fill this gap in which the

* The data used in this article were interviewed with second and third generation immigrants in the Çatalca region of Istanbul (total 25 immigrants interviewed for doctoral thesis) between 2014 and 2016.

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü
Asst. Prof. Dr., Istanbul Ticaret University, Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, Department of Sociology
ORCİD 0000-0003-0958-6063
ahupakoz@gmail.com

Cite as/ Atıf: Paköz Türkeli, A. (2021). Experiences of first generation Lausanne exchange migrants: Çatalca region. *Turkish Studies – Social Sciences, 16*(3), 1305-1320. https://dx.doi.org/10.47356/TurkishStudies.50112
Received/Geliş: 23 March/Mart 2021 *Checked by plagiarism software*
Accepted/Kabul: 20 June/Haziran 2021 **Published/Yayın:** 25 June/Haziran 2021
CC BY-NC 4.0

studies made in the last three decades are filling in the Turkish side. The article also points the forced migration and why Lausanne Treaty is categorized in this section and the effects of forced migration on the migrants.

The research used some migration, culture, and identity theories to support and explain the data analyzed. In order to understand the existing social relationships and behaviors of the people and current social order, analyzing only today's situations and relations will not be enough. We need to understand and look at the history of those people and lands as well. Mannheim argued that "the central thesis of historicism was that no product of human culture could be analyzed and understood in a 'timeless' fashion; interpretation had to begin by ascribing to each product a temporal index, by relating it to a period-bound 'style.'" (Mannheim, 1952: 6). The research is looking at the migrant identities from a 'generational' point of view and throughout the study, it is realized the generation is not defined by their age but by the experiences they have been through.

This paper aims to present the experiences of the first-generation Lausanne Treaty exchange migrants during the migration process by giving references to the process of migration and its effects on the migrants. It will also present the first generation migrants' afterward position and manners regarding their history and their motherlands. This will be achieved with the help of the in-depth interviews conducted with 25 second and third-generation migrants between the years 2014-2016; observations made in Çatalca, Istanbul; and previous oral history books on the first generation migrants by the Foundation of Lausanne Treaty Emigrants (LMV). The data gained in the unpublished Ph.D. thesis, "Influences of 1923 Population Exchange on Second and Third Generation Migrants in 2016," and panel discussions with the LMV in 2020 will form the article's basis. Some excerpts from the Ph.D. thesis will be used directly in the article. (Paköz Türkeli, 2016) We will focus on exchange migrants who migrated during the period 1923-1930 under the 1923 Lausanne Treaty. In the article, firstly, the migration process will be pointed briefly from the perspectives of the migrants interviewed, to reveal and recognize the situations of the migrants. So the main research questions are;

- What did they experience and what were their feelings during migration and afterward?
- Did they want to go back again?
- What were their feelings towards their motherland (Greece) later on?

The research uses the qualitative discourse analysis method to analyze the interviews conducted and oral books history books. The facts in history and important events for the migrants are also summarized to build the conversations and discussions made on familiar grounds for the reader. Distinctive features of the Catalca region and the migrants moving there are provided. The language they spoke upon arrival (Greek) stands out as the main feature of the migrants settled there. It also affected their reception by the locals and their adaptation process. What came out as common and will be mentioned in this paper are;

- Their feelings upon arrival,
- Their urge to go back and see the lands they left behind.

In summary, it can be argued that the hardships and events they faced before they left, on the road and upon arrival mainly forced them to be silent after they settled in Turkey. Leaving everything behind in a period when nationalism was high in every country, and being a minority in these periods seemed like a big problem. These all add up to their becoming more silent about their past and they generally did not tell their children about the bitter memories of the past. Therefore, upon arrival their first action was waiting patiently for the situation to resettle and calm down; and in the first 10 years, it can be argued that they were thinking this as a temporary situation that will pass after the war period is over. However, afterward, they started to see Turkey as a homeland and did not want to leave again. Yet, Greece also remained always as motherland in their minds. Although the untold memories created a gap in the identity transfer to the next generations, in recent years their children and grandchildren started collecting the memories and trying to learn the missing history. Their children and grandchildren are still bringing earth from their grandmothers' motherland cities and villages to put on their graves as a promised will.

Keywords: Sociology of Migration, Exchange Migrants, Lausanne Treaty, First Generation Migrants, Identity

Öz: Yaklaşık iki milyon insanı ilgilendiren Lozan sözleşmesi kapsamında çoğu mübadil zorla memleketlerinden çıkarıldı. Bugün en çok göç alan ülkelerden biri olan Türkiye için 1923 Lozan Barış

Antlaşması ve "Rum ve Türk Nüfus Mübadelesine İlişkin Sözleşme" nin önemi halen devam etmektedir. Birinci nesil göçmenlerin deneyimleri dünya çapında ilgi gördü, ancak Türkiye tarafında hikayeler 1980'lere kadar çoğunlukla anlatılmamış ya da kaydedilmemişti. Sonradan çok sayıda çalışma ve kitap yapıldı ama özellikle İstanbul çevresindeki göçmenler çok yakın zamanlara kadar tam olarak analiz edilmemişti. Bu makale, 2016 tarihli doktora tezim olan "1923 Nüfus Mübadelesinin İkinci ve Üçüncü Kuşak Göçmenler Üzerindeki Etkileri" (Paköz Türkeli, 2016)'den parçalar kullanarak ve tez için 25 kişiyle yaptığım derinlemesine görüşmeler ve sözlü tarih kitaplarından faydalanarak İstanbul Çatalca bölgesinde ve çevresindeki ikinci ve üçüncü nesil mübadillerin perspektiflerinden birinci neslin göç sırasında ve sonrasındaki deneyimlerini ve düşüncelerini anlatacaktır. Literatür incelemesi ve antlaşmada yer alan olayların ve bölgenin tarihi hakkında kısa bilgiler verildikten sonra makale çalışmanın teorik çerçevesini sunacaktır. Bu makalede öncelikle ilk nesil göçmenlerin göç sürecinde ve sonrasında yaşanan deneyim ve düşüncelerine odaklanılacaktır. Ötekilik duyguları ve bu duygunun üstesinden gelmek için aldıkları önlemler vurgulanacaktır. Aynı zamanda yaşadıkları/bıraktıkları topraklara çift taraflı bağlılıklarını ve yakınlıklarını da vurgulayacağız. Çalışmada ayrıca doktora tezinden alıntılar da kullanılacak. Makalenin çıktıları özellikle göç ve kuşak çalışmaları için faydalı olabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Göç Sosyolojisi, Mübadiller, Lozan Antlaşması, Birinci Nesil Göçmenler, Kimlik

