

WALKING IN-BETWEEN MEMORIES:
EVERYDAY AND AFFECTIVE ENCOUNTERS IN THE MEMORY WALKS
AND FACING THE PAST

DAMLA BARIN

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2022

WALKING IN-BETWEEN MEMORIES:
EVERYDAY AND AFFECTIVE ENCOUNTERS IN THE MEMORY WALKS
AND FACING THE PAST

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

Master of Arts

In

Sociology

by

Damla Barın

Boğaziçi University

2022

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Damla Barın, 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 material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature

Date

ABSTRACT

Walking In-Between Memories: Everyday and Affective Encounters in the Memory Walks and Facing the Past

This thesis is about the everyday experiences of facing the past through memorialization practices. It takes the Memory Walks as a case study where the participants encounter histories and memories through collective walking and storytelling in the city. Based on theories of everyday life, place, performance/performativity, memory, and affect, and ethnographic fieldwork as a research method, the thesis reveals how the Memory Walks open the door to invisible histories and memories, new ways of experiencing the city and ways of feeling and knowing about difficult pasts. Bringing together urban experiences, walking practices, and performances of memory, the thesis aims to expand the legal, policy-related, and nation-state-centered understandings of facing the past and offers a framework of the everyday. Arguing that facing the past is an open-ended process, the thesis looks at the everyday and affective experiences in the Memory Walks on two main axes. First, it demonstrates the role of walking in shaping people's relationships with the city and making urban places by examining the performative and critical aspects of walking. Second, it explores the role of emotions in memorialization practices and analyzes the affective encounters in the Memory Walks by examining ways of feeling and knowing connected to facing the past. Exploring the two axes, the thesis asks: How are the everyday and affective encounters that emerge through memorialization practices connected to the experiences of facing the past in the everyday?

ÖZET

Hafızalar Arasında Yürümek:

Hafıza Yürüyüşlerinde Gündelik ve Duygulanımsal Karşılaşmalar ve Geçmişle Yüzleşme

Bu tez, hafızalaştırma pratikleri aracılığıyla geçmişle yüzleşmenin gündelik deneyimleri üzerinedir. Katılımcıların kentte kolektif yürüme ve hikaye anlatımı yoluyla tarihlerle ve anılarla karşılaştığı Hafıza Yürüyüşleri'ni araştırma konusu olarak ele alır. Gündelik yaşam, mekân, performans/performativite, hafıza ve duygulanım kuramlarına ve araştırma metodu olarak etnografik alan çalışmasına dayanan bu tez, Hafıza Yürüyüşleri'nin kentteki görünmez tarihlere ve anılara, kenti deneyimlemenin yeni yollarına, ve zorlu geçmişlere dair hissetme ve bilme yollarına nasıl kapı açtığını ortaya koyar. Kent deneyimlerini, yürüyüş pratiklerini, ve hafıza performanslarını bir araya getiren tez, geçmişle yüzleşmeye ilişkin yasal, politika bağlantılı ve ulus-devlet merkezli anlayışları genişletmeyi amaçlar ve gündeliğe dair bir çerçeve önerir. Geçmişle yüzleşmenin ucu açık bir süreç olduğunu savunan tez, Hafıza Yürüyüşleri'ndeki gündelik ve duygulanımsal deneyimlere iki ana ekseninde bakar. İlk olarak, yürümenin performatif ve kritik yönlerini inceleyerek insanların şehirle ilişkilerini şekillendirmede ve kentsel mekanlar oluşturmada yürümenin rolünü gösterir. İkinci olarak, hafızalaştırma pratiklerinde duyguların rolünü araştırır ve geçmişle yüzleşmeye dair hissetme ve bilme yollarını inceleyerek Hafıza Yürüyüşleri'ndeki duygulanımsal karşılaşmaları analiz eder. Bu iki ekseni araştıran tez şu soruyu sorar: Hafızalaştırma pratikleri aracılığıyla ortaya çıkan gündelik ve duygusal karşılaşmalar, geçmişle gündelik hayatta yüzleşme deneyimleriyle nasıl bağlantılıdır?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Meltem Ahıska for her guidance and support during the creation of this thesis. Without her encouragement, I would not have had the courage to follow my intuition and find my own voice when writing this thesis. I am grateful to Umut Tümay Arslan and Saygun Gökariksel, who have meticulously read the thesis and given insightful suggestions that have provided me with more to think about. Also, I am thankful to Aylin Vartanyan for her valuable comments that helped me to see my research questions with new eyes.

I feel very lucky for the support and friendship of Güzin, and all of my colleagues I have worked with over the past two and a half years, Arzu, Caner, Ege, Ekin, Elif, Yağmur, Turgut, and Zeynep. I will remember our times in the office with a smile on my face.

I want to thank the Karakutu Association, the Civil and Ecological Rights Association, and the Sabancı University Gender and Women's Center of Excellence for opening their doors to me and participating in my research. My special thanks go to all of my interviewees, fellow Memory Walk participants, and the people I have met in the Memory Walks, without whom this thesis would not have been possible. I am also grateful to TÜBİTAK for providing me with financial support.

My heartfelt thanks go to Yasemin, who motivated me and kept me informed about what was going on in the world when I had no time and energy; Büşra, who listened to all of my wild thoughts and feelings during this process and who took me out to relaxing date nights in Kadıköy; Gülce, who shared her daily life and cheered me up with funny cat videos from far away; İlke and Mayıs, who always had my back and brought joy to my life, especially in our study nights; Gökçe, who always

listened to me and prepared delicious breakfasts; Şehrazat, who meticulously read parts of the thesis and gave great suggestions; and İbrahim, who helped me to take a break by sharing his adventurous life with me. I am also very thankful from the depths of my heart to Arjin, Ekin, Nisan, Su, and Suat for their love and support from far away and not so far away. I also want to express my gratitude to all my friends who were writing their own thesis and with whom I have studied and shared my concerns and excitements.

I have no words to express my gratitude to my parents, İzber and Levent, for supporting me in every possible way and always believing in me. Their love and support kept me motivated. I also thank Güllü for keeping my parents busy when I am gone. Finally, I thank my partners in crime, Jüjü and Şinasi, for always waking me up in the morning, showing me love and affection, and accepting mine.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: THE EVERYDAY OF FACING THE PAST	18
2.1 Facing the past paradigm	20
2.2 Transitional justice framework	23
2.3 Nation-state-centered framework.....	33
2.4 Everyday framework.....	40
2.5 Methodology	62
CHAPTER 3: MEMORY WALKS: A CRITICAL SPATIAL PRACTICE OF WALKING AND PLACE-MAKING	70
3.1 Memory Walks.....	72
3.2 Walking makes places.....	82
3.3 In-betweenness of places.....	84
3.4 Extraordinary places in the memory walks	89
3.5 Walking as a critical spatial practice.....	93
CHAPTER 4: “OPENING A DOOR” TO FACING THE PAST: AFFECTIVE ENCOUNTERS IN THE MEMORY WALKS	126
4.1 Opening a door.....	131
4.2 Feeling too much or too little	144
4.3 Relating to the pain of others: shame and empathy	147
4.4 Ending with or beginning from hope	153
4.5 “Holding on to anger”	160
4.6 “As if for the first time”: curiosity and wonder	166
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	172

APPENDIX A: THE STORY OF GOMIDAS VATRABED	178
APPENDIX B: LIST OF MEMORY WALKS	185
APPENDIX C: LIST OF INTERVIEWS	186
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	188
APPENDIX E: LONG QUOTES IN TURKISH.....	199
APPENDIX F: APPROVAL OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE.....	208
REFERENCES.....	209

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. My group's route in the Şişli Memory Walk on 16.10.2021.....	3
Figure 2. A storyteller with the memory walk participants at Ülker Street	74
Figure 3. Discussion session at the end of Karakutu memory walk	75
Figure 4. Interviews from the SEHAK memory walk in İzmir, 2018	78
Figure 5. Participants listening to a story in front of the Süreyya Opera, from Curious Steps gender and memory walk in Kadıköy.....	80
Figure 6. Participants sitting at the park and listening to a story, from Curious Steps gender and memory walk	81
Figure 7. Istanbul Feminist Night March in 2019.....	118
Figure 8. A group walking on the outskirts of Istanbul, from Serkan Taycan's Between Two Seas political ecology walks	121
Figure 9. Diorama named <i>Deus Ex Machina</i> created by Nazlı Tümerdem in 2017 shows the animals, humans, and urban infrastructure of Istanbul in the same frame	122

ABBREVIATIONS

AKP	Justice and Development Party (<i>Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi</i>)
CUP	The Committee of Union and Progress (<i>İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti</i>)
DEMOS	The Research Center for Peace, Democracy and Alternative Politics (<i>Demokrasi, Barış ve Alternatif Politikalar Araştırma Derneği</i>)
EU	European Union
ICTJ	International Center for Transitional Justice
ICC	International Criminal Court
LGBTQI+	Lesbian gay bisexual trans queer/questioning intersex and other
MKK	Place Identity Card (<i>Mekan Kimlik Kartı</i>)
NIT	Netherlands Institute in Turkey
NGO	Non-governmental organization
SEHAK	Civil and Ecological Rights Association (<i>Sivil ve Ekolojik Haklar Derneği</i>)
SU	Sabancı University
TJ	Transitional justice
UN	United Nations

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

On the 16th of October, 2021, I arrived at the meeting point in Şişli, a spacious room in a municipality community center (Figure 1, A) and greeted the people I know from the Karakutu Association, who were organizing and volunteering for that day's Memory Walk. This walk was part of the Şişli Memory Journey Program, a one-month program consisting of online seminars and Memory Walks. I was one of the participants in the walk. Having started my fieldwork and conducted a considerable amount of interviews, I was familiar with the Memory Walks and had some knowledge about the stories and the routes of the walks. Yet, I was excited as this was one of the few chances I got to be a participant.

We divided into small groups, solved our puzzle¹, and found our first destination (B). It was the old Agos Newspaper Building. I immediately understood what we were going to listen to. There would be no surprises for me when we arrived and met the storyteller Pınar. While Pınar was telling the story of Hrant Dink, an Armenian journalist assassinated in front of Agos, I found myself at the break of crying and trying to hold myself. I said to myself, "I should not be crying this easily. I should be angry instead."

Receiving the next puzzle, we started walking again. I was experiencing what my interviewees had told me: This was a different kind of walking, a walking that feels different and leads to new roads (in all of its meanings). I was looking around and recognizing new things that had been there all along. Çağla, a fellow participant and an architect student, told us about the different architectural styles of the

¹ Each group is given a puzzle, photograph, riddle, reference to a book or article, etc., which gives a clue about the destination. Each puzzle indicates a different location or a story.

buildings. Meanwhile, I was imagining the people that lived there and how their lives were.

We reached our destination (C) and met with Utku, who told us the life story of Gomidas Vartabed, an Armenian composer and musician. In the interviews I did with Utku and others, people had already told me a lot about Gomidas. I knew it was an impressive story and thought I knew most of it. When listening to Utku's story, I noticed I knew so little about Gomidas and his life. Furthermore, I realized that a story can never be known and grasped completely. Utku, a dedicated researcher and storyteller, enjoyed giving us details, including different historical side stories. Yet, Utku's effort and all these details made me realize that a story will include gaps no matter how meticulously prepared. I realized that telling and hearing a story is not about learning all about it. Instead, it is about the new feelings, thoughts, and questions that the story brings.

Our last destination (D) was the *Ayadimitri* Church. Here, I learned about the Tavatla Fire in 1929 and Tavatla Festival *Baklahorani* for the first time. These were stories about the Rum community in old Şişli, Tavatla. I knew that Şişli was once and still is home to Rums and Armenians, although the numbers have radically decreased over the years due to traumatic events. Still, I did not know about their daily lives, shops, churches, festivals, and fires. I feel ashamed of not knowing more. I noticed that filling out the gaps remains an urge. Yet, it is not a destination but a way to encounter new stories.



Figure 1. My group's route in the Şişli Memory Walk on 16.10.2021
Source: [https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/edit?mid=10ALfSLOyAfGCmE-pUPInj_VqPTfCODo&usp=sharing, July, 2022]

One week later, the Memory Walk volunteers of the Karakutu Association, myself included, gathered at the same meeting point. That day, me, Barış, Toprak, and Zelal were the storytellers. I was much more excited and nervous as I would tell the story of Gomidas. We, the storytellers, left the building together and parted our ways to walk to our destination points. This time, I would not walk with the participants to hear other stories. I waited for the first group, sitting in the shade. When they arrived, I went across the street to the front of the Cumhuriyet Pharmacy. After giving some initial information, I suggested going to the park nearby where they listen to the story without being interrupted by the flow of people and the traffic noises. We found a bench at the park, and I started telling my story (Appendix A). Before, I was nervous that the participants would ask me questions or details I did not know. I remembered

listening to the story last week from Utku, who seemed to know a lot, and I asked myself: “Why am I the one telling this story?” As I told the story and saw the faces and reactions of the participants, I became more relaxed. The hard questions did not freak me out anymore. We discussed them and searched for the answers together.

That day, I told three different stories of Gomidas Vartabed to three different groups. Although it was the same story, it did not feel the same as I was telling them. Each time, I added different nuances and talked more about the different aspects of the story. For example, if the participants asked about it or seemed interested, I explained more about his music career, nomad life, or the events following the 24th of April, 1915.

As my feelings and the story changed during the walk, the participants changed too. I could observe that each participant experienced something different when walking in the streets and listening to the stories. Whereas some were shocked about the 24th of April, not knowing about it before, some were more curious about the life history of Gomidas and his music. Some were angry to hear about the deportations of Armenian intellectuals, and some were sad about how Gomidas spent the rest of his life in hospitals. Each encounter between the stories, places, and people was different.

Going out to the field, in the Memory Walks and the interviews, I first noticed the open-endedness of the walks, which shaped my experiences as a participant and a volunteer storyteller. By open-endedness, I mean that one cannot foresee what will happen in a Memory Walk: How will the storytellers tell their story? How will the participants feel and react? So, through my fieldwork, I tried to get a grasp of the experiences of the storytellers and the participants. I talked to and observed both groups but spent most of my time with the storytellers.