Introduction

In order to understand the existing social relationships and behaviors of the people and current social order, analyzing only today's situations and relations will not be enough. We need to understand and look at the history of those people and lands as well. Mannheim argued that "the central thesis of historicism was that no product of human culture could be analyzed and understood in a 'timeless' fashion; interpretation had to begin by ascribing to each product a temporal index, by relating it to a period-bound 'style.'" (Mannheim, 1952: 6). This paper aims to present the experiences of the first generation Lausanne Treaty exchange migrants' during the migration process by giving references to the process of migration and its effects on the migrants. It will also present the first generation migrants' afterward position and manners regarding their history and their motherlands with the help of the in-depth interviews conducted with second and third-generation migrants; observations made in Çatalca, Istanbul; and previous oral history books on the first generation migrants by the Foundation of Lausanne Treaty Emigrants (LMV). The data gained in the unpublished Ph.D. thesis, "Influences of 1923 Population Exchange on Second and Third Generation Migrants in 2016," and panel discussions with the LMV in 2020 will form the article's basis. Some excerpts from the Ph.D. thesis will be used directly in the article. (Paköz Türkeli, 2016) We will focus on exchange migrants who migrated during the period 1923-1930 under the 1923 Lausanne Treaty. In the article, firstly, the migration process will be pointed briefly from the perspectives of the migrants interviewed, to reveal and recognize the situations of the migrants.

Literature Review

Although internationally the topic attracted the attention of many research areas, on Turkey's side the topic remained relatively silent until the last two decades. As mentioned this type of migration is categorized as the forced migration which is defined as;

> A migratory movement in which an element of coercion exists, including threats to life and livelihood, whether arising from natural or man-made causes (e.g. movements of refugees and internally displaced persons as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine or development projects (https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/glossary_search/forced-migrant_en)

In this type of migration, the migrants' desire or motivation to leave the lands they live in is extremely low, and the migration process starts unexpectedly and abruptly, generally leaving the

migrants in a very unprotected and unprepared situation. In this type, loss of many lives and traumatic experiences in terms of the individuals involved are usually observed. Generally, the time of forced migration is a time of turmoil and conflict for societies.

The previous studies mainly discussed the political, economic and historical sides of the events in detail (Alpan, 2012; Arı, 2003; Çapa, 2001; Erdal, 2006; Hirschon, 2004; Yıldırım, 2006a; Yıldırım, 2006b) or focused on the atrocities and cruelties of the process and conditions during the migration and the hardships the migrants on both sides had undergone. (Ağanoğlu, 2001; Arslan, 2008; Hatipler 2003;). Another focus was the settlement processes and problems, or "the liquidation of refugee properties and their proper indemnification had been under the authority of a Mixed Commission." (Erdal, 2006; Rogers and Willekens, 1986; Yıldırım, 2006a)

Moreover, most of the studies were conducted with highly biased feelings, mostly right after the forced migration process. Due to official documentation problems and difficulties in finding first-hand sources, most studies did not include interviews. These studies also fail to show the outcomes in a long-term process and fail, to a great extent, to show the following generations' practices, views, and feelings towards these experiences. When the literature is analyzed, one can easily recognize the abundance of research about the topic among the Greek migrants when compared to the Muslims (Yıldırım, 2006b: 50). According to Yıldırım, "the initial phase of [the Turkish migrants] plight remains, for the most part, a mystery due to the absence of related documentation and especially owing to the policy of the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Ankara, which is still closed to researchers." (Yıldırım 2006a: 137) Previous studies all discuss the migration and settlement process itself; this period itself is a topic of debate and has already been researched by various fields. (Alexandris, 1992; Şimşir, 1970; Seha, 1972; Altuner, 1937; Kökdemir, 1952; Yıldırım, 2006a).

The Turkish literature is relatively late about scholarly analysis of the exchange migrants. It can be stated that Thrace, Samsun, and Izmir's exchange migrants were among the cases mostly researched by scholars. Although Istanbul received a significant number of migrants, it was not that intensely analyzed. That was another reason this research is about exchange migrants settled in the Istanbul region. The table below shows the numbers of people arrive at different regions in Turkey.

Table 1: People arrive as of November 1924: (Erdal, 2006: 111)

Territory	**Excluded from Population Exchange**	**Included to Population Exchange**	**Total**
Samsun	---	51.353	51.353
Thrace	118	59.902	60.020
Trebizond	---	18.836	18.836
Smyrna(Izmir)	623	59.185	59.808
Bursa	398	24.450	24.848
Constantinople	---	30.093	30.093
Izmit	---	24.711	24.711
Antalya	---	4.254	4.254
Konya	1.485	22.155	23.640
Adana	---	20.246	20.246
Sivas	805	3.314	4.121
Kastamonu	407	2.216	2.623
Total	**3.838**	**320.742**	**324.580**

Furthermore, when the Istanbul area is analyzed at that time, as urban Greeks were not included within the Lausanne Treaty Convention 'Article 2':

> The following persons shall not be included in the exchange provided for in Article1:
>
> a)The Greek inhabitants of Constantinople.
>
> b)The Moslem inhabitants of Western Thrace.
>
> All Greeks who were already established before the 30 October 1918, within the areas under the Prefecture of the City of Constantinople, as defined by the law of 1912, shall be considered as Greek inhabitants of Constantinople [...] (Turkish Foreign Ministry Website, Lausanne Treaty)

Thus, the Istanbul area again stood out as an important example for the population exchange topic. The migrants were especially settled in the periphery area in Istanbul, such as Kartal, Maltepe, Tuzla, Catalca, Silivri, and the Prince Islands. Another reason was the settlement concerns; the Turkish migrants from Greece were planned to settle in the areas emptied by the Greeks living in those places in Turkey, and these were the places in which mainly the Greek minority were settled before. Catalca, which includes nearly all of the migrants we interviewed in the Istanbul area was also among the cabinet council's distribution places on 17 July 1923 (Erdal, 2006: 136). This area especially attracts attention as most exchange migrants settled there did not know any Turkish when they came to Turkey. They were later named "patriyot" (spelled the same as the patriot in English) to be separated from the Turkish Speaking exchanged migrants. The fact that the patriyot exchange migrants were highly populated in the Catalca area made it more available to meet with their former and subsequent generations.

Methodology

In this article, in-depth interviews were conducted with the second and third-generation migrants in the Catalca area of Istanbul (in total 25 migrants interviewed for the Ph.D. Thesis) between the years 2014-2016, and the oral history books published by the Lausanne Treaty Migrants Foundation will be used as the primary source. Upon reaching some of the migrants, the difficulty in finding first-generation migrants who were alive and healthy is realized. Therefore, second and third-generation migrants are interviewed, and their thoughts and knowledge about their mothers/fathers; grandmothers/grandparents are gathered. We also spoke with one first-generation migrant aged 97 in Çatalca who migrated from Neapoli, Greece. Moreover, to reach long-term conclusions for further studies and make comparisons, it was better to speak with both the second and third generations.

In this research main points to discuss in the in-depth interviews were;

- The first generations feelings and situation upon arrival,
- Their urge to go back and see/live the lands they left behind. (and if there is an urge)

So the main research questions are;

- What did they experience and what were their feelings during migration and afterward?
- Did they want to go back again?
- What were their feelings towards their motherland (Greece) later on?

First of all, the contacts are made with the help of LMV, and together with their links, the interviews were directed to Catalca, Lausanne Treaty Exchange Migrants Museum. With the Museum director and their associations' help, the first contacts in the field are reached. By using snowball sampling and purposive sampling (we used the locations technique where the groups are mostly settled and the social groups they interact with) as many cases as possible are reached. Some interviews are conducted in the museum and some are conducted in the interviewees' houses. The

interviews lasted about 1,5-2 hours. The list of the interviewees is below. Their names are changed, but their age and where they come from are presented below.

Tablo 2: Interviews Conducted in Istanbul

n	Interviewee*	Age /From	Generation	Settlement in Turkey
1	Nurcan Sayim -f	70/ Thessaloniki	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Yedikule
2	Bediha Erkurt-f	85/ Thessaloniki	Second Generation	İstanbul/ Maltepe
3	Nalan Özsoy-f	80/ Thessalonili	Second Generation	İstanbul/Eyüp
4	Ayşe Okur-f	73/ Thessaloniki	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Eyüp
5	Interviewee-m	97/ Neapoli	First Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
6	Mert Dinçer-m	54/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
7	Mustafa Toygar-m	68/ Neapoli	Second Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
8	Ali Ergün-m	77/ Neapoli	Second Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
9	Nergis Şahin -f	47/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
10	Sema Gül-f	47/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
11	Ismail Gül-m	50 / Drama	Third Generation	İstanbul/Çatalca
12	Mübeccel Duran -f	81/ Neapoli	Second Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
13	Rena Gencer-f	49/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
14	Belgin Tezer-f	51/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
15	Erdal Özgün-m	52/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/Çatalca
16	Galip Eren-m	57/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/Çatalca
17	Ismail Tan-m	61/Langaza	Third Generation	İstanbul/Çatalca
18	Erol Taner-m	32/ Neapoli	Third Generation	İstanbul/ Çatalca
19	Ahmet Gün –m	76/ Neapoli	Second Generation	İstanbul/Çatalca
20	Interviewee-f	60/Neapoli	Second Generation	İstanbul/Çatalca
21	Süleyman Bağcı –m	96/Neapoli	Second Generation	İstanbul/Mimarsinan
22	Sevilay Bağcı-f	55/Thessaloniki	Third Generation	İstanbul/Mimarsinan
23	İsmail Keskin-m	83/Thessaloniki	Second Generation	İstanbul/Mimarsinan
24	Interviewee-m	67/ Thessaloniki	Second Generation	Istanbul/Maltepe
25	Interviewee-m	54/ Thessaloniki	Third Generation	Istanbul/Çatalca

*The names of the interviewees are changed and made up in order not to reveal their identities.

We should be more precise about the choice of generation. As the population exchange occurred after a war period and did not restrict people according to their age, sex, occupation, or any other categorization, people of varying ages, sexes, and occupation groups migrated to Turkey during the migration process. As a result, the first generation migrants include both one-year-olds and sixty-seventy-year olds which subsequently affected the ages of the second-generation migrants. However, it is hard to find a healthy, living first-generation migrant who could share their memories with us today. One first-generation migrant is contacted and included also in the research to get a different perspective and be able to make comparisons with the other interviewees. For the oral history books, a similar scheme is used, and with the help of these written sources; supporting, contrasting and similar points with the interviews are encoded. They provided a broader perspective and enabled one to see the people that could not be reached or spoken with during the research.

Before the interviews, the interviewees were informed about the questions, and all the participants were voluntarily involved in the study. A brief description of the study, the questions, the purpose of the research, and its expected duration were provided to the subjects together with the 'consent form'. All the subjects were guaranteed anonymity, and their names were not included in the study. It is also important to point out that not everyone was willing to share their experiences.