First, in the field, I did not know how to conceptualize this open-endedness. Following my initial observations and some interviews with the storytellers, I thought: There is no facing the past in the Memory Walks. The walks were short and superficial activities that could not have a lasting effect on people. I was anxious as I felt like I was losing my research topic altogether. But, as my research continued, I had more experiences as a storyteller. I realized I had to listen to my interviewees, mostly the storytellers, more carefully. At one point, I noticed that they were, in fact, telling me their own stories of encountering other stories. These were their stories of facing the past, which consisted of everyday and affective encounters between themselves, stories, places, and other people. This thesis is an attempt to understand these encounters in connection to facing the past conceived in broader and affective terms. The Memory Walks, the thesis argues, open up a space and time in the everyday to talk and think about a topic that we do not usually see as part of our everyday lives: facing the past.

How does the Memory Walk as a form of performance and memory work relate to facing the past? How can we understand and analyze the everyday instances of facing the past, including a spectrum of experiences of moving close to and away from a critical and open relationship with the past? What is the role of emotions in these everyday experiences? This thesis will start from these questions and demonstrate the relationship between performance, memory, emotions, and facing the past by analyzing how memory walks make an extraordinary everyday.²

It is commonly said that Turkey is an amnesiac and memory-less society (Ahıska, 2014; Özyürek, 2007). According to Özgür Sevgi Göral (2021), Turkey is more likely a society of *aphasia*, a term borrowed from Ann Stoler, rather than a

² I will introduce the concept of the extraordinary everyday and examine it in detail in the next chapter.

society of amnesia. According to Stoler (2011), the term colonial aphasia signifies “a difficulty retrieving both conceptual and lexical vocabularies and, most important, a difficulty comprehending what is spoken” (p. 125) rather than simply ignoring or not knowing the past. Rather than a binary of remembering and forgetting, the concept of cultural aphasia, used by Paul Bijl, underlines “the lack of language [that] inhibits the production of a memorable past” (Bijl, 2012, in Göral, 2021, p. 90). Cultural aphasia enables us to think about how the politics of remembering and forgetting designate particular experiences as memorable and not memorable, rather than simply focusing on the lack of memory and knowledge.

Although systemic silence and repression, lack of knowledge, disavowal, and denial of particular histories and memories are fundamental parts of the dominant politics of remembering and forgetting in Turkey, in no way does Turkey designate a society without memory. Rather, it is the lack of appropriate vocabulary and the lack of space to make use of that vocabulary together with the lack of knowledge that characterizes the dominant politics of memory in Turkey. In this context, amnesia and aphasia work together.

The term aphasia calls for exploring “what it means to know and not know something simultaneously” (Stoler, 2011, p. 122), which is quite relevant for the politics of memory in Turkey. Göral (2021) understands cultural aphasia as a term that refers to “public secrets, of the known but unspoken, and not adequately acknowledged and recognized” (p. 93) and discusses it in relation to the Kurdish conflict and movement in Turkey, specifically the enforced disappearances in the 1990s and the political performances of the Saturday Mothers as a response to these public secrets. The performances of the Saturday Mothers are considered an example

of creating “a new vocabulary vis-à-vis the aphasia”, which “establish[es] new links between state violence, acknowledgment, and responsibility” (p. 94).

The relevance of cultural aphasia in Turkey is not limited to specific histories but covers the histories and memories related to different kinds of past atrocities concerning different eras and contexts. As Mithat Sancar (2007) describes it, the history of Turkey consists of many intertwined social traumas coming on top of another. Therefore, the lack of vocabulary applies to the politics of memory in Turkey, including the deportation, exile, and Muslimization of non-Muslim communities and minorities, the massacres and displacements of Armenian, Alevi, and Kurdish populations, and various forms of violence against oppositional groups and individuals (Ahiska, 2014). In some contexts, such as the Armenian genocide, the lack of vocabulary is connected to what is called the politics and “habitus of denial” (Suciyan, 2016). Yet, there are many examples of (political) performances that create and make use of new vocabularies. Like the Saturday Mothers, these performances can denote a combination of everyday life and political demands of various kinds. I believe that the coming together of the everyday and political is especially relevant in the memorialization practices and performances of memory that open up a space to talk about and experience facing the past: encountering the histories and memories about the public secrets that are known but not speakable.

Then, what is the relationship between performances of memory and facing the past? In the context of ignorance and silence about the difficult pasts in politics, culture, and everyday life, how do memorialization practices in Turkey, performances of memory, in particular, attend to these memories in a way that does not repeat and contribute to structures of forgetting and not knowing?

In *Kayıp Hafızanın İzinde* [In Search of Lost Memory] (2021), Pınar Yıldız examines the Turkish politics of remembering through an analysis of representations of Turkishness in cinema and discusses the ethico-political subjectivities of the audience. Her questions about the connection between ignorance, representation, and facing the past are intriguing indeed: How do ignorance and denial determine the content and form of the representations of the past? How can we trace the repertory of images and emotions that shape our historical subjectivity that is based on the idea of our innocence? How can we narrate the pasts that we deny and ignore with an ethico-political position that questions the “story that made us” (Yıldız, 2021, p. 13) without trivializing or turning the past into historical fact? Accordingly, turning the gaze back to us, our “sheltered identities” (p. 219) built on ignorance is a start. When the camera is pointed at us, it has the potential to force us to face the past and our own responsibility and implication. In her analysis of some contemporary works of art from the *Memory and Art* archive created by Truth Justice and Memory Center (*Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi*), Umut Tümay Arslan (2021) also suggests examining ‘broken performances’ of facing the past. Understanding collective memory as a field of division, conflict, exposure, and encounter, Arslan points out the role of turning the gaze on ourselves:

Can we reflect on what we have failed to do as generations bearing the legacy and memory of agency? What do we not hear? What are we not seeing? We can also go towards a question about the present, the possibilities and impossibilities of speaking, digging into the soil of inequality. (p. 154, my translation) (Appendix E, 1)

Sharing the same curiosities about the possibilities of speaking about and reflecting on the past, as well as our experiences about facing the past through encountering histories and memories of the past, this thesis aims to understand how people relate to the histories and memories of the past by contributing in memorialization

practices, or performances of memory in particular. To understand how these practices open up a space and time for such encounters, we must first look at the context in which these practices emerge.

Since the early 2000s, there is said to be a ‘memory boom’ in Turkey, covering a wide field consisting of social sciences, art, cinema, literature, architecture, heritage policies, civil society, tourism, commodity market, and more. Oral history, which is one of the primary disciplines that research on memory, has become prominent first in the first half of the 1990s (Öztürkmen, 2001). Covering many topics and research subjects, oral history research mainly focuses on the recent history of Turkey and examines how people recall this history. The main topics in oral history can be listed as identity and subjectivity (Neyzi, 2002; 2004a), urban life and belonging (Neyzi, 1999a), urbanization (Cantek & Zırh, 2014), material culture (Öztürkmen, 2003), life histories (Neyzi, 1999b; 2004b), trauma (Neyzi, 2008), ethnic and religious identities and minorities (Altınay & Çetin, 2009; Neyzi & Kharatyan-Araqelyan, 2010; Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları, 2012), youth (Neyzi & Darıcı, 2013), modernization and the Republican generation (Akşit, 2005). Overall, by bringing together the individual and socio-political dimensions of memory, oral history research aims to make people’s voices visible and offer a new methodology for researching history, memory, culture, and identity.

Especially in the 2000s, other disciplines joined the conversation on memory, such as sociology, anthropology, political science, cinema, literature studies, architecture, urban studies, spatial studies, and art and performance studies. Memory studies make up a multi- and inter-disciplinary field with works that focus on a wide range of topics, exemplified in the collections by Neyzi (2011) and Özyürek (2007). I will mention some of the works to give a glimpse of the field. One

axis is the works that examine the relationship between state, politics, and memory, focusing on concepts such as the culture of memory (Sancar, 2007), regimes of memory (Çınar, 2020), state policies and narratives of denial (Aybak, 2016), and habitus of denial (Suciyan, 2016).

Besides, some works deal with the relationship between popular culture, consumption, state discourses, and memory. One area of research is Neo-Ottomanism, defined as the rising interest in Ottoman history in popular culture and state discourses since the 1990s and especially under the Justice and Development Party (AKP) rule. Many scholars study the revival of interest in the Ottoman past in contemporary Turkey and examine TV series (Çevik, 2019; Ergin & Karakaya, 2017), food (Samancı, 2019), consumption (Karaosmanoğlu, 2010; Sandıkçı & Ger, 2002) and urban places and sites of memory (Walton, 2016; 2010). Nostalgia, either for the Ottoman past (Yavuz, 2020) or modern and secular Turkey (Özyürek, 2006), is another research topic.

Another area of research deals with the traumatic pasts with regard to non-Muslim and non-Turkish communities and minorities and the past atrocities and violations that consist of the violence against particular ethnic and religious groups or oppositional and marginalized groups and individuals. The vast literature includes the life stories and memories of Armenians and Kurds (Bilal, 2004; Çelik & Dinç, 2015; Suni, 2019), memories of victims and relatives of past atrocities such as the 1980 coup d'état (Firat, 2016; Orhon, 2015), practices of mourning and loss (Çavdar, 2020), collective memories of past atrocities (Çelik, 2020; Dinç, 2016), political performances of memory (Ahıska, 2019; Göral, 2021), and discussions on transitional justice (Sancar, 2007; Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi, 2021). Representation of the past and the ethnic and religious communities and minorities in

Turkey is also a popular research topic. Art and cinema studies, among other fields, inquire about the representation of the past by looking at the representation of ethnic and religious minorities and communities in Turkey (Köksal, 2016), the construction of subjectivities and identities based on the nation (Arslan, 2010; Yıldız, 2021; Suner, 2006), belonging (Suner, 2009), and possibilities and limitations of facing the past (Yıldız, 2021; Arslan, 2021)

Moreover, research on memory encompasses topics such as memorialization practices, places, and urban memory. The works on memorials and statues (Akçura, 2020; Ahıska, 2011; Tekiner, 2021), archives (Ahıska, 2006), museums, and theme parks (Bozoğlu, 2019; Gür, 2007; Öncü, 2007; Uğur Çınar & Altınok, 2021), national commemorations (Ökten, 2007), and feminist pedagogy and practices of remembrance (Akkent & Kovar, 2019) give only a glimpse of the extensive work on these topics. The research on urban memory, for example, focuses on topics such as place (Kolluoğlu-Kırlı, 2002; Mills, 2010), urban social movements (Eken, 2014; Harmanşah, 2014; Houston, 2020; Whitehead & Bozoğlu, 2016), urban palimpsest (Turgut, 2021), the transformation of urban spaces and neighborhoods (Gür, 2002; Kovanlıkaya, Fırat, Yılgür, Aslan & Özarslan, 2021), everyday urban places (Günel & Çelikkın, 2019; Center for Spatial Justice, 2018), and walking practices (Abiral, Altınay, Çalışkan & Yıldız, 2019; Yıldırım, 2020).

In fact, the so-called ‘memory boom’ in Turkey is part of the rising interest in memory in social sciences, politics, civil society, and society in general, starting from the 1980s in Western European societies and traveling to other locations. The extensive research on memory consists of works from many disciplines, such as history, anthropology, sociology, cultural studies, media and cinema studies, critical theory, oral history, literature, architecture, urban studies, etc., that share an interest

in memory. In his lecture on the origins of the ‘memory boom’, Jay Winter (2012) argues that not only the Holocaust (as assumed) but additional factors related to diverse but overlapping social, cultural, medical, and economic developments contributed to the rising interest in memory. He lists public commemorations, identity politics, rising affluence, interest in family history and memory and traumatic memories of war and violence, and the cultural turn in historical studies. Noting that many factors have influenced our relationship with memory and the past, I would like to turn to the point that Pierre Nora and Andreas Huyssen underline in their remarks on our obsession with memory today.

When discussing why memory has acquired a prominent role in today’s society, they underline its connection to the changes due to the acceleration of history (Nora, 1989) and the experience of modernity (Huyssen, 2003). Both refer to a similar point. Evaluating the interest in memory in recent decades, Huyssen and Nora are on the same page on acknowledging the complex dynamics of remembering and forgetting that characterize the interest in memory today. Huyssen considers today’s hypertrophy of memory a paradox: He suggests that our obsession with memory is accompanied by panic and fear of forgetting. Nora (1989) makes a similar point when acknowledging the end of a tradition of memory, characterized by *milieux de memoire* (real environments of memory) and the emergence of modern memory “seized by history” (p. 13) of which duty-memory and archival-memory are examples. According to Nora, our interest in memory emerged “at a particular historical moment, a turning point where consciousness of a break with the past is bound up with the sense that memory has been torn—but torn in such a way as to pose the problem of the embodiment of memory in certain sites where a sense of historical

continuity persists” (p. 7). These sites are called *lieux de mémoire* (sites of memory), described as sites that try to hold on to a barely surviving memory.

Breaking part with Nora at this point, Huyssen (2003) suggests pushing Nora’s conservative arguments based on a discourse of loss and a binary framing of *lieux* vs. *milieux* in a new direction that “accepts the fundamental shift in structures of feeling, experience, and perception as they characterize our simultaneously expanding and shrinking present” (p. 24). For Huyssen, our relationship with memory is linked to the simultaneous expansion and compression of time and space in modernity, characterized by mass media, globalization, and changes in technology and consumption practices (p. 21). Hence, our “turn toward memory is subliminally energized by the desire to anchor ourselves in a [modern] world characterized by an increasing instability of time and the fracturing of lived space” (p. 18). According to Huyssen, many of today’s critical memory cultures around the world, with a focus on gender and ethnicity issues, human rights, and democratization, express and strive to meet our needs of

Slowing down rather than speeding up, expanding the nature of public debate, trying to heal the wounds inflicted in the past, nurturing and expanding livable space rather than destroy it for the sake of some future promise, securing ‘quality time’. (p. 24)

This is the context in which memorialization practices emerge, circulate, and are passed on: a modern urban context. What Huyssen calls our “unmet cultural needs” (p. 27)—see the quotation above—is connected to globalization as much as urbanization and urban life. Slowing down the speed, creating livable spaces and enjoyable times, enhancing public debates, and inclusion and participation in urban life are indeed significant for memory cultures and practices pertaining to urban spaces/places.