During the interviews, yes and no questions and leading questions were avoided. After the interviews with open-ended questions were concluded; parallel patterns or themes among the participants were checked. Moreover, conducting a structured interview was avoided to avoid the

mechanical tone and adapt to the different life experiences, be more flexible in the questioning process, and get a wider perspective from the respondents.

The interviews are continued until similar patterns from the migrants were heard in each different case and age group. Even with varying social statuses, perspectives, and backgrounds, varying and common characteristics became apparent when the interviews were finished.

In this paper, small-scale interactions between groups are observed, and the group dynamics are scrutinized. In this way, the outcomes of these interactions and decisions for the structures they are embedded in will be seen. Seeing the first generation through the eyes of the second and third generations also presents us with the later results of their thoughts upon arrival and actions.

Lausanne Convention and Migration Process

Ongoing clashes between the two countries forced Greece and Turkey to sign a convention in Lausanne, which went into effect on 25 August 1923 and was concerned with the simultaneous exchange of Orthodox Christians from Turkey to Greece and Muslims in Greece to Turkey; except the ones settled in Istanbul and Western Thrace. The urgency of the Convention was also a result of the pressures coming from the Allied Countries' representatives and the disorder in both countries' economies and politics during the period. Thus, during that period, all social, economic, and political problems and burdens of the two countries seemed to find a legitimate reason under the 'minority problem' name. When taken into international grounds, this seemed to be an urgent case to be solved as soon as possible. (Shaw&Shaw, 1977; Hall, 1936; Şimşir, 1986; Duman, 2009). Within this perspective, it would not be wrong to say that the Lausanne Peace Treaty in a way both confirmed the immigrants and minorities being a problem and make the problem official on the international grounds (Yıldırım, 2006a; Uzunçarşılı, 1988; Sevim, 2002; Ağanoğlu, 2001; Balbay, 2007; Köprülü, 1991; Inbaşı, 2002; Küçük, 2005; Hammer, 1999). The reflection of this is later seen in the experiences of the migrants from both sides. They were seen as a problem before they migrate, which caused them to be seen as a problem by the natives when they settle into the new lands. The nation state's emphasis pointed everything different as a problem, and the exchange migrants were "different" at first sight.

When the first-generation migrants are examined after looking at the process of treaty and migration, it is easier to understand their feelings and behaviors after settlement. Before, a compulsory population exchange on this scale had never been experimented. Therefore, this migration is categorized as forced migration and the people as forced migrants. In this type of migration, the urge to leave the country is very low in terms of migrants, and usually, the transportation and settlement process is traumatic. In the interviews, it is understood that nearly every family lost a close relative on their way to Turkey.

After the treaty's urgent implementation, the countries would see the challenges waiting for them while the treaty was putting into practice. As many scholars have already named it, the treaty's main problem was that the treaty failed to clearly sort out who exactly is included in the exchanged populations. Although the first five articles of the convention talk about which groups were included in the population "to be exchanged" it was still open to discussion. Both countries seemed to have perceived it as they want and try to include the groups of people they saw as causing trouble. In Greece, the Gypsies and Albanians; and in Turkey Christians and Armenians were also forced to be included in the population exchange groups. This situation also explains and makes it easier to understand how hard it could be to be different or “seem/thought as different” in a newly emerging nation based on nation-state ideals and constant emphasis on being a homogenous nation.

According to the interviews, the migrants came through various ways but most of our interviewees came with ships and boats. Their migration and assignment to their new place have taken weeks and in some cases months, some of the elderly and unhealthy ones were already lost

during the journey. Some got sick during this process, and when they were directed to their new location, they were with nothing in their hands. Being emotionally damaged, socially and geographically deracinated, and financially broken, migrants are taken into health checks at the borders and sent to their new locations.

Therefore, a significant problem was the transportation and resettlement of the migrants to their new lands and finding solutions to their post-settlement needs such as food, clothing, and accommodation. Some of the migrants had to provide for their own needs after they managed to cross the borders. They assigned Refugee Settling Officers (İskan-ı Muhacirin Memuru) to settle the incoming migrants to the most suitable places for them and preferably regions that are fertile and similar in landscape and climate to the place they migrated from. No matter how careful the parties were, it is for sure that the migrants went through many changes, including a whole new geographical and socio-cultural environment. Between 1923 and 1933, the Balkan migrants were especially named as "free migrants" as due to the limited budget, the government declared that only the migrants coming from Greece could be supported, and the government would carry out the settling procedure. Therefore, the other Balkan migrants were accepted as free migrants, and they were expected to bring the money and belongings they would live on with themselves. (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi (TBMMZC), (D): V, (İ): (C1): 6, 78; & Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi (BCA), 272.12/56.143.34.; 272.14/77.40.6.; 272.12/55.140.12.)

Upon arrival, thousands of people were placed temporarily in public areas such as religious or private charity houses and mosques. Many slept in the streets or on the carriages they came with until they were directed to their permanent residence place (Halaçoğlu, 1994: 69.). Most of the exchange migrants are mostly placed in the regions and houses emptied by the Greek (Rum) citizens. There were so many people coming, this was chosen as a faster solution for the accommodation problems of the coming migrants. Izmir and Edirne stood out as two of the main cities when the population exchange with Greece. Most of the migrants coming from the other Balkan states and Greece stated they did not want any governmental help while settling, but after 1927 the reports coming from the local authorities show that the procedures were not properly working and most of the people previously not asking for governmental help were deeply in need. In theory, according to the 1923 Lausanne Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, it was planned that the houses left by the Greeks would be given to Muslims coming from Greece in return for the goods they left behind. However, mostly the nature of events became an obstacle for the people and the government to implement that plan. Some migrants fail to bring any documents that prove their possessions back in Greece, and in some cases, before the local and central authorities were organized and ready to control the movements, many Greek migrants had already emptied their houses and the goods, houses, and lands they left behind were plundered on a large scale. Thus, there is again no accurate information showing the number of goods these people left behind (Arı, 2003: 9-15). Another researcher argues all the land left behind were officially seized, and the lands with no belongings on them were directly sold to the local populations by the government, states that it is probable that only in the Vilayet of Aydın, the Greeks left 270.000-hectare land behind (Keyder, 1983: 39.) When its nature and mechanisms are taken into account, it should be accepted that it is impossible to reach accurate numbers, even so, these numbers estimated can at least enable one to imagine the dimension of the events during that period.