Emphasizing the urban aspect of memorialization practices, this thesis attempts to bring together urban experiences, performances of memory, and walking practices, drawing on an understanding of facing the past in the everyday through emotions. As a beginning, this thesis will expand the understandings of facing the past in terms of international and national policies, laws, and transitional justice mechanisms to understand facing the past in relation to everyday and affective encounters. My case study will be a specific memorialization practice: Memory Walks. For the scope of this thesis, I will examine the Memory walks organized by the Karakutu Association, the Sabancı University Gender and Women's Studies Center of Excellence, and the Civil and Ecological Rights Association (*Sivil ve Ekolojik Haklar Derneği*, SEHAK) in Turkey.

There will be two main axes in my analysis of memorialization practices and their relation to facing the past. One axis is: I will look at and explain how memorialization practices influence people's relationships, perceptions, and experiences with the city and urban places. To do that, I will focus on the bodily and spatial aspects of performing memory and explain how memorialization practices give the everyday a critical character, which opens up the way for different experiences in urban places. Performance and performativity will be fundamental for reading the everyday practice of walking as a performance of memory that creates encounters between people, the extraordinary everyday, and extraordinary places. I will conceptualize walking as a critical spatial practice that paves the way for imagining, remembering, exploring, writing, and claiming the city and (re)making urban places.

The second axis is the relationship between memorialization practices and emotions/affects. Emotions will be essential in understanding how memorialization

practices shape people's relationships with the past. I will regard storytelling as a form of communication that shares and performs individual and collective memories. I will argue that particular memorialization practices can hold the potential for facing the difficult pasts; asking questions about one's role and position with regard to the past, feeling new things or giving new meanings and directions to feelings, and acting on these questions and feelings. In this respect, my case study will be an example of facing the past. I will not see facing the past as an outcome or an aim but as a process consisting of different and contrasting feelings, thoughts, and actions. My reading of people's encounters about the stories they listen to and places they walk through will be grounded in an understanding of facing the past as an opening and an in-between experience, which involves a spectrum of experiences of moving close to and away from a critical and open relationship with the past.

The thesis is composed of three main chapters. The first main chapter, chapter two, introduces the concept of *facing the past* and outlines its universalization and institutionalization. Then, I will examine three different frameworks of facing the past: transitional justice, nation-state-centered, and everyday framework. First, I will look at the transitional justice framework, which denotes a multi-disciplinary field of policy and theory consisting of no single formula but particular universal principles, purposes, and mechanisms. I will emphasize the different critiques of transitional justice and underline that it attains different meanings when traveling to other contexts and locations. Second, I will elaborate on the nation-state-centered framework by discussing the nation-state politics of remembering and forgetting and practices of facing the state. Third and last, I will introduce the everyday framework of facing the past, which is based on the everyday and affective encounters and practices that (re)shape people's

relationship with the past. This framework will focus on the experiential, bodily, and affective/emotional aspects of facing the past in daily lives and pay attention to the emergence of what I call an *extraordinary everyday*. I will introduce the main theoretical concepts, which will be essential for my framework of the everyday. Lastly, this chapter will discuss the methodology and explain my research methods and limitations of my research.

Chapter three will focus on the role and significance of walking in shaping people's relationships with the city and everyday urban life. The chapter will start by giving a detailed description of the three different Memory Walks organized in Turkey and outlining their common characteristics. Then, I will elaborate on the performative aspect of walking by explaining how walking makes and imagines places in the memory walks as extraordinary places occurring in the extraordinary everyday. I will draw on the literature that engages with the relationship between memory and place and emphasize the *in-betweenness* of the places in the memory walks. Moreover, I will give examples of these places and describe their main characteristics. Then, in the second part of the chapter, I will conceptualize walking as a critical spatial practice and explain what makes walking critical in the urban context. Drawing on different literatures, such as philosophy, performance and art studies, everyday life theory, and urban geography and sociology, I aim to delineate how thinking, writing, exploring, and claiming the city are connected to walking in the city with a critical attitude. To make my point, I will give examples from different kinds of walks, but the Memory Walks will be my primary source. In my analysis of walking in the Memory Walks, I aim to pay attention to the sensory, bodily, social, and political aspects that make walking critical.

The last main chapter, chapter four, will read the emotions that (do not) come about in the memory walks in connection to facing the past in the everyday. I will consider facing the past as a process rather than an outcome or purpose. Therefore, rather than a binary of facing/not facing the past, I will examine the experiences in the Memory Walks, focusing on the encounters between people, stories, and places. My understanding of emotions/affects will be based on the concept of encounter. I will start the chapter by explaining how the Memory Walks open a door in two senses. First, they open the door to different histories and memories, delineating an alternative distribution of the sensible. I will discuss the role of storytelling, which is a particular form of communication and a performance. Secondly, the Memory Walks open the door to facing the past. To explain this opening, I will discuss the ways of feeling and knowing in relation to the discussions on *situatedness*, troubling questions, and uncomfortable feelings about the difficult pasts that are crucial in the formation of national identity and official historiography. In the second part of the chapter, I will have a closer look at the *affective encounters* in the Memory Walks. I will examine how particular emotions, such as shame, empathy, hope, anger, curiosity, and wonder, denote different relationships with past stories and one's position, roles, and actions concerning these stories. To do so, I will draw on the vast literature on affect/emotion that deals with the bodily and social aspects in tandem.

Concluding, in chapter five, I will pick up where the last chapter left off and discuss how facing the past can be seen in relation to being implicated. I will restate my arguments and elaborate on further research topics and questions that come out of my findings and the shortcomings of the thesis.

CHAPTER 2

THE EVERYDAY OF FACING THE PAST

This thesis will explore and attempt answer a seemingly simple but nonetheless challenging question: How does one face the past? Rather than tackling this question at the conceptual level only, I will review the different frameworks, practices, and experiences of facing the past. In addition to the international and nation-state-centered frameworks widely discussed in the transitional justice and peace studies literatures, I will introduce a framework of the everyday. The framework of the everyday takes into account and explains the experiential, bodily, and affective/emotional aspects of facing the past in the daily lives of individuals and communities. I will rethink and redefine the everyday in connection with my research case, which is a specific form of memorialization practice, the Memory Walks.³ Since the 2010s, different groups such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), university centers, and initiatives have been organizing memory walks in Istanbul and other cities.

As I see them, memory walks are a combination of memory work and affects/emotions, of everyday practices and performances such as collective walking and storytelling on the streets, of the past and the present, of the ordinary and the extraordinary. In the memory walks, the everyday comes to be experienced and sensed differently. As a combination of many things, memory walks open up an environment, a time and space for learning, thinking, and feeling. Hence, memory walks are an excellent example to illustrate the role of affects/emotions in people's relationship with the past and the city.

³ From now on, I will not use capital letters to refer to the memory walks, instead I will be referring to a specific kind of walk that I will explain further shortly after.

In this chapter, I will go over the definition and history of the term *facing the past* and elaborate on how it was universalized and institutionalized as a bundle of practices and policies. I will then outline the transitional justice (TJ) and the nation-state-centered frameworks of facing the past. These frameworks are rather macro-scale frameworks that deal with international and national legal procedures, policies, and liabilities and consist of discussions of justice, accountability, impunity, and alternative ways of facing the past or ensuring peace or reconciliation.

Going over these frameworks, I will also discuss the role of memorialization in the practices and policies of facing the past. In its simplest sense, memorialization is a practice of (selective) remembering consisting of various mechanisms and processes to preserve, collect, and display memory in the public sphere.⁴ These mechanisms and processes of memorialization can take the form of constructed and found sites and activities such as commemorations, memorials, museums, cultural heritage, memory sites, memory tours, walks, art installations, testimonies, and books and films (Barsalou and Baxter, 2007). Memorialization involves different ways and kinds of memory transmission⁵ and memory work. Several actors such as international organizations, states, NGOs, civil society initiatives, policy-makers, and victim groups are involved in discussing, researching, policy-making, and implementing forms of memorialization.

After examining the transitional justice (TJ) and the nation-state-centered frameworks, I will suggest a different framework that my research will be based on: a framework of the everyday. I aim to expand the understanding of facing the past

⁴ Freud (1901), among other scholars, has noted that remembering and forgetting are not opposites; they are deeply intertwined with each other. A recollection of the past is a (re)formulation based on selective remembering and forgetting. In this sense, memorialization includes forgetting as much as remembering the past.

⁵ Memory transmission, in its most widespread sense, is the transmission of memory within the family through storytelling or the narration of personal memories, which are usually transmitted from older generations to younger ones. Other ways of memory transmission include research, literature, cinema, and art on memory that contribute to making memory visible in public sphere.

from the contours of international and national policies, mechanisms, and principles to a perspective of the everyday life through the case of memory walks as a practice that brings together memorialization practices, everyday life, and performances of collective walking and storytelling. I conceptualize the everyday in the memory walks as an extraordinary everyday, which opens the door to different ways of feeling and knowing and to different experiences of facing the past. I will go over the key concepts of my framework of the everyday and then discuss my methodology in conducting the research.

2.1 Facing the past paradigm⁶

In his lecture in 1959, Theodor W. Adorno begins with a question that still requires some explanation today: “What does working through the past mean?” (p. 89).

Adorno asks this question in a time of crisis in West Germany when the post-war coalition government was facing public criticisms regarding one of its ministers’ involvement in the crimes of the Nazi regime. A trendy term of the time, working through the past, is used in a context where it refers to the intention “to close the books on the past and, if possible, even remove it from memory” (Adorno, 1959, p. 89) rather than a serious working on the past, “through a lucid consciousness breaking its power to fascinate” (p. 103). Yet, according to Adorno, such closure of the past is impossible because “the past one would like to evade is still very much alive” (p. 89). In arguing that National Socialism is still alive in Germany, Adorno is informed by a psychoanalytical perspective that traces the unconsciously existing

⁶ There are a couple of terms used in the literature: coming to terms with, deal with, face, work through, or reconcile the past. I will prefer the term facing the past because it focuses the attention on the process better (and not the outcome), compared to the other terms, which imply either reconciliation, settling the account or overcoming the past. I prefer facing the past also because it involves a bodily aspect, which Saygun Gökariksel (2019) inspiringly points out in his research on the public exhibitions of faces in Poland.

remnants of the fascist tendencies that are waiting for their comeback. At the end of the lecture, he contends that working through the past will only be done when the causes of the past atrocities are eliminated. Whether it is possible to eliminate the causes of past atrocities as Adorno wished for is a question with no definite answer.

However, the objective to work through the past has continued to be a topic of interest, expanding to different geographies, times, and contexts throughout the decades. The term *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in German, often translated as working through the past or overcoming the negative facets of the past, originated after 1945 in West Germany. It referred to the atrocities during the Third Reich. Adorno was right; the 1950s were silent times with regard to the violence of the Holocaust.⁷ The Eichmann trials in Jerusalem in 1961 were a turning point for the memory of the Holocaust for two main reasons; it was crucial for the emergence of the idea of the uniqueness of the Holocaust (Rothberg, 2009) and it marked the emergence of the witness as a social figure (Wieviorka, 1998). Whether the Holocaust was a unique event was one of the main topics discussed in the famous Historians' dispute (*Historikerstreit*) between conservative and left-wing intellectuals in the late 1980s in West Germany. The conservatives argued that the Holocaust is one among many genocides, whereas the others considered it a unique event that is incomparable to other crimes. Regardless of the endless disputes, or maybe because of them, the Holocaust eventually became a frame of reference for various other transnational, international, and national contexts that deal with past atrocities.

⁷ For the most part, it was the memories of the German victims that were visible in public (Wüstenberg, 2017). Although the government was engaged in the denazification of the state, there were not any widespread prosecutorial efforts to impose penalties for the actions of the perpetrators (Bayer, 2019; Wieviorka, 1998). It was not until the social movements of the 1980s and 1990s that memories of the minorities and the crimes of the majority became more publicly represented in the German context. The 1950s and 60s were silent times with regard to the colonial violence too. None of the colonial powers publicly debated the links between colonial violence and fascism in Europe apart from the French debates over Algeria and the debates of the newly emerging Western New Left that made connections between the two (Fordsick, Mark, & Spišiaková, 2020).

Originated in the post-world war II context in West Germany and then shaped by the transnational memory of the Holocaust⁸, the term facing the past expanded its reach in the late 1970s and 1980s. It traveled to other contexts⁹, attained different names, meanings, and uses, and connected to different terms and understandings of memory. As Charles Forsdick, James Mark, and Eva Spišiaková (2020) note, the idea of facing the past “became part of a globally-powerful consensus over how societies should overcome violent and traumatic experiences” (p. 1), especially after the ‘memory boom’ in the 1980s.¹⁰

According to Mithat Sancar (2007), there are a couple of dimensions of the universalization of facing the past: the turn from the national to the global accumulation of experiences, the increase in international and comparative studies, the emergence of international criminal prosecutions, the role of international relations, and the emergence of an apology culture. The universalization does not refer to the opposition of the global and the local; rather, it demonstrates their connection and dependency on each other. According to Sancar, one of the main opportunities of universalization is that a new memory paradigm rooted in the idea of human rights called cosmopolitan memory, exceeds the boundaries of the nation-state and differentiates itself from the national memory. Also, the universalization of cosmopolitan memory and the institutionalization of facing the past at the global

⁸ The Holocaust memory can be seen as transnational in terms of few aspects: 1) Various transnational and international organizations are engaged in human-rights-based Holocaust education (Stockholm Declaration, 2000) and genocide prevention 2) the Holocaust is widely covered in film, media, and literature around the globe as a result of the memory boom in the cultural field, 3) the testimonies of the Holocaust survivors became more and more publicly visible and this marked the beginning of the era of the witness as Annette Wieviorka (1998) calls it.

⁹ These travels include, but cannot be limited to, the West European countries that were involved with the Nazi regime, the East European countries after the fall of the Soviet Union, post-war and post-conflict societies in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, and the countries with colonial and imperial pasts.

¹⁰ With the boom, memory studies emerged as an academic discipline. Various international and national bodies, policy-makers, civil society organizations became interested in memorialization practices. Memorialization became one of the objectives of TJ. There was also a boom in cinema, literature, and art, and a rising interest in the collection, publication, and use of the testimonies of witnesses.

level have laid the grounds for the formation of TJ, which is one of the frameworks through which facing the past is practiced and discussed.

2.2 Transitional justice framework

As an interdisciplinary tool and a field of policy-making, TJ emerged in the so-called third wave of democratization (Huntington, 1993), which refers to the transitions from authoritarian rule in Eastern Europe, Central and Latin America, and South Africa in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Lessa, 2013). The third wave marks a significant period for the transitioning societies to engage with and act on the objective of facing the past. Different models of facing the past were developed and implemented as nation-states searched for ways to address their violent pasts,¹¹ but they endured international pressure to adopt standard models of justice and memory that made the basis for TJ mechanisms and processes (David, 2020a).

With the establishment of The United Nations (UN) sponsored ad hoc criminal tribunals in Yugoslavia (1993) and Rwanda (1994) and the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2002, TJ was institutionalized at the international level (David, 2020a). The UN and other international organizations, such as the International Center for Transitional Justice (ICTJ), have been influential in shaping and consolidating the TJ framework. They not only provide expertise and support to the so-called transitioning societies but also define the principles and standards of TJ.¹² Although scholars agree that there is no single theory or no fixed meaning of TJ (Fletcher and Weinstein, 2015; Gready and Robbins, 2020), the

¹¹ The Spanish model of consensus based on the idea of reconciliation in return for silence about the past appealed to Latin American and European countries until the mid-1990s. This model advocated for (collective) amnesty to secure peace. In the 1990s, other models that focus on accountability, such as the German model and Latin American model prevailed but amnesties and pardons continue to be granted as part of the peace agreements (David, 2020a; Lessa, 2013).

¹² See the UN reports published in 1997, 2004, 2005, and 2010. The principles of TJ are listed in the UN report in 1997 and 2005 as the right to truth, justice, reparation, and non-recurrence (Joinet, 1997; Orentlicher, 2005).

policy-making field is mainly based on the principles and standards that are shaped by the UN-based human rights, memorialization policies, international legal system, legislation, and criminal justice mechanisms.

In one of her earlier works, Ruti Teitel (2003) defines TJ as “the conception of justice associated with periods of political change, characterized by legal responses to confront the wrongdoings of repressive predecessor regimes” (p. 1). This early definition understands TJ primarily in legal and policy-related terms and shows the significance of international law and political science in laying the grounds for the field. Over the years, the TJ field has become a multidisciplinary field consisting of sociology, anthropology, psychology, history, peace and conflict studies, and international relations (Lessa, 2013). As scholars and practitioners started to criticize the narrow definition of TJ (Duthie, 2017), the framework expanded from accountability and transition to democracy to a broader conception of transition, including a wider range of legal regimes, mechanisms, and goals (other than justice), accepting that “there is no single formula for dealing with [the] past” (ICTJ, 2008). Paying attention to the contextual factors, such as the institutional and political contexts, the nature of the conflict, and the underlying socio-economic problems, the ICTJ underlines that the TJ framework offers “a series of mosaics, or processes arranged according to the circumstances in play” (Duthie, 2017) rather than a toolkit or template that is uniformly applied all over the world. So, not only the establishment of truth-seeking mechanisms, criminal prosecutions, symbolic and monetary reparations, and guarantees of non-recurrence (four pillars of TJ) but also the transformation of the society, reforms in the state and institutions, establishing respect for the rule of law, and providing solutions for structural inequalities became the goals of TJ in the last decade (Walker, 2018).

Yet, a quick look at the field of policy-making, i.e., the UN and NGO reports and briefings, shows that the TJ framework continues to regard seeking accountability and fighting impunity as its main objectives. The definition of TJ in the UN Guidance Note of the Secretary-General in 2004¹³ also shows that although the TJ field has expanded to include diverse mechanisms, processes, and local factors, it is nonetheless rooted in particular principles and standards regarding accountability, justice, and reconciliation.

In *Coming to Terms with the Past*, Sancar (2007) goes over the debates and examples of facing the past in different geographies, examines processes of Truth Commissions and criminal law (extrajudicial executions, amnesty, trials), and discusses the possibilities and limitations of facing the past. Noting that every country is unique in facing its past, he underlines that there are complex factors that must be taken into account in each context but argues that it is important to have universal principles and standards to fight against the violations around the world.

2.2.1 TJ is challenged

However, especially since the 2010s, the TJ framework and its understanding of facing the past have been challenged by criticisms in the global South, Eastern Europe, and the West (Forsdick et al., 2020). Mainly in the global South, the postcolonial criticisms attempt to decolonize memory studies as they regard the cosmopolitan memory as a neocolonial imposition that fails to capture the local experiences and structures of imperial violence. They question the TJ mechanisms

¹³ The report defines TJ as “the full range of processes and mechanisms associated with a society’s attempts to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past abuses, in order to ensure accountability, serve justice and achieve reconciliation. These may include both judicial and non-judicial mechanisms, with differing levels of international involvement (or none at all) and individual prosecutions, reparations, truth-seeking, institutional reform, vetting and dismissals, or a combination thereof” (Report of the Secretary-General, 2004, p. 4).

and processes, which, according to them, ensure the control of the periphery by integrating it into the global neoliberal economy.

Furthermore, many scholars question the normative assumptions and beliefs of facing the past paradigm and its approach to memorialization. Lea David (2020a) lists these assumptions as such: 1) facing the past is necessary for healing, forgiveness, and reconciliation, 2) accountability fosters democracy, peace, and human rights, and 3) facing the past is a moral duty. She criticizes these for being individualizing and Eurocentric assumptions that are not backed up by empirical data.¹⁴ Scholars also examine how TJ mechanisms and concepts operate across time and space, how they reinforce existing power relations, and how they often result in incomplete and narrow outcomes (Demian and Kent, 2020). In a similar vein, some anthropologists point out how the TJ mechanisms fail to address structural inequalities, trigger competition over victimhood, and define victimhood in such a narrow way that people are excluded from receiving reparations (Kesselring, 2016).

Over the last decade, memorialization practices attained a significant role in the TJ framework. These practices are mostly grounded on legal and policy-based understandings of facing the past. The revised final UN Report by Joinet (1997) introduces the concept of ‘duty to remember’ under the category of ‘the right to know’, one of the four principles of TJ.¹⁵ Memorialization is also fundamental for the right to reparations as in the symbolic reparations listed as “official apologies, changing names of public spaces, the establishment of commemorative days, memorials to the victims, and assistance in reburials and culturally appropriate

¹⁴ Not only these core assumptions but also clear distinctions and definitions have been unsettled by critical works. For example, the distinction between before and after conflict and the definitions of peace, justice, and victimhood have been questioned and redefined.

¹⁵ “Its corollary is a ‘duty to remember’ on the part of the State: to be forearmed against the perversions of history that go under the names of revisionism or negationism; the knowledge of the oppression it has lived through is part of a people’s national heritage and as such must be preserved.” (Joinet, 1997, p. 5).

mourning ceremonies” (Lessa, 2013, p. 15). Another form of memorialization practice is the truth commissions, which are truth-seeking and reconciliation mechanisms with many examples from the world, such as Latin America, Africa, Europe, and Southeast Asia. A truth commission is an official body that investigates and reveals the past wrongdoings of governments or non-state actors. One of its aims is to create an archive of the narratives of the victims by collecting and making their memories visible.

In the United States Institute of Peace Working Group report, Judy Barsalou and Victoria Baxter (2007) elaborate on how memorialization can enhance reconciliation and social reconstruction rather than preserving or igniting further conflict. Designating memorialization as a TJ mechanism, they give recommendations to actors involved in memorialization initiatives.

The ‘urge to remember’ and the widespread slogan ‘never again’¹⁶ illustrate the entanglements of remembering and facing the past that extend the issue to the wider society, especially civil society. The responsibility to remember is extended to other bodies, such as international and national NGOs, who provide expertise, create and preserve archives, and engage in human rights and peace education and memorialization projects. However, the main actor responsible for ensuring TJ is the state. Non-governmental actors are seen as the gatekeepers or facilitators of the processes, who check up on the responsibilities of the state by following the lawsuits, preparing reports on state policies, and lobbying for changes in the legislation.

¹⁶ The idea behind the motto of never again is rooted in the principle of the guarantee of non-recurrence of conflict and the task to enforce legislative, institutional, and social reforms and changes to ensure non-recurrence.

Yet, TJ's approach to memorialization is also criticized. David (2020b) critically analyzes the relationship between human rights and memory¹⁷, follows the rise of the global phenomenon known as the human rights memorialization agenda, and investigates its implementation. Originated in the 1980s, this agenda developed and gained prominence in the TJ field in the 1990s. Accordingly, its upsurge has resulted in a policy-oriented memorialization agenda, which shapes the policies and standards of memorialization at the world polity level. Examining the reports of various international organizations that set the standards (Barsalou and Baxter, 2007; Impunity Watch Policy Brief, 2013; UN Report of the Special Rapporteur, 2020), David (2020b) demonstrates the institutionalization of facing the past agenda and the standardization of memory. According to her, the human rights vision of memorialization does not result in a greater appreciation of human rights. Instead, it strengthens ethnic and national sentiments and divisions¹⁸ and creates new social inequalities resulting from the competition among the victim groups for access to justice and reparation.

David draws attention to an important point by drawing parallels between the ethno-national sentiments and the facing the past paradigm. In the last decade, the TJ framework and facing the past paradigm have been challenged by the ethno-nationalist and populist movements worldwide. The first challenges emerged from

¹⁷ David considers human rights as an ideology. Samuel Moyn (2010) makes a similar point in stating that the understanding of human rights today became widespread with the weakening of other political ideologies such as socialism, colonialism, anticolonialist nationalism and other anticolonial projects in the 1970s. In *The Last Utopia* (2010), Moyn investigates why human rights prevailed in the 1970s but not in 1940s, and concludes the weakening of other ideologies was crucial in the acceptance of human rights as a moral alternative at the global level. With the proliferation of human rights, the claims for socio-economic justice gave way to a focus on individual rights. The understanding of right in this perspective focuses more on victimhood and suffering rather than resistance and struggle (Cercel, 2020; David, 2020a; Levy and Sznajder, 2002). Such a focus is said to depoliticize memory, arguing that the idea of human rights makes room only for particular claims to justice, equality, and rights. Based on the idea of the individual, these claims disregard other claims that focus on the society at large (Fordsick et al., 2020). According to Moyn (2020), what made human rights an alternative in the 1970s was this aspect of neutrality and antipolitics.

¹⁸ Whether it strengthens the ethnic and national divisions is a question of great importance that needs to be researched in detail.

the New Right in the 1980s and attained a broader reach in the 2010s (Forsdick et al., 2020). Although the movements differ from one another, they all stand against the dominant paradigm of facing the past and use similar strategies: They appropriate the Holocaust memory for their ethno-nationalist agendas¹⁹ (Subotić, 2020), demand to be recognized as victims by using a discourse based on victimhood and suffering, celebrate the positive aspects of colonialism or dictatorship, and refuse to feel ashamed or guilty for the past (Forsdick et al., 2020).

Pointing out the links between the memory boom and the nostalgic-conservative turn in memory discourses, Cristian Cercel (2020) argues that both the left-liberal cosmopolitan memory and the antagonistic memory²⁰ used by ethno-nationalist movements, focus on victimhood, trauma, and nostalgic-conservative discourses. Anna C. Bull and Hans L. Hansen (2020) also point out that the ethno-nationalist movements not only negate the cosmopolitan memory but also subvert and appropriate it for their own agendas. David's remarks on strengthening ethnic ties and competition over victimhood can be understood in this context. Such an

¹⁹ Jelena Subotić (2020) looks at the commemorative practices and museums in Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, and Serbia and explains how they appropriate the memory, symbols, and imagery of the Holocaust to 1) equate the suffering of non-Jewish national majorities with the Holocaust, and 2) situate communism as the main criminal legacy of the twentieth century. According to Subotić, the Holocaust provides a template of suffering that the ethno-nationalist movements can use to form their own nationalist histories of victimization. Hence, in a number of Eastern European countries, the nationalist movements draw parallels between the Holocaust and communism, and “displace[...] the Holocaust with the idea of ‘communist genocide’” (Forsdick et. al, 2020, p. 10).

²⁰ In their categorization of ethico-political modes of remembering according to the principles of conflictivity, morality, and reflexivity, Anna C. Bull and Hans L. Hansen (2020) distinguish between three modes: cosmopolitanism, antagonism, and agonism. The cosmopolitan memory is the mode that shapes the facing the past paradigm and it is defined as “[a] mode of remembering [that] builds on an understanding of the world as one big and potentially harmonious entity, united by a common culture based on the recognition of human rights. The moral categories of ‘good’ and ‘evil’ are applied to abstract systems such as democracy and dictatorship, and the cosmopolitan mode is highly self-reflexive” (Bull and Hansen, 2020, p. 2). The antagonistic memory, on the other hand, is based on a fiction of an ethnically pure past and views conflict as a way to eliminate the enemy-Other. It applies the categories of good and evil not to abstract systems but real characters. Adopted by ethno-nationalist movements, it does not reflect on its role in the constitution of identity. The third way, the agonistic mode, sees conflict as an ontological characteristic of society and reflects on its role in the construction of us and them.

appropriation is possible because both of these modes focus on discourses of victimhood.

2.2.2 TJ: A traveling and expanding concept

The challenges of postcolonial critics and ethno-nationalist movements against this framework are helpful in understanding how the concept travels across different geographies and times. Although I agree that the universalization of the concept has led to a degree of standardization, I do not think that the concept is directly adapted as it travels, rather the original concept goes through a translation process, in which the “idea is to some extent transformed by its new uses, its new position in a new time and place” (Said, 1983, p. 227). Traveling across time and space, the core assumptions of facing the past and the cosmopolitan memory influence the local contexts, but they acquire diverse meanings and purposes, which may be different from the standardized ones. Andreas Huyssen (2003) notes that the Holocaust loses its specificity as a historical event as it becomes a universal “metaphor for other traumatic histories and memories” (p. 14). Spreading over to various contexts, the Holocaust memory can stimulate or block other traumatic memories or serve as a ‘screen memory’ (Huyssen, 2003).

As Michael Rothberg (2009) impressively demonstrates in *Multidirectional Memory*, the Holocaust memory enables the articulation of other histories and memories, the history of decolonization in his case, in unexpected ways and times. He gives the example of the early postwar period between 1945 and 1962 when the Holocaust memory developed in conversation with the struggles in the decolonization era. According to Rothberg, these conjunctions reveal significant insights into the dynamics of collective memory. Therefore, Rothberg offers to think

about these connections, providing an unacknowledged history of the connections between the Holocaust memory and other memories while critically engaging with how the Holocaust memory works with the discourse of uniqueness.