In the group we chose, most of the incoming people were peasants and needed to be assigned their lands to be producers in their new homeland. Their allocation of land did not start until they were completely settled, which was in some cases after 1935. Between the years 1923-1935, the exchange migrants were settled and turned into producers but after that, they were still trying to adapt to the new social, political, economic, and cultural structure they entered in after many years.

Some of the migrants, who cannot be settled into the outgoing Greeks houses, were settled into their temporary settlements, and the government started to build permanent adobe houses for the migrants. The houses were built collectively with the voluntary working of the migrants and the locals in unison and alternately. As many migrant's houses were still not finished after a long time, the government abandoned the voluntary working for the houses and decided to work with building contractors. (Ulus, 6.9.1937: 6; Turan, 9 Eylül 1936: 1; Anadolu, 29 Temmuz 1937: 2; Ulus, 1.8.1937: 10; Ulus, 4.8.1937: 2; Ulus, 10.8.1937: 10; Son Posta, 31 Ağustos 1937: 3). Between 1934 and 1937, around eighteen thousand houses were built for the migrants (Duman, 2009: 487). Most of the houses built were similar in style, mostly one floor, three or four-room houses with one storage, toilet, and barn next to it. The migrants were expected to start paying for the house's cost eight years after they were settled, and the payment of the houses was put into 20 years monthly installments (Son Posta, 1936: 3).

Therefore, the state could not cover all the lacks of the migrants, yet it allowed them to make a new start in the new lands covering the basic needs and sheltering them. This process gave them a chance to start their new lives in Turkey one step forward. Nevertheless, it can be suggested that the migrants mostly had to solve most of their economic, social and cultural problems themselves after the settlement process was over. They had to change their jobs, look for the best alternative city to live in for their family, choose between the government offered jobs, lands, and the other alternatives, and try to form new relationships with the locals.

Analytical Framework

The research used some migration, culture, and identity theories to support and explain the data analyzed. Still, the main argument supported in the thesis is related to and inspired by Karl Mannheim's theory of generations, namely the "Problem of Generations," as he named it (Mannheim, 1952: 276-323.) The research is looking at the migrant identities from a 'generational' point of view, and Mannheim's theory is regarded as "the most systematic and fully developed treatment of generation from a sociological perspective" and highlights critical sociological concerns as "the relationship between biology and social; the nature of time; the relationship between biography and history and between personal and social change; the mechanisms of social change; and socio-psychological connections of language and knowledge." (Pilcher, 1994: 482.) Throughout the study, it is understood that the first-generation and second-generation migrants are not defined by their age but by the experiences they have been through.

In "The Problem of Generations", Mannheim introduced the framework for research on generations different from the demographical approaches on generations as predetermined age groups; instead, he argues dramatic socio-political events determine the generation groups and each "new generation generates a renewal effect which serves as a fundamental factor of historical change. (Powell and Hendricks, 2009: 42.) We also believed that it is possible to find different patterns in each generation as their attitudes and feelings are all embedded in and mutually affected by the society and the broader intertwined structures within the society and time they live in. The study shows that the first generation's behaviors and choices had a great impact on the second and third-generation migrants.

Discussions based on Interviews and Oral History Books

As provided above, in this paper the focal point will be the information about the interviewees;

- knowledge on the first generations' experiences;
- the feelings and situation upon arrival
- Their urge to go back and see/live the lands they left behind.

According to the interviews and oral history books, the common grounds and recurring themes and answers brought us to the headings below.

a. The feelings and situation upon arrival:

First of all, for all of the migrants, we can argue that they could not describe the migration process of their parents or grandparents in detail. There were lacks and blank areas when they are talking about the events about the transportation and settlement process. They stated they also learned most of the events after the 1980s-90s when they started to search more on the subject.

Catalca region is distinctive by the nature of the incoming exchange migrants who did not know any Turkish when they landed in their new settlement areas. This is also important because the outgoing exchange migrants were speaking Turkish back then. Language becomes an important medium for creating "the other" in the locals' minds and they were not very much welcomed until the locals witness their similarities and neighborly behaviors. This is especially important because according to the interviews, the hardships encountered on the road and back in their motherlands, the exclusion they faced on the first years of arrival, and the fear of losing what is left behind caused them to be more silent about their memories, stories, and their past. Therefore, what is learned or acquired (by the second generation and following generations) in the childhood or adolescence years from the family is actually what the family chose to tell them. As an example; a second-generation migrant Mert Dinçer stated he visited Greece several times and during those visits, he could learn more about the migration stories of his father and grandmother more than he was told. He stated

> My grandmother was always telling me stories about their life back in Greece and she told me how to speak Greece while she was weaving a carpet and I – as a child-was sitting by her side. Yet, after my visits, I learned that she was always telling me only about the good memories and stories. (Dinçer, 54, Third Generation.)

He recognized this when he went to Greece and learned about his family's stories and searched for the family's official records there. The great news for him was that there left two aunts of him still living in Greece. This when first learned shocked the Dinçer family as they were not aware that the aunts were still alive and living there. He stated his father must have died thinking that his sisters died during the population exchange. For the rest of the family, however, the news was even more shocking as they were not even aware of her existence.