Following Rothberg, I am curious about how the cosmopolitan memory and the human-rights-based approach travel to national and local contexts and how they work to support social movements and resistances of working classes, ethnically and religiously marginalized groups, LGBTQI+ and feminist movements, climate justice movements, and so on.

The discussions and debates over TJ and facing the past in Turkey, noting that not all of the discussions can be recounted here, is an example of how these concepts travel. Examining different countries' facing the past processes, Sancar (2007) distinguishes Turkey from them: Whereas other countries deal with one major event such as military dictatorship, civil war, genocide, or massacre, Turkey has successive major events to deal with. These events cover a long period starting from the late Ottoman era until today²¹ and constitute "a layering of 'social traumas' shielded by a thick and hard crust, the breaking of which could be very painful and traumatic in itself" (Sancar, 2007, in Ahiska 2014, p.5). According to Sancar (2007), for a systematic confrontation with the past, a "culture of remembering" has to flourish against the "culture of oblivion" (p. 257). The existence and maintenance of such a culture are intimately connected with whether there is a powerful societal demand or a political will for confrontation, which according to Sancar, is not the case in Turkey.

²¹ A list of these events includes the 1915 Armenian Genocide, one-party period, the Wealth Tax in 1942, Kurdish rebellions, Dersim massacre, 6-7 September events, 1 May 1977, Sivas massacre, systemic state violence in the Southeast Turkey against the Kurds, all the coup d'états and attempts respectively in 1960, 1971, 1980, 1997, 2016, and more.

So, “why discuss TJ in Turkey?” is a popular question in Turkey that asks about the significance of discussing TJ in a context where it is not initiated or even blocked by the Turkish state for decades. This question is posed in the introduction of the collection of papers from the symposium *Transitional Justice in Turkey: Changing Subjects, Methods, and Tools* (2021) published by Truth Justice and Memory Center (*Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi*). Başak Çalı emphasizes that this maybe not be the best question to ask. The papers in the collection examine diverse topics such as legal proceedings, museums, history lesson curriculums in schools, social media, social movements, trees, cinema, and more. The collection covers the works focusing on law and TJ as a method and a purpose and the works exploring extrajudicial and interdisciplinary perspectives of facing the past.

Acquiring a broad perspective on TJ, new and creative methods and tools are introduced into the discussions of TJ. This is possible as the authors do not see TJ as a fixed process with a definite beginning and ending and definite subjects, tools, and purposes, but as a process that evolves and changes while the actors, places, and demands change. With such a view, TJ in Turkey is not seen as an ultimate goal that has to be reached but as a process that would facilitate people’s involvement and actions regarding the distant and near past, violations, and atrocities. Such a framework of TJ and its discussion call people to act either individually or collectively. With this understanding of TJ, many methods and practices that deal with the past are involved in the discussion. These practices, methods, and subjects involve practices of the everyday.

Following the path of this collection, I will take a different perspective that goes beyond the understanding of facing the past as a matter of law and policy-making. Although the TJ framework can be expanded to include diverse practices

and ways of facing the past, as exemplified in the Truth Justice Memory Center collection, the framework does not have the necessary conceptual tools to deal with everyday experiences and practices. My understanding of the everyday involves not only films, museums, textbooks, or social movements but also the everyday practices and encounters in the city that, in some contexts, for example, in the memory walks, take a different turn. Although the TJ framework has extended to include much more about the everyday, I prefer working with a different framework: a framework of the everyday that focuses more on how the everyday turns into a time and space for encounters that move people close to or away from facing the past.

2.3 Nation-state-centered framework

Before elaborating on the everyday, I want to go over another framework closely connected to TJ: the nation-state-centered framework. The nation-state-centered framework of facing the past shares similar purposes with TJ, such as holding the perpetrators accountable, attaining acknowledgment and redress for the past crimes, and ensuring the non-recurrence of the past atrocities. The difference is that the TJ framework includes the entanglements of global, national, and local mechanisms and processes, whereas the nation-state-centered framework focuses on the actions of the nation-state and the politics and culture of memory within the nation-state. The discussions on the internationally acknowledged TJ mechanisms and processes and the comparisons made with other countries are of course part of this framework. Yet, as the concepts and principles of TJ travel to national contexts, they enter into and find their position among the ongoing discussions on the politics and culture about remembering and forgetting within the nation-state.

A discussion of facing the past in this framework mostly focuses on the actions of the state; what the state does for or against facing the past. Some of the discussions on culture and habitus include much more than direct actions of the state. Nonetheless, they are connected to what the state does; how the state, with its policies and apparatuses, reproduces or changes the ways of remembering, forgetting, or denying that shape the everyday lives of people.²² So, it can be concluded that the state is seen as the primary responsible actor in how the past is dealt with as it decides on, implements, or blocks diverse remedies such as legal proceedings, reparations, apologies, etc. Responsibility of the state in facing the past has two meanings: the state is responsible for 1) the past wrongdoings and 2) ensuring justice and remedies for them. Taking the example of Turkey, I will look at the discussions on the politics of memory in Turkey and then argue that facing the past in this framework can also acquire the meaning of facing the state.

2.3.1 The nation-state politics of remembering and forgetting

According to Benedict Anderson (1983), all nations are imagined political communities” that come together with the idea of a shared past and future. The

²² Discussions on the culture and habitus with regard to remembering and forgetting in Turkey are plentiful. Here, I will only give a couple of examples to provide a general understanding. As mentioned in the previous section, Sancar (2007) argues that for a systematic confrontation with the past in Turkey, the history of which is characterized by successive events of violence, the initiation and success of TJ mechanisms or processes cannot be seen apart from a turn to a “culture of remembering” against the “culture of oblivion” (p. 257). There is also discussions on habitus, such as the “post-genocide habitus of denial” (Suciyan, 2016), which underlines the way in which denial is normalized and institutionalized in Turkey with regard to 1915. With this concept, Talin Suciyan (2016) demonstrates how denial shapes the everyday life and subjectivities of people and “operates through and structures all state policies and socialized subjectivities” (p. 23) including law, academia, and the daily life. She concludes that “the entire denialist habitus plays a decisive role in the generation of apparatuses of exclusion, in the construction of a model of citizenship, and, consequently, in the affective attachment to all dimensions of the denialist habitus itself” (p. 202). Other scholars see denial as a policy of the state. For example, Tunç Aybak (2016) argues that the state has departed from a politics of silence to a different denial policy in the last years where “[t]he sufferings of the Armenians are officially registered but not fully recognized” (Aybak, 2016, p. 138). The public speech of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the prime minister of the time, on 24 April 2014, is given as an example of the rebranding and consolidation of the denial policies of the state.

formation of a new nation-state, even if it attempts to break the ties with its predecessor, is grounded in its past. All beginnings, even after a revolution, entail a recollection of the past (Connerton, 1989). The idea of a shared past is grounded in the recollection and rewriting of the past according to the ideal nationhood and national identity. Hence, the formation of the nation-state and the national identity is intimately connected with the politics of remembering and forgetting.

The establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923 was seen as a new beginning as the newly founded Republic attempted to erase the memory of its Ottoman past and turned a new page by defining itself as a modern republic. In this sense, “the Turkish Republic was originally based on forgetting” (Özyürek, 2007, p. 3) not only the Ottoman past but also the constitutive violence.²³ Different terms are used to describe forgetting in the formation of the Turkish Republic and the politics of memory in Turkey. For example, Esra Özyürek (2007), referring to Milan Kundera (1980), calls it organized or administrated forgetting to underline the series of reforms of the new Turkish government that aimed to establish a homogeneous and secular nation-state and a new national identity. Tanıl Bora (2009) uses the term “militant forgetting” (p. 8) to depict the repression of the past in Turkey. According to Meltem Ahıska (2014), the term militant demonstrates

the enormous and radical rupture with the past, the involvement of force in the prohibition of memories and in the fabrication of a national memory, and the impact of denial and repression on everyday life by way of building a certain habitus. (p. 3)

Militant forgetting resembles another term introduced by Paul Connerton (2008):

‘repressive erasure’. “[E]mployed to deny the fact of a historical rupture as well as to

²³ By constitutive violence, I mean different kinds of violence that contributed to the formation of the Turkish Republic and the national identity rooted in Sunni Turkishness. It includes all kinds of violence against the ethnic, religious, and linguistic communities such as forced deportation and migration, annihilation, pogroms, and all kinds of racist and discriminatory policies and laws such as the Wealth Tax in 1942, prohibitions with regard to education and language, criminalization, structural inequalities that reproduce impoverishment, etc., in short, all kinds of wrongdoings and violations against the ones that are cast outside the definition of the Turkish national identity.

bring about a historical break” (Connerton, 2008, p. 60), repressive erasure can involve overt and covert forms of violence. In the case of historical rupture, it can involve eliminating and destroying the remnants of the old regime. In sum, it can be said that the forgetting that characterizes the formation of the Turkish Republic is grounded in the violence that constituted the new nation-state and national identity, which Connerton calls, forgetting that is “constitutive in the formation of a new identity” (p. 62).

Forgetting is only one side of the coin. The formation of the nation-state is based on selective remembering as much as the forgetting of the past. Martin Stokes (2000) notes that remembering the past can have the function of justifying the new regime:

Remembering becomes both a problem and a matter of cultural elaboration. This is not because the state is incapable of making people forget but because the politics of forgetting paradoxically demands the preservation of a variety of things to demonstrate the necessity of their having been forgotten. (Stokes, 2000, in Özyürek, 2007, p. 6)

How the past is remembered justifies not only the new regime but also shapes the politics of memory by (re)writing the history, (re)creating the national holidays, commemorations, and monuments, and drawing the boundaries of public discussions and the everyday life.

The debates on the ways of remembering and forgetting in the national context are ultimately tied with the nation-state and how it shapes the politics of memory starting from its very formation. The national identity is shaped by the formulation of a shared past and future that brings together the nation and sets it apart from the others and other ways of remembering and forgetting the past. In this framework, a discussion about facing the past eventually becomes a discussion of the

nation-state, its policies, laws, and its wrongdoings and responsibilities concerning the past.

2.3.2 Facing the past, facing the state

When facing the past is understood as the responsibility of the state in both meanings mentioned above, that is, responsibility for the past wrongdoings, as well as for remedying of them, it may also mean and be practiced as facing the state. What I mean by facing the state includes the wide range of practices, discourses, and performances of non-governmental organizations, social and political movements, civil initiatives, victim groups and their relatives, or groups based on ethnicity, sex, gender, occupation, age, etc., that hold the state responsible and demand the state to face the past. Raising this demand requires a turn towards the state, in my words, facing the state. Of course, there are many actors and ways of facing the state that cannot be covered in the scope of this thesis. The common point is that they demand the state to initiate and foster the mechanisms of facing the past and ensure the social and political conditions for facing the past. They also hold the state accountable for blocking these mechanisms. Among the wide range of practices of holding the state accountable, some of them can be listed as doing research, creating and safeguarding archives, creating artworks, publishing reports, books, and materials on the past wrongdoings, state policies, legal proceedings, social movements, and organizing events, symposiums, conferences to make these discussions public and widespread. It also involves different ways to make demands known, such as protesting online or on the streets.

The Saturday Mothers in Turkey, which have been gathering at the Galatasaray Square since 1995 to make their demands heard and seen, can be an

example. Every Saturday, they meet at noon and display the photographs of the forcibly disappeared people in Turkey, the majority of whom are their relatives. These gatherings are a political performance, where the witnesses, the disappeared people, and the memories of their disappearance encounter (Ahıska, 2019). It is also an encounter with the state, a way of facing the state on the street, directly by facing the police and indirectly by defending their case and making their stories heard and known by the broader public despite the lack of remedies.

Various NGOs such as the *beraberce* Association²⁴, Hrant Dink Foundation, Human Rights Association (*İnsan Hakları Derneği*, İHD), Research Center for Peace, Democracy and Alternative Politics (*Demokrasi, Barış ve Alternatif Politikalar Araştırma Derneği*, DEMOS), Truth Justice Memory Center, Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (*Türkiye Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Vakfı*, TESEV), and more, have contributed to the public discussions on facing the past. Their way of facing the past also involves facing the state in the form of following up on what the state does or does not do. Overall, the published materials cover a wide range of issues, such as the state discourses and policies, the laws, the follow-ups on the lawsuits, the discussions on impunity, the international laws and mechanisms, and the experiences of the victims and their relatives.²⁵ The research and published materials on these issues make up an archive of how the state attempts to, backs away from, or stands in the way of facing the past. A discussion on facing the past is almost impossible without discussing the doings of the state. And, diverse practices

²⁴ *Berberce* means together in English.

²⁵ To give a couple of examples, the report *Confronting the Past: Impunity and High Profile Cases* (2012) published by TESEV define facing the past as a way of searching justice through legislation and fighting impunity and underline the role and responsibility of the state in unsolved murders and disappearances. The Truth Justice Memory Center publishes reports and articles on a wide range of issues: the enforced disappearances in Turkey and other countries (Göral, Işık & Kaya, 2013; Alpaya, Altıntaş, Sevdiren & Sevimli, 2013; Bozkurt and Kaya, 2014; Dinçer and Doğru, 2017, Göral, 2019), impunity (Kurt, 2014; Sevdiren, 2015; Tahincioğlu, 2021; Gedeş, Kılıç, Sevimli, Zeren & Zingil, 2021), TJ in Turkey (Truth, Justice and Memory Center, 2021), facing racism (Uçarlar, 2021), the Kurdish Issue (Göral and Kaya, 2018; Çiçek, 2021), and more.

ranging from publishing reports to protesting on the street can be included in how the state is faced.

Overall, facing the past within the nation-state-centered framework is of course connected to the everyday. Firstly, the mechanisms and processes of facing the past, in which the state has a leading role, influence the ways of remembering and forgetting that shape the everyday lives of people. Facing the past in the form of initiating legal proceedings, finding and punishing the perpetrators, changing the laws, officially acknowledging and apologizing for the past wrongdoings, and providing symbolic and material reparations have tremendous effects on the everyday. Secondly, diverse forms of facing the state are also connected to the everyday as they shape the everyday encounters and public discussions on the state's responsibility in providing justice for past wrongdoings.