While talking about memories and identity formation, one topic that kept emerging was the belongings left behind. In the light of the given examples, we can easily conclude that none of the interviewees could sell any of their properties before they hit the roads for Turkey; the case was also true for the biographies and written live interviews studied. One first-generation migrant stated that they were very wealthy when they were in Greece (First Generation, 97); however, they left everything behind while coming to Turkey. All of the people revealed that their parents or grandparents could come with only a handful of belongings as they were in a hurry and feared that they might be killed or tortured on their way to Turkey. The urgency of the procedure made it even harder for the migrants to set on the road. Until they reach a form of transportation to carry them to Turkey, they walked on foot with their children. Given these conditions, it is not easy to guess how much of a possession they could take as well. Özge Çelik narrated that she found some documents at home when she was in secondary school but could not understand them as they were written in the Ottoman language. She brought them to her teachers to be translated and then learned that they were documents showing the items they brought with them. On the paper, it was written that they came only with 'quilt and a luggage'. This fact aroused her curiosity about her grand grandparents' past in which they had to embark on a journey only with a quilt and luggage.

On the other hand, these items, furniture, and all the other belongings (animate and inanimate) left behind were a part of their past. Besides the materialistic values of these cherished

possessions, they had intangible value for the owners no matter how much they cost. They provided them with historical continuity, contentment, comfort, and a sense of belonging. As Belk argued, "[o]ur possessions are a major contributor to and reflection of our identities" (Belk, 1988: 139). Another important point about their identity and group consciousness was the time they learned about being an exchange migrant. Some of them learned these memories directly from their parents/grandparents; however, they stated they were not able to give a lot of details about them until the 1990s. They try to see and find the houses they left behind in the visits which mostly took place in the 1990s. They also questioned whether there is any memory/ item which stands still there. Some managed to find their pictures and some small belongings when they visited the village and the houses they left behind in Greece. Being an exchange migrant was not told with its whole reality to the upcoming generations, their children learned about the food and culture however they were not told the feelings and emotions the first generation experienced before and after settlement. Therefore, they in a way avoided or prevented to pass the migrant identity to their children. The children did not feel excluded from the new community they entered and grow up like the locals. Between the lines, the true feelings of the first generation right upon arrival remained a mystery for all for a long time. However, after the 1980s their children and grandchildren started to search for these untold memories and feelings. Years after their arrival, their feeling of belonging grew for both of the countries.

b. Their urge to go back and see/live the lands they left behind:

One striking feature of the migrants in the Catalca area is that people residing in these areas mostly came from Thessaloniki vilayet and its villages. Another important common characteristic of these people was that 22 of them from the Istanbul area were speaking Greek both before and after the population exchange process. In the interviews, they stated that even after the migration process to Turkey, those who migrated at an elderly age could not learn Turkish very well and mostly continued speaking Greek at home and in their relationships.

If individuals' unique perspectives are sought, then there is not much choice but to rely on their selves. Moreover, observing the individual's version of the history and observing them retell their fathers/grandfathers' stories are another topic of interest. The stories or moments they choose/point to as necessary will also tell us a lot about both the individuals and the group's feelings and views. In fact, it is that subjective perspective "what constitutes the individual's reality of his or her world (Atkinson, 2002: 124).

It can be argued that the choices of the first generation and the movements of the authorities in the 1920s are still effective in the lives of the second and third-generation migrants. It is mostly stated that the first generations were thinking about turning back to their motherland (Greece) at least in the first decade after migration. This is also understood from their savings and investments. They mostly started buying lands and houses after this period. Some stated they were thinking of this as a temporary position until the relationship between the countries was settled down. In my opinion, it is also because they come so unprepared that one part of them always wanted to get their belongings and memories back from their home. Most of the interviewees stated, "I wish they could have taken the family albums of the parents and grandparents with them," some long for and curious about their homes, and most of them mentioned their parent's and grandparent's sorrow about not visiting or seeing their parents' grave.

It is also revealed that most of the interviewees were peasants both in Greece and after they migrated to Turkey. (Except 4 people) According to the biographies and interviews, when these people of specific occupations migrate to another country, after a while of recovery, the first thing they did was to evaluate the possibilities presented by the government. As the government granted them land and house their first choice of residence was the place shown by the state, and their occupations would be linked with the place they were residing in. The incoming exchange migrants were classified by the government authorities "according to their places of origin and divided them

into three broad categories: 1) tobacconists (tütüncü), 2) agriculturalists (çiftçi), and 3) grape-growers and dealers in olives (bağcı ve zeytinci)" (Yıldırım, 2006a: 140) what is striking is that this classification also affected the following generations as revealed in the interviews. Being a farmer necessitates one to bind with the land as their economic survival also depends on it. Therefore, once settled, it is harder to leave the land or change the job. Until the third generation, the families who were granted land and resided in the outskirts of Istanbul or its villages were mostly dealing with farming and animal breeding. Today, there are still exchange migrant families who are dealing with agricultural activities. For instance, Galip Eren stated he was also dealing with agriculture and animal breeding as an occupation and continues in that occupation. He also emphasized he could not get higher education for economic reasons, which was also why he chose this job. The case is similar for many migrants born around the same period (Eren, 57, Third Generation).

The jobs they are dealing with also impacted the inner family dynamics and social life they are in. Most of them were living in extended families while they were in Greece, and farming and animal breeding required them to help each other, and it turned into a family occupation for them. Upon the first residence in Turkey, they mainly preserved their extended family and helped each other recover. However, it is observed that in the Catalca area they mostly chose to live as nuclear families after the second generation. However, some newlyweds were still living close to the other family members.

'The place' in migration studies (and in this case Greece or Turkey) is given importance to understand the context, attributions, and the production of identities. As discussed, the identities should also be understood "in relation to the ever-changing situations and contexts where they emerge." (Ehrkamp, 2005: 348). In the case of exchange migrants, their motherland (Greece) and homeland (Turkey) gave meaning to define their identities.