Although the nation-state-centered framework and the TJ framework cannot be seen apart from the everyday in any way, they are grounded in different understandings of facing the past, which see the international bodies and nation-states as the primary actors responsible for initiating, fostering or impeding facing the past. These frameworks discuss the social, political, and legal factors in facing the past on a larger scale, whereas the framework of the everyday that I will suggest is grounded in the everyday encounters and practices that (re)shape people's relationship with the past through opening up new ways of knowing and feeling. These new ways of feeling and knowing turn the everyday into a time and space for facing the past, questioning one's relationship with the city, the past, the self, and the others. My case study of the memory walks will be an example of this everyday.

2.4 Everyday framework

The everyday framework of facing the past involves all kinds of everyday encounters, experiences, and practices that move people close to or away from experiences of facing the past. How does the everyday turn out to be a place for facing the past? In other words, how can we conceptualize the everyday by taking notice of the critical potential of everyday practices and the ways of feeling and knowing that provide a space and time for facing the past? To demonstrate the relationship between the everyday and the experiences of facing the past, I will explain how a familiar and ordinary everyday of modern urban life can turn into an unfamiliar and extraordinary everyday, which brings forth new ways of feeling and knowing concerning the city, the past, and the self.

At its simplest, the everyday covers all the big and the teeny-tiny things that shape how people live in the world, that is, how a day goes by. Although a list of all the everyday things cannot be covered here, it includes habits, rituals, conversations and interactions with other human and non-human beings and the environment, all kinds of practices from shopping to cooking, eating, walking, going to a movie or a museum, doing sports, going out with friends or family, going to work, discovering new spots, and doing daily chores at home.

Many scholars have written about the everyday, especially the everyday life in the city. Georg Simmel, Walter Benjamin, Henri Lefebvre, Michel de Certeau, Nigel Thrift, Lauren Berlant, Kathleen Stewart, and Brian Massumi, among others, can be listed. For the scope of this thesis, I will deal only with some of the concepts that Simmel, de Certeau, and Benjamin work on. Drawing on these concepts, I will set the scene for an understanding of the extraordinary everyday.

The writings on everyday life in the twentieth century that have laid the grounds for an everyday life theory, focus on the new and rich sensorium in the cities and the people's bodily, sensory, and affective experiences in the cities. The urban anomie, describing the anonymity of spaces and people in the city, along with the new objects and scenes in the city, is usually associated with feelings and reactions like shock, indifference, and detachment in the face of the overstimulation coming from all the anonymous things and people around. In "The Metropolis and Mental Life," first published in 1903, Georg Simmel defines the psychic and mental state of the people in the city as the blasé metropolitan attitude, which results from the agitation of "the nerves to their utmost reactivity until they finally can no longer produce any reaction at all" (Simmel, 1950, p. 14). For Simmel, the blasé attitude is intimately connected with the money economy in the cities. As money becomes "the common denominator of all values" (p. 14), all differences in the quality of things that make them individual and incomparable lose their unique value and become equated to an exchange value. The blasé attitude results from the internalization of the money economy. A blasé person sees all things "in a homogeneous, flat and grey color, with none of them worthy of being preferred to another" (p. 14) and consequently is indifferent to the things and people around.

Although today's urban life is very much different from the twentieth century of early modernity, when Simmel was writing, the concept of the blasé still gives us a hint to understand the contemporary urban life, in which places, things, and people remain anonymous, unrecognized, and impersonal as though they do not contain any unique quality. The ordinary everyday in the city is still experienced in similar ways, consisting of feelings of indifference and a reserved state, in which the individual does not know of or is not curious about the things around.

Another work that I will engage with is *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1988) by Michel de Certeau. Drawing on linguistics theories, the book attempts to form a theory of everyday practices that looks at the “multiform, resistance, tricky, and stubborn procedures that elude discipline without being outside the field in which it is exercised” (p. 96). De Certeau calls these practices tactics. A tactic is described as a “maneuver” or “a calculated action determined by the absence of a proper locus” (p. 37). Unlike tactics, strategies pertain to a “specific type of knowledge, one sustained and determined by the power to provide oneself with one’s own place” (p. 36) as in military or scientific strategies. Tactics, on the other hand, do not pertain to rigorous planning or a god-like view of the adversary. Rather, it is “an art of the weak” (p. 37); it takes advantage of the incoming opportunities but cannot hold on to them for long. Not being able to plan, tactics are made of the “chance offerings of the moment” (p. 37) that enable people to “make use of the cracks” (p. 37) opened in the structures of power. De Certeau is quite influenced by Michel Foucault’s understanding of power as he states that these everyday practices are “far from being regulated or eliminated by panoptic administration, have reinforced themselves in a proliferating illegitimacy, developed and insinuated themselves into the networks of surveillance...to the point of constituting everyday regulations and surreptitious creativities” (p. 96).

It can be concluded that de Certeau’s everyday is shaped by the structures and relations of power and the everyday and spatial practices developed and enacted within them. Nonetheless, his everyday also has space for the unpredictability of the everyday life, exemplified in the chance events from which the tactics emerge. De Certeau’s everyday certainly involves an extraordinary aspect that comes from the idea of everyday tactics.

Another work that investigates the ordinary and the extraordinary of the everyday is the unfinished and celebrated masterpiece Walter Benjamin wrote between 1927 and 1940, *The Arcades Project* (2002), a collection of writings on the nineteenth century city life in Paris. Benjamin's understanding of modernity is inspired by Karl Marx, Georg Simmel, and Georg Lukács and grounded in concepts such as commodity fetishism, reification, overstimulation, and so on (McCracken, 2005). His concept of phantasmagoria demonstrates how the culture of consumerism has pervaded all aspects of everyday life and relations between people and things. The concepts of *Erlebnis* and *Erfahrung*²⁶ also show the complexity of everyday urban experiences (McCracken, 2005). Another important concept is the flâneur, which Benjamin examines through the poems of Charles Baudelaire. The flâneur is the observer and explorer of the city's attractions, spectacles, and objects. For Benjamin, the flâneur is a figure of the nineteenth century that pertains to an "intermediate stage" (Benjamin, 2002, p. 21); it is a figure between the intelligentsia and the buyer. Through seeking refuge in the crowd, "the familiar city is transformed for the flâneur into phantasmagoria" and "appears now as a landscape" (p. 21) to be explored.

So, Benjamin's everyday certainly involves the ordinary and extraordinary aspects of daily life in the modern city. Through the practice of strolling around, namely the flânerie, one can experience the city with an awareness of all that makes the city. In contrast to Simmel's everyday with the blasé attitude, this everyday lies at "the threshold between the ordinary and the extraordinary, between *what is* and *what might be*." (McCracken, 2002, p. 163).

²⁶ As a defense against the urban shock, that is, the shock from all of the stimulation in the city, the incidents turn into an isolated experience, *Erlebnis*. *Erfahrung*, on the other hand, refers to a reflexive state that grows out of long lasting impressions. Benjamin points out to the dialectic between the two rather than juxtaposing them as totally separate experiences.

Although providing the conceptual background for my framework of the everyday, these concepts do not exactly refer to the extraordinary everyday that I illustrate in this thesis. To explain how the extraordinary everyday emerges and what it brings forth, I will focus on a specific memorialization practice: memory walks. Ranging from museums to monuments and counter-monuments, from sites of memory to national commemorations and holidays, memorialization practices make up a significant part of the everyday. Among them, memory walks consists of seemingly ordinary and everyday places such as streets, parks, squares, residential buildings, shops, etc. In a nutshell, memory walks are a combination of everyday habits and practices, urban discoveries, past stories, performances of walking and storytelling, work and research on memory, and new ways of sensing, feeling, and knowing. Installed at the heart of everyday life in the city, the memory walks are grounded in the practices of collective walking in public spaces.

My research and analysis will be based on the memory walks organized in Turkey by three different organizations, namely the Karakutu Association, the Civil and Ecological Rights Association (SEHAK), and the Sabancı University (SU) Gender and Women's Studies Center of Excellence.²⁷ The next chapter will include a detailed description of each organization's memory walks. For now, I will only give a general picture of what memory walks are.

Memory walks are one-day-long city walks comprised of pre-determined routes and stops in a chosen neighborhood in a city. They last between four to eight hours. A variety of people, such as the coordinators, facilitators, storytellers, participants, and random people on the streets, contribute to the walks at different levels. In a memory walk, the participants (sometimes the storytellers) walk in the

²⁷ For short, I will call it the SU Gender Center from now on.

city, go to designated places, stop and listen to a story, discuss it, and continue walking. The participants walk in groups of three to five or walk altogether as 20-30 people. Nonetheless, in all different versions, these are collective walks in urban public spaces. Other activities such as storytelling, street interviewing, and video shooting are also part of the walks, along with some pre-and post-walk activities such as training, seminars, archival and oral history research, video editing, and discussion sessions.

The designated places in the walks consist of streets, squares, parks, shops, hospitals, churches, residential buildings, and so on. The walks tell the stories of these places, stories of past atrocities and events, biographies of people, or fragments of daily life in the past. These stories are mostly publicly unknown or invisible stories that are not included in school curriculums, public discussions, or public spaces, at least not like how they are told in the walks. The stories in the walks are based on extensive research: they rely on historical data and facts and testimonies of witnesses, personal and collective memories of the storytellers and the participants, and their perspectives and emotions. Rather than being fixed and closed, the stories change based on new comments and continuing research.

Overall, practices of walking and storytelling make up the core of the memory walks. As I will explain in the next chapter, I see them as performances and performatives. Through practices of walking and storytelling, places are (re)created in the walks. Also explained in the next chapter is how an everyday practice such as walking that is predominantly seen and lived as part of the ordinary routine or as a habit can actually be an unpredictable and incalculable practice or a critical one. Seen as a critical practice, walking is a combination of many things: a research method, a memory work, an exploratory event full of shock, tears, laughter, and

surprises, and an imaginary event involving dreams about stories, places, and people of the past. As stories come together with everyday urban spaces through collective walking and storytelling, a new everyday opens up. I will call this the extraordinary everyday and identify it as an opening. It is an opening both to different kinds of stories and to facing the past, both of which are intimately related to the ways of looking and sensing the city and ways of feeling and knowing experienced in the walks. As I will demonstrate in the next chapters, facing the past in this extraordinary everyday is an experience in which one questions their relationship with and understanding of the past and the city. Hearing and telling about the events and people in the past can give rise to troubling questions concerning one's identity, responsibilities, investments, privileges, and emotions related to the past and the present. Encounters with these questions and emotions constitute the experiences of facing the past within the framework of the everyday.

The transformation of everyday into a time and space for discovery, intervention, and reflection is intimately connected with the creation and imagining of everyday places. During the walks, ordinary and familiar public places, which we pass by but do not recognize, register, and remember in the course of our daily lives, transform into unfamiliar and extraordinary places that incite curiosity, wonder, empathy, anger, hope, and so on. The everyday places are seen as if for the first time. What is familiar but unrecognized until then is (re)discovered through a new look that is attentive, careful, and curious. They become a source of exploration and discovery rather than being unrecognized, taken for granted, or boring. The turn to extraordinary everyday is shaped by new ways of looking and sensing the city and new ways of feeling and knowing which the walks bring on. It must be noted that this everyday is a transitory everyday. The transitory character of this everyday is

what separates it from the ordinary everyday, which can be as much unpredictable and extraordinary as the extraordinary everyday. Although it is transitory, it certainly leaves traces behind. The storytellers and participants remember it and sometimes turn back to it.

My understanding of the everyday in the memory walks will also be grounded in the multiplicity of the experiences in the walks, exemplified in all the different emotions and meanings given to these emotions. As I will show in the fourth chapter, there are multiple ways that these emotions can go. Drawing on Rothberg's (2009) multidirectional approach to memory, I will consider the everyday in the memory walks as multidirectional. For Rothberg, the multidirectional approach is an alternative to the competitive approach to memory, which assumes that the public space is a scarce resource and that the interaction of different collective memories takes the form of a zero-sum game. By pointing out how memories can enhance discussions on different memories, the multidirectional approach acknowledges the unexpected and unwanted connections between memories, identities, forms of solidarity, and visions of justice. I believe that memory walks fit well into Rothberg's multidirectional approach. Their multidirectionality comes from both the multidirectionality of memories incorporated in the stories and the contingency and openness that characterizes the performances of walking and storytelling. The emergence of an extraordinary everyday through the walks provides quite suitable grounds for new experiences of feeling and knowing. The fact that each walk and storytelling is unique and unrepeatable, employing the general characteristics of performance, makes the multidirectional aspect of the walks becomes even more prominent. In each telling and listening, stories can go in

different ways, talk to different things, attain different meanings, open up new discussions, or shut them down.

To illustrate the extraordinary and multidirectional everyday in the memory walks and examine the experiences of facing the past, this thesis will engage with some key theoretical concepts: performance/performativity, place, memory work, affect/emotion, and walking.

2.4.1 Performance/performativity

This thesis is based on the concepts of performance and performativity as I read the bodily and discursive practices of memory walk storytellers and participants in relation to these concepts. During my ethnographic fieldwork, I had the opportunity to participate in the memory walks both as a storyteller and a participant. I noticed that the memory walks are constituted of different kinds of performances such as walking, storytelling, street-interviewing, etc. I also observed that these performances are much more than bodily and discursive re-enactments, they (re)make places too. Therefore, I argue that walking and storytelling are performatives.

In “What is Performance?” (2006), Richard Schechner defines performance as restored behaviors which are physical, verbal, or virtual actions, consciously or unconsciously prepared or rehearsed. He underlines that all behavior is restored, but performances are marked and heightened behaviors that are somewhat separated from everyday life. Although performances are made from fragments of restored behavior, every performance is different from every other because they are combined in endless variations. Even in cases where the same combination of behaviors is re-enacted, each re-enactment is different, depending on various factors such as the

differences in the environment or the participants' moods. Every performing event is unique and unrepeatable.

In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Erving Goffman interprets the human social interaction with the imagery of theatre. He argues that a social interaction is a performance consisting of pre-established patterns of actions, participants of these actions, and social relations (Schechner, 2006). Similarly, Schnecher (2006) states that performances “exist only as actions, interactions, and relationships” (p. 30). These definitions of performance enable us to study the social interactions in daily life as performances and performatives.

Collective walking and storytelling can be regarded as performances as they are pre-established patterns of actions that are unrepeatable and unique, performed by the participants and the storytellers. The walks open up a space and time for all to tell and contribute to the stories. The performances in the walks lie between performing arts, daily life, and identity constructions on Schechner's (2006) performance continuum. Similar to how the performances of everyday life “intentionally blur or sabotage the boundary between the world of the performance and everyday reality” (p. 43), the performances of walking and storytelling in the city also denote a different everyday. I call it the extraordinary everyday.

The memory walks take place in urban public spaces. This necessitates considering the relationship between politics, performance, and urban spaces. The concept of choreography can enable us to understand how bodies come together in urban spaces. André Lepecki's definition of choreopolitics as the “redistribution and reinvention of bodies, affects, senses through which one may learn how to move politically, how to invent, activate, seek, or experiment with a movement whose only sense (meaning and direction) is the experimental exercise of freedom” is helpful

(Lepecki, 2013, p. 20). The way in which bodies come together and move in the memory walks also refers to a political sphere. In the upcoming chapters, I explain more about political action and its examples in walking practices.

Walking and storytelling in the walks are performatives. In “Lecture I” in *How to Do Things with Words* (1962), John L. Austin focuses on what he calls performative utterances or performatives. Accordingly, a performative “indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action” (p. 6). A performative does not just say something, describe it, or indicate that it is true or false, but it does something. The most well-known example is the expression “I do”, said in a marriage ceremony. Here, saying “I do” does not describe or report on marriage, but two people actually get married by saying so.

Since Austin, many scholars have worked on the concept of performativity. Known for her influence on feminist and queer scholarship, Judith Butler has worked on performativity and gender, arguing that gender identities are established by behavior. Rather than being an essence, gender and sex are performatives. Butler’s theory of gender draws on the phenomenological tradition that explains how social reality is constituted through language, gesture, and behavior (Butler, 1988). For Butler, gender “is in no way a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts proceed; rather, it is an identity tenuously constituted in time- an identity instituted through a *stylized repetition of acts*” (p. 519). Gender is not a role that “expresses or disguises an interior ‘self’” (p. 528). It is a performance that is performative. It is an act that constructs the very idea of gender. For Butler, there is no preexisting gender identity that is expressed. Or, there are no true or false expressions of gender. Rather, gender is constituted through gender acts pertaining to bodily gestures and movements.

Drawing on the literature on performativity, I consider the performances of walking and storytelling in the walks as performatives. I argue that everyday urban places in the city are rethought, reimaged, and remade through these performatives.

2.4.2 Place

Theories of place are especially relevant for understanding the bodily, sensory, and emotional experiences and the construction of urban places in the memory walks. In *Sensory Ethnography* (2009), Sarah Pink highlights the importance of rethinking the ethnographic process through theories of place and space and the phenomenology of place. She draws on the works of Edward Casey, Doreen Massey, and Tim Ingold.

According to Edward Casey's phenomenological theory of place (Pink, 2009; Casey, 1996, 2001), time and space are contained in place. Coming together in place, they make up an event. Casey's theory points out the primacy of place in contrast to understanding place as a product or a materialization of space. In other words, Casey rejects the idea of abstract space and a particular and singular place. He contends that the corporeal subject, the lived body, is not an inert and intact thing located in empty space. The lived body belongs to places and constitutes places, inasmuch as places belong to lived bodies and depend on them.

What does being in place mean? The experiences of being in place, which lie at the core of the memory walks, include different kinds of bodily movements that Casey (1996) lists as staying in, moving within, and moving between places.

Referring to the discussions in phenomenology, Casey acknowledges that the ability to grasp being in a place is possible through perception. Yet, adding an annotation to the idea of the primacy of perception, he argues that there must be "an ingredient in perception from the start, a conveyance of what being in places is all about" (p. 17).

For Casey, this ingredient is that we are always already emplaced. Spaces and sensations are always already emplaced too. He regards the relationship between place and perception as dialectic, stating that they are constantly shaped by each other and that “we are never without emplaced experiences” (p. 19). The primacy of place and the idea of emplacedness contribute to my understanding of the memory walks.

Casey also points out that place has the power to gather animate and inanimate entities, experiences, histories, languages, thoughts, memories, emotions, and much more: “Gathering is an event, and an exploration of place-as-event allow[s] us to see how places, far from being inert and static sites, are themselves continually changing in accordance with their own proper dynamism” (p. 44). Furthermore, places also have a deconstructive power that unravels the binary oppositions of self-other, perception-memory, nature-culture, and space-time. Acknowledging the power to gather and deconstruct provides the background for my analysis of the affective encounters in the walks, which make up the everyday experiences of facing the past.

Another reformulation of the relationship between place and space comes from Doreen Massey, who challenges Casey’s primacy of place (Pink, 2009). Criticizing the conceptualization of space as closed and abstract, Massey considers space contingent and active. For her, space is “a simultaneity of stories-so-far” (Massey, 2005, p. 130), and places are “spatio-temporal events” (p. 130). For Massey, both place and space are lived. Her conceptualization is similar to Casey’s in the sense that they both see place as an event, “a constellation of processes rather than a thing” (p. 141), which Massey describes as the “throwntogetherness of place” (p. 140).

Another important scholar in this literature, Tim Ingold, offers an understanding of the environment, considers it a “zone of entanglement” (Ingold, 2008, p. 1797) and gives primacy to movement. Ingold argues that places are produced from movement. Since people are always moving, they are always already emplaced. Also, for Ingold, places are similar to an event; they do not exist by themselves, they “occur” (Ingold, 2008, p. 1808). According to Pink (2009), Ingold’s idea of place as a meshwork of paths is a good combination of Casey’s and Massey’s understandings of place. Neither giving too much emphasis on the agency to gather nor on the randomness pertaining to places, the idea of the meshwork refers to how places occur “through the intersections and proximities of [entangled] pathways” (Pink, 2009, p. 33).

All these theories have a common point: they all see place and space as an event or movement. They all refer to the fluidity and non-fixity of place. They describe being in place or being emplaced as open-ended, unique, contingent, and random. My understanding of the concept of place is in line with these points. I see place as non-fixed, contingent, and multidirectional. The idea of movement is crucial for my conceptualization of place as I focus on the performative aspect of walking and argue that walking in the memory walks (re)makes places.

Similar to Pink’s (2009) ethnographic places, the places in the memory walks are constituted of a combination of things such as “theory, experience, reflection, discourse, memory and imagination” (p. 42). I call these places in the memory walks extraordinary places. They are created and imagined collectively through performances of walking and storytelling. Calling them extraordinary fits well with the in-betweenness of places, which are neither planned nor spontaneous, neither

voluntary nor involuntary, neither out in the open nor buried under, but in-between, imagined, and transitory.

2.4.3 Memory work

The concept of memory work enables me to conceptualize the memory walks as a memorialization practice and a performance. During my fieldwork and the interviews with the memory walk volunteers/storytellers, the phrase memory work (*hafıza çalışması* in Turkish) came up many times in conversations. So, I became more curious about memory work. I started to think about how to define it, what kinds of practices it consists of, and why it is crucial in understanding the memory walks.

In *Civil Society and Memory in Post Germany* (2017), Jenny Wüstenberg defines memory work as a mode of action in civil society or a form of activism that different memory actors use. She defines memory work as

those activities that are the primary occupation of memory initiatives, including: holding meetings; networking with stakeholders and potential benefactors; creating forums for debate; lobbying; conducting historical research (through archival work, interviews and the collection of materials); safeguarding of evidence (sometimes under adverse conditions); presenting findings in exhibits, publications, and guided tours; and organizing commemorative events (large and small). (p. 18)

For Wüstenberg, memory work is non-contentious, meaning that it is ignored or not visible by the wider public or in line with the dominant regime of memory. Another mode of action is memory protest. This mode is described as contentious memory work because of its content (it clashes with or challenges the norms of the government's politics of memory in nondemocratic regimes) or its tactics, such as rallies, sit-ins, hunger strikes, graffiti, illegal monuments, etc. Memory protest refers to the "actions [that] provoke public outrage or pressure on other actors to either shift positions or dig in their heels, thereby producing more protest" (p. 19), which are

more effective in creating change in the mnemonic norms and institutions in comparison to memory work. Wüstenberg's study traces how mnemonic norms are challenged or transformed by social movements and memory protest over the years. However, in my research, the lines between memory work and memory protest cannot be drawn easily. In fact, these lines are not crucial for my analysis because I do not consider memory work as a form of activism or evaluate its success in changing the norms and institutions.

Another understanding of memory work is exemplified in *Memory and Methodology* (2000). Introducing this collection, Susannah Radstone holds memory work almost equivalent to memory research.²⁸ Among the definitions of memory work in this collection, I draw on Annette Kuhn's understanding of memory work, which she develops from her work on the family albums in *Family Secrets* (2002). For Kuhn, memory work "is an active practice of remembering that takes an inquiring attitude towards the past and the activity of its (re)construction through memory" (2000, p. 186). Memory work has a questioning attitude concerning the authenticity or the truth-value of what is remembered. Better said, memory work does not treat memories as truth but sees them as a "material for interpretation, to be interrogated, mined, for its meanings and its possibilities" (Kuhn, 2010, p. 6).

Moreover, Kuhn states that memory work contains "an active staging of memory" (Kuhn, 2000, p. 186), pointing out the link between memory and performance. In her later works, Kuhn (2010) defines memory work, along with memory text, as performances of memory. A performance of memory is "the activity of recounting or telling memory-stories, in both private and public contexts" (Kuhn,

²⁸ *Memory Work: Archaeologies of Material Practices* (2008) is another example. Exploring the intersections of material culture and social practices in this collection of essays, Barbara J. Mills and William H. Walker describe memory work as the interpretive work of the archaeologists and the way in which the research subjects make memory.

2010, p. 1). These re-enactments are interactive, dynamic, and open to change.

Besides visual media, cinema, and photography that Kuhn focuses on, performances of memory include a wide range of activities, places, and ways of narration.

Drawing on Kuhn, I define the activities in the memory walks as memory work. The walks consist of three main activities: research, on-street activities, and discussions. Archival and oral history research conducted by the storytellers makes up the basis of the stories in the walks. Here, memory work is more like memory research. The findings from the research are transferred to a written format, namely, the Place Identity Card (MKK), but they are not fixed and closed, rather always open to change. Interestingly, doing research on memory is likened to the practice of digging and excavation by most storytellers. Walter Benjamin (1999) also links memory with the practice of excavation. Considering memory as a medium to explore the past, Benjamin notes that “[h]e who seeks to approach his own buried past must conduct himself like a man digging” (1999, p. 576). Compared to research, on-street activities denote a memory work that is more interactive and public. Lastly, the discussions, whether during or after the walks, designate the critical and reflexive aspects of memory work.

Overall, memory work in the memory walks acquires all the characteristics of Kuhn’s definition of memory work. This thesis focuses on the performative and performance aspects of the activities in the walks and define these activities as performances of memory.

2.4.4 Affect/emotion

The concepts of affect and emotion are essential for my analysis of memory walks, especially when looking into the experiences of facing the past in the everyday

framework. Chapter four examines these experiences more closely. Here, I will briefly clarify my standpoint on emotion and affect.

The so-called ‘affective turn’ in the early and mid-1990s designates the rising interest and work on affect theory in critical theory, psychoanalytic theory, anthropology, philosophy, humanities, gender studies, and more. The invitation to turn to affect is an invitation to turn to the body, the unconscious, and the interpersonal and pre-personal as a response to the focus on semiotics and the limitations of post-structuralism and deconstruction (Clough, 2008). Drawing on Baruch Spinoza, Henri Bergson, Gilles Deleuze, and Felix Guattari, the affect theorists define affect as “pre-individual bodily forces augmenting or diminishing a body’s capacity to act” (Clough, 2008, p. 1). Among the theorists that work on affect, such as Brian Massumi, Eve Sedgwick, Elizabeth Povinelli, Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Lauren Berlant, Nigel Thrift, and more, I will engage with Sara Ahmed.

In *The Cultural Politics of Emotions* (2004), Ahmed extends the psychological understanding of emotions to the cultural and the political. She examines what emotions do, how they move people, and how they attach to things, people, and places. She focuses on the relationship between emotions, language, and bodies and analyzes the role of emotions in terrorism, philanthropy, nation-building, identity construction, and queer and feminist theory. Her intriguing work examines emotions such as pain, hate, fear, shame, love, grief, pleasure, anger, curiosity, wonder, and more. Asking “What do emotions do?” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 4), she tackles how emotions circulate between individual and collective bodies and how they stick and move.

I believe that Ahmed’s understanding of emotion demonstrated in her book attends to the *affect-emotion gap*, which Daniel White (2017) points out in his short

introduction on affect. The definition of affect as a bodily and non-conscious intensity and emotion as conscious expressions of feelings through discursive practices creates this gap. Rather than separating them, Ahmed argues that the separation between sensation, emotion, and affect can only be analytical. Through reading René Descartes, she offers an understanding of emotion based on contact. For Ahmed, emotions neither exist inside and move outwards (psychological understandings) nor come from without (Durkheim's sociological model). Instead, she argues that the boundaries of inside and outside are shaped by our encounters with objects, people, and our emotions. For her, the sociality of emotions means that "emotions are about objects, which they hence shape, and are also shaped by contact with objects" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 7).

In my analysis of the memory walks, I draw on Ahmed's understanding of the sociality of emotions and see the encounters between people, places, and objects as a fundamental part of the emergence and circulation of emotions. Therefore, I call the encounters between participants, storytellers, people on the street, everyday places, and histories and memories in the form of stories 'affective encounters'. Like Ahmed, my understanding of the feeling subject is based neither on the 'inside out' model nor the 'outside in' model of emotions. Here, the subject is formed through affective encounters, in which emotions emerge through being impressed and affected by the stories and places. The feeling subject is (re)created in different and open-ended encounters.

Moreover, my understanding of emotions gives importance to the role of the body, senses, and bodily movements, as well as the verbal social interactions, such as discourses on emotions and emotional discourses. I pay attention both to the sociality of emotions (the acts, performances, and discourses about emotions) and to the body,

senses, and the body's movements (the bodily and sensory experiences of walking and being in places). For me, these two cannot be separated and examined in isolation. Therefore, examining everyday encounters is a suitable way to attend to both bodily and verbal interactions connected to emotions.