They all accepted Turkey as their home and Greece as a part of their identity. Thus not only are the localities the places of subject formation, as some scholars have argued (Ehrkamp, 2005: 348) but also the places (they had never been to) add up to the construction or formation of their identities as well. Some of them even had hardships in calling 'one place' as hometown and defining themselves as exchange migrants or giving the first city they were settled or sent from, although it was their parents/grandparents who were literally been/sent there.

The nature of the place and both the opportunities and barriers they face add up to their character and identity. The multicultural atmosphere of Istanbul, the possibilities about the settlement, and that most of the settlers were from the Naslic and Drama region enabled the migrants a relatively more comfortable and reliable atmosphere after they migrated to Turkey. Nevertheless, no matter how cosmopolitan Istanbul was, it is evident that throughout the years of Turkish nationalism in the Republican era, events like Wealth Tax of 1942, the events of 6-7 September, and the 1964 decree for the deportation of Greeks to leave the country caused many non-muslims to leave the country and after the 1970s ended the centuries-old multiethnic coexistence in the city (Sasanlar, 2006: 17).

Thus it can be argued that the continuous tension between the two countries affected the thoughts and behaviors of the exchange migrants and caused them to be more silent in order not to be labeled as the "other" again. This is also supported by the statements of the exchange migrants who stated their grandparents declined the help for the exchange migrants coming from the state to not be named as exchange migrants.

Ömer Denk (Denk, 59, Third Generation), a third-generation migrant from Seyrek, stated their missing their motherland was also a result of the hard conditions they were thrown into. He stressed the fact that according to what he has learned from his grandparents, the Balkan state's condition towards the end of the Ottoman Empire was better in every term than the Anatolian towns.

In educational, cultural, and economical terms they were in a higher and more comfortable situation before the conflicts hit the towns and cities.

Later on, the locals' hospitable behaviors also make their new places more comfortable and secure for the migrants. The adaptation process was successful for the exchange migrants in Catalca. It can even be argued that the new relationships and structures connected them so much to their new homeland and settlement areas that, even during the great internal migration movements experienced in Turkey after the 1950s they did not consider leaving their town in the Catalca region. They remained in the relatively rural area of Istanbul and did not consider moving to the city center until after the 2000s. However, this does not cause them to forget their motherland. Almost all of the interviewees mentioned bringing soil from the visits they made to Greece to put their parents/grandparents' graves. So their connection and feeling of belonging continue for both of the lands. Their love for one does not diminish their love for the other.

Conclusion

In this paper, the feelings of first-generation exchange migrants upon arrival and their thoughts on going back and seeing the lands they left behind are mainly analyzed. In summary, it can be argued that the hardships and events they faced before they left, on the road and upon arrival mainly forced them to be silent about their past and memories (especially bitter ones) after they settled in Turkey. Whatever the reasons for this silent period were, in the long run, it caused the loss of some memories and break the smooth continuity of the traditions from one generation to the other. As Mannheim argues we can state that;

> The continuous emergence of new human beings certainly results in some loss of accumulated cultural possessions; but, on the other hand, it alone makes a fresh selection possible when it becomes necessary; it facilitates re-evaluation of our inventory and teaches us both to forget that which is no longer useful and to covet that which has yet to be won (1952: 294).

This is also evident when we asked about the feelings of the first generation to the later generations. Thus, as Mannheim deducted; "[m]embers of any one generation can only participate in a temporally limited section of the historical process" (Mannheim, 1952: 296) has found its body form in the population exchange migrants especially as a result of all the hardships, obstacles and thoughts the first generation faced with. Although the thoughts upon migration include blurry areas and stories it is evident that they choose to be silent about the memories for at least two decades. Within these conditions language as Kristeva argued became an important element in building the 'other' for both the exchange migrants and locals (Kristeva, 1991). They mainly did not want to be labeled the "other" by the locals. Language also stands out as the most important difficulty in their adaptation and integration process. The belongings came up as another important element mentioned during the interviews. There is a longing for the belongings left behind and in the later years especially the houses and pictures they left behind are questioned most.

This is also evident when we analyze their "urge to go back and see the lands they left behind" in the first decade they think their situation is a temporary one and they will go back. Therefore, upon arrival their first action was waiting patiently for the situation to resettle and calm down; and in the first 10 years, it can be argued that they were thinking this as a temporary situation that will pass after the war period is over. These thoughts started to change after a decade and they started seeing Newland as a homeland. This is also a result of the job (farmers) they are mainly dealing with. It attached them to the land and they started buying lands with their incomes. They started building new friendships with the local communities and accepted as a local there.

Apart from that, it can be argued that they mostly quickly adapted to the new environment. Their dealing with similar jobs and climate helps them a lot in this adaptation process. Leaving

everything behind in a period when nationalism was high all around the world, and being a minority is seemed like a big problem, make them more silent about their past and they generally did not tell their children about the bitter memories of the past. However, afterward, they started to see Turkey as a homeland and did not want to leave again. Yet, Greece also remained always as motherland in their minds. After the 1990s, whenever they visit Greece, their children and grandchildren are still bringing earth from their grandmothers' motherland cities and villages to put on the first generations' graves as a promised will.

References

Ağanoğlu, H.Y. (2001). *Osmanlı'dan cumhuriyet'e Balkanlar'ın makus talihi göç*. Kum Saati Tarih Dizisi.

Alexandris, A. (1992). *The Greek minority of Istanbul and Greek –Turkish relations, 1918-1974.* Centre for Asia Minor Studies.

Alpan, A. S. (2012). But the memory remains: History, memory and the 1923 Greco-Turkish population exchange. *The Historical Review* IX, 199–232.

Altuner M. E. çev. (1937). *Mübadeleye dair Türkiye ve Yunanistan arasında imza olunan mukavelenameler, muhtelit mübadele komisyonu kararları.* Damga Matbaası.

Arslan, S. (2008). *Balkan Savaşları Sonrası Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri ve Osmanlı Devlet İskanları*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi], Trakya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Arı, K. (2003). *Büyük mübadele: Türkiye'ye zorunlu göç 1923-1925*. (3. Baskı), Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Atatürk, M. K. (1972). *Nutuk I-II*. Türk Devrim Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları.

Balbay, M. (2007). *Balkanlar*. Cumhuriyet Kitapları.

Baker, U. (2002). From opinions to images: Towards a sociology of affects". Middle East Technical University (PhD thesis), Graduate school of social sciences.

Bardakçı, İ. (2006). *İmparatorluğa veda*. Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı.

Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 15(2), 139-168.

Çapa, M. (2001). Mübadele'de kızılay (Hilali Ahmer) cemiyeti'nin rolü. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 10, 29– 60.

Duman, Ö. (2009). Atatürk döneminde balkan göçmenlerinin iskân çalışmaları 1923-1938. *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*. 43, 473–490.

Duman, Ö. (2008). Atatürk döneminde Romanya'dan Türk göçleri 1923-1938. *Bilig*. 45, 23-44.

Ehrkamp, P. (2005). Placing identities: Transnational practices and local attachments of Turkish immigrants in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. *31*(2), 345-364.

Erdal, İ. (2006). *Türkiye ile Yunanistan arasında mübadele meselesi 1923-1930.* [Doktora tezi], Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Hammer, J. V. (1999). *Büyük Osmanlı tarihi*. Çev. Mehmet Ata, C. 1. Sabah Yayınları.

Hall, Richard C. (2000). *The Balkan wars 1912-1913*. Routledge.

Halaçoğlu, A. (1994). *Balkan harbi sırasında Rumeli'den Türk göçleri 1912-1913.* Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Hatipler, M. (2003). *Selanik'ten Edirne'ye insan ziyanlığı*. (1. basım). Assos Yayınları.

Hirschon, R. ed. (2004). *Crossing the Aegean*. (2 ed.) Berghahn Books.

İnbaşı, M. (2002). *Balkanlarda Osmanlı Hakimiyeti ve iskân siyaseti.* Yeni Türkiye Yayınları.

Karal, Z. (1983). *Osmanlı tarihi.* (8. Cilt) Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Keyder, Ç. (1983). Paths of rural transformation in Turkey, *Journal of Peasant Studies*. 1(11), 34-49.

Kökdemir N. der. (1952). *Eski ve yeni toprak, iskan hükümleri ve uygulama kılavuzu*. Yeni Matbaa.

Köprülü, F. (1991). *Osmanlı Devleti'nin kuruluşu.* TTK.

Küçük, M. (2005). *Bir nefes Balkan*. Horasan Yayınları.

Lewis, B. (1968). *The emergence of modern Turkey*. Oxford University Press.

Mannheim, K. (1952). *Essays on the sociology of knowledge*. Paul Kecskemeti ed. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Meray L. S. haz. (1972). *Lozan barış konferansı: Tutanaklar, belgeler*. (8. Cilt), Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.

Paköz Türkeli, A. (2016). *Influences of 1923 population exchange on second and third-generation migrants* [Unpublished Ph.D. thesis]. Middle East Technical University, Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Powell, J. L., & Hendricks, J. ed. (2009). *The welfare state in post-industrial society: a global perspective*. Springer.

Pilcher, J. (1994). Mannheim sociology of generations: an undervalued legacy. *British Journal of Sociology 45*(3), 481–495.

Rogers, A. & Willekens, F. eds.(1986). *Migration and settlement: a multiregional comparative study*. D. Reidel.

Sevim, S. (2002). *Türklerin Rumeli'ye ilk geçişleri ve iskân faaliyetleri, Balkanlar'daki Türk kültürünün dünü, bugünü ve yarini*, Uludağ Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Sasanlar, B. T. (2006). A Historical panorama of an Istanbul neighborhood: Cihangir from the late nineteenth century to the 2000s, [Unpublished masters' thesis], Boğazçi University, The Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History.

Shaw S. J. & Shaw E. (1977). *History of the Ottoman empire and modern turkey*, (Vol. I& II). Cambridge University Press.

Şimşir, B., haz. (1970). *Turkish emigrations from the balkans: Documents, Issue I, Turkish exodus,1877-1878, and Issue II a year of transition*, Ankara Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.

Şimşirgil, A. (2005). *Birincil kaynaklardan osmanlı tarihi kayı*, Tarih Düşünce Kitapları.

Tilly, C. (1978). Migration in Modern European history. in *human migration: patterns and policies*. Eds W. H. McNeill & R. S. Adams, Indiana University Press.

Uzunçarşılı, İ.H. (1988). *Osmanlı tarihi*. (Cilt 1), T.T.K. Basımevi.

Yaşar N. N. (1936). *Değişen dünyamız: Balkanlar ve Türklük*. Varlık Yayınları.

Yıldırım, O. (2006a). *Diplomacy and displacement, reconsidering the Turco-Greek exchange of populations 1922-1934*. Shahrough Akhavi ed, Routledge.

Yıldırım, O. (2006b). *Diplomasi ve göç: Türk-Yunan mübadelesinin öteki yüzü*. (1. Baskı) İstanbul Bilgi Universitesi Yayınları.

Websites:

https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we do/networks/european_migration_network/glossary_search/forced-migrant_en

http://www.mfa.gov.tr/lausanne-peace-treaty-vi_-convention-concerning-the-exchange-of-greek-and-turkish-populations-signed-at-lausanne_.en.mfa

Newspapers:

Ulus, 6.9.1937, p. 6.; Turan, 9 Eylül 1936, p. 1.; Anadolu, 29 Temmuz 1937, p. 2.; Ulus, 1.8.1937, p. 10.; Ulus, 4.8.1937, p. 2.; Ulus, 10.8.1937, p. 10.; Son Posta, 31 Ağustos 1937, p. 3., Son Posta, 13 İkincikanun 1936, p. 3.