This thesis examines particular emotions that are relevant for the memory walks and shows how emotions circulate and how they go in different ways and move people in different ways. My analysis of these emotions is grounded in the idea that different encounters, even with the same objects and things, have the potential to result in different ways of feeling and knowing. Hope, for example, can result in hopeless or open hope. Anger can make people feel desperate or motivate them to act. Chapter four elaborates on these encounters.

2.4.5 Walking

Another concept that is influential in my framework of the everyday is walking. As I became acquainted with the wide variety of the literature on walking, I found it more challenging to define it encompassingly. I noticed not only that there are many different ways, purposes, and meanings of walking but also that the experience of walking is highly contingent upon possibilities of encounters and interactions. One can walk in the country, city, or between the two, unsettling the rural and urban divide. One can walk in solitary or in groups. As Yaşar Adanalı (2017) outlines, walking in the city can have different purposes, such as performing religious rituals, nation-building, artistic production, exploring and experiencing the city and urban life, claiming the right to the city and fighting for other rights, researching the city, relaxing, and many other things. Although it is an everyday and habitual activity, it can also be regarded as a critical practice, as this thesis shows.

The literature on walking in the city takes the emergence of modern cities in nineteenth-century Europe as a starting point (Benjamin, 2002; de Certeau, 1984; Elkin, 2017; Pinder, 2005; Bassett, 2004). Walking in the city consists of the habitual practices of everyday walking, such as pedestrianism, and more exploratory and critical walking practices, such as the *flânerie* and *dérive*. It includes a variety of walkers ranging from the ordinary practitioner of de Certeau (1984) to Walter Benjamin's bourgeois and intellectual *flâneur* (2002) and the walking practices of various artist groups. With the rising interest in walking in the city and walking as a research method in social sciences, cultural studies, and art and performance studies, scholars started to engage with the works of early modernity and explore how the earlier forms of walking practices (and the relevant literature) contribute to urban ethnography (Jenk & Neves, 2020) and contemporary walking practices in arts and sciences (Bassett, 2004; Pinder, 2005; Phillips, 2005; Heddon and Turner, 2012; Kramer and Short, 2012) with a more gender-inclusive understanding (D'Souza & McDonough, 2006; Elkin, 2017; Heddon & Turner, 2012).

The common characteristic of different forms and purposes of walking is the aspects of performance and performativity. Walking is a performance constituted of pre-established actions that are not repeatable. And, walking is performative because it (re)makes places. Collective walking is especially relevant in exploring performativity. Through coming together and moving together, people intervene in places, (re)imagine them, and give them new meanings and purposes. My focus on the performance aspect of walking led me to the literature on art and performance that deals with walking practices. Inspired by Jane Rendell's (2008) definition of art and Yağmur Yıldırım's (2020) reading of the Curious Steps memory walks as a

critical spatial practice, I consider collective walking practices in the city as critical spatial practices.

Drawing on different literatures, such as philosophy, everyday life theory, urban sociology and anthropology, and art and performance in chapter three, I examine a couple of aspects that are essential for the critical potential of walking. I consider the reflexive and social aspects of walking essential for this critical potential. Following de Certeau's footsteps, I examine the practices of writing the city and intervening in the city. I demonstrate that walking includes recalling one's past and encountering different histories and memories of the past. In my analysis of the affective encounters in the memory walks, I explain how these encounters can take a critical turn, leading to troubling questions and uncomfortable emotions about one's role and position in the stories of the past. I elaborate on the exploratory aspect of walking in the city and explain how bodily and sensory experiences contribute to the critical approaches to the city and urban life. My understanding of walking as a critical practice also benefits from the literature on the right to the city (Harvey, 2008; Lefebvre, 1996).

Furthermore, walking is a research method in this thesis. Many scholars such as Katrin Lund (2003, 2005), Hayden Lorimer (2003), Jo Lee and Tim Ingold (2006, 2008), Jon Anderson (2004), and Sarah Pink (2008, 2009) practice and discuss walking as a method of research. Described as "fieldwork on foot" (Lee and Ingold, 2006), walking designates the groundedness of the researcher and its emplacement in the field. The researcher is, after all, part of the social, sensory, and material environment, political agendas, and power relations. The concept of the emplaced ethnographer refers to the process of aligning one's body, rhythm, taste, and ways of seeing others. In *Doing Sensory Ethnography* (2009), Pink also explains that attuning

oneself as a researcher to other people's practices and occupying similar, parallel or related places to those whose experiences and imaginations one seeks to understand are essential for doing ethnographic research. Like Pink, walking is a way to attune myself to people's experiences in the memory walks. Therefore, walking makes up an essential part of my research. Now, I will discuss my methodology for conducting research.

2.5 Methodology

The first memory walk I participated in was in 2018 in Beyoğlu. It was organized by Karakutu Association. This first experience made me curious about the possibilities and limitations of memorialization practices, especially concerning the relationship between memory and facing the past. After deciding to take memory walks as a case study in my thesis, I conducted two preliminary interviews with two volunteers of the Karakutu Association in 2019, which were influential in formulating my primary research questions.

Methodologically, the thesis is based on participant observation, walking, semi-structured interviews, and archival research. My research is predominantly based on the memory walks organized by Karakutu Association. My research data mostly comes from participant observation, my experiences of walking and storytelling in Karakutu walks, and the interviews with Karakutu storytellers and participants. The interviews with the SU Gender Center and the SEHAK Association and my experiences in Curious Steps memory walks also contribute to my research and analysis.

A significant part of my research consists of participant observation. Therefore, I will first elaborate on my participation in the field, consisting of my

volunteering in the Karakutu Association and my participation in Karakutu and Curious Steps memory walks as a storyteller and a participant.

Since November 2020, I have been a volunteer at Karakutu Association. During this time, I attended many online and face-to-face events. In total, I have participated in a three-day-long beginning training²⁹, seven workshops³⁰, nine memory walks³¹ (see Appendix B), and a four-week-long seminar program.³² My position as a volunteer of the Karakutu Association for more than a year and a half has provided me with the grounds for participant observation. Apart from my participation in the formal events, I spent considerable informal time with the volunteers, for example, when we went out for a drink and chatted after the walks. My ethnographic data consists of my experiences in the memory walks, my field notes, my participation in the formal events, and my interactions in the small talks and spontaneous discussions with the volunteers and memory walk participants I have met.

Being a volunteer helped me get in touch with other volunteers, board members, and part-time and full-time employees of the Karakutu Association. Overall, Karakutu Association has supported my research in every way possible by introducing me to its volunteers, providing access to the participants, and referring me to other institutions and people that organize memory walks. Furthermore, as a volunteer, I had my own experiences and feelings; I felt like I was fully in the field.

²⁹ This was a training consisting of workshops, seminars, and a memory walk for all the new volunteer storytellers.

³⁰ They were all online workshops with different topics such as storytelling, history writing, representation of traumas in art, place of women in social memory, sites of memory, facilitation skills. They were capacity-building events combined with interactive activities and discussions.

³¹ Since the COVID-19 pandemic, memory walks were not being held on a regular basis like before. I had the chance to participate in the first memory walk that SU Gender Center organized since the pandemic. The other eight walks were organized by Karakutu Association.

³² This was an online program named Memory Layers of the City (*Şehrin Hafıza Katmanları*): Şişli consisting of presentations and discussions in each week about a particular topic and a face-to-face Memory Walk in Şişli.

Surely, any anthropologist doing research is immersed in the field. More than observing from a distance, the researcher participates in the field, interacts with humans and non-humans, and has an influence on and is influenced by the research subjects. My volunteer position has allowed me to feel much more in the field. Although it is not my primary method, autoethnography is undeniably a part of my research because I also had my own experiences, thoughts, and feelings in the memory walks.

On the other hand, being a volunteer had its hardships. Shifting between my position as a volunteer and a researcher was sometimes challenging. As a researcher, I sometimes felt the need to distance myself from the field to think about and analyze my data. Yet, as a volunteer, Karakutu became part of my everyday life; I frequently participated in formal and informal activities, became friends with some of my interlocutors over the months, and dedicated my time and energy to the memory walks. Karakutu has been not only a research object for me; it has become a part of my social life. As a result of my double position in the field, I felt even more responsible for representing Karakutu in the right way.

A considerable amount of my research consists of my participation in the memory walks and my own experiences of walking. I could interview a small number of memory walk participants because it was harder to get in touch with them and arrange a meeting. So, my primary source of data on being a participant in a memory walk is my own experiences and observations. I participated in the walks in different roles: as a participant and a storyteller. The shifting of roles gave me the opportunity to experience the walk in different ways and observe other people's experiences from different perspectives.

Overall, walking makes up an essential part of my research method. Pink's (2009) understanding of walking as an ethnographic research method is relevant here. For Pink, sensory ethnography is a methodology that enables one to explore their own and other people's emplacement in the field. In her research on the town named Mold in Wales, Pink (2008) combines walking and other qualitative research methods to attune herself to the people and the slow rhythm of the town and takes the research event, the urban tour, as a case study. The "sensory sociality" (Pink, 2008, p. 193) of walking, eating, drinking, talking, taking photographs, and recording alongside and in collaboration with other people is considered a place-making and knowledge-making practice.

Knowledge transmission occurs through the emplaced engagements with people and things; the researcher learns through and in practice, not by taking on others' knowledge (Ingold, 2000 in Pink, 2009). In this sense, walking is a practice of understanding (Lee and Ingold, 2006), which Rebecca Solnit (2001) beautifully illustrates in her analogy between walking and thinking in a passage from *Wanderlust: A History of Walking*: "The rhythm of walking generates a rhythm of thinking, and the passage through a landscape echoes or stimulates the passage through a series of thoughts" (pp. 10-11).

For Pink, walking, among other methods of sensory ethnography, is a place-making practice. The emplaced researcher is involved in the making of ethnographic places, which are not the actual places but the places researchers use when they communicate their research to others (Pink, 2009). These places are an assemblage of people, things, sensations, discourses, and emotions. As I have already mentioned, in the memory walks, not only the researcher but every participant of the walk contributes to the making of extraordinary places through walking and storytelling.

Therefore, walking as a research topic and a method is a fundamental part of my thesis.

Besides walking, the one-hour-long discussion sessions at the end of the Karakutu walks were crucial sources of observation. These sessions were, in a sense, like a focus group of six to 15 fifteen people.³³ Usually, they begin with the moderator asking the participants how the walk was, if they were tired and if they enjoyed it. After warming up, the moderator asks more: How are all these stories connected? What are the connections of these stories with today? What place, story, moment, or emotion has stayed with them? To these questions, participants give longer answers, talk about their emotions, and reflect on the stories. The storytellers also join the discussions.

In the summer of 2021, I started conducting in-depth and semi-structured interviews. In total, I conducted one-to-one interviews with 23 people (see Appendix C). Thirteen were online meetings held via Zoom, and 10 were face-to-face³⁴, lasting between one and two hours. They were conducted with people who were involved in the Karakutu Association (19 interviews), SU Gender Center (one interview), and SEHAK Association (three interviews). I divided my interlocutors into three groups: the employees and board members, the volunteers, and the participants. I prepared different interview questions for each group (see Appendix D).

The first group (eight interviews) is composed of the part-time or full-time employees, board members, and the coordinators of the memory walks, who actively

³³ The questions asked in these sessions are quite similar to my interview questions. The difference of the discussion session from an interview is that there is a group of people thinking and discussing together in the sessions, whereas there is only two of us in the interview. On the other hand, the difference from the focus group is that I did not have the chance to ask follow up questions in the sessions since I was not the moderator. Although very helpful and rich in data, the discussion sessions cannot substitute for a focus group or one-to-one interview.

³⁴ Although more than half of the interviews were online, I find it important to note that I have come to know almost all my interlocutors in person. These interviews were held via Zoom for a couple of reasons: the COVID-19 pandemic was ongoing, some of the interlocutors had tight working schedules and some of them were living in other cities or abroad.

contribute to the design, organization, and moderation of the memory walks. The interviews consist of one interview with SU Gender Center, two interviews with SEHAK, and five interviews with Karakutu Association. Most of the interlocutors from the Karakutu Association and SU Gender Center also had experiences in storytelling in the walks. The interviews with this group were beneficial because my interlocutors introduced me to the concepts they worked with, their objectives, and their observations from the field. Yet, a limitation of interviewing this group was that they were inclined to talk much more about the goals and the should be's compared to the storytellers and the participants.

The second group (12 interviews) consists of the Karakutu Association and SEHAK Association volunteers. These interviews provided me with the richest information about the processes of doing memory work, storytelling, and walking. It must be noted that the volunteer network of the Karakutu Association is rather limited in that it consists of young adults between 23-30 years old, living in Istanbul, studying at university or working. Many of them grew up in Istanbul, but some are from other cities in Turkey. Mostly, they have middle and upper-middle-class backgrounds.

The third group (three interviews) consists of the participants in the memory walks. I conducted two interviews with Karakutu memory walk participants and one with a SEHAK memory walk participant. I asked them to tell me specific places, emotions, or incidents that remained with them. We walked through the events of the memory walk one by one.

To all groups, I asked how they got to know the organization and how they have been involved in its activities. Then, I asked general questions about memorialization practices and memory work in Turkey. The last part, the central

part, was about their experiences in the memory walks. I asked about their relationship with the city and the urban public places. I was also curious about their ideas and feelings about walking in the city and telling or listening to stories. I asked for details such as their sensations, emotions, and thoughts about, during, and after walking. I tried to encourage them to talk about their emotions. Together, we discussed the possibilities and limits of the experiences of facing the past and witnessing in the memory walks. I specifically asked the first and second groups for details about the volunteering and working process, the research process (if any), and their experiences as storytellers, such as their storytelling tactics and feelings about telling stories.

Lastly, as part of my research, I examined online archives, including the websites of Karakutu Association, SU Gender Center and Curious Steps, and SEHAK Association, their yearly reports and booklets, YouTube channels, and the interviews of the employees and volunteers of these organizations. I also listened to and attended several conferences, seminars, workshops, and podcast series about memory and facing the past organized by other organizations such as the Research Center for Peace, Democracy and Alternative Politics (*Demokrasi, Barış ve Alternatif Politikalar Araştırma Derneği*) (DEMOS), and the Truth, Justice, and Memory Center (*Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi*), *beraberce* Association, Hrant Dink Foundation, and Netherlands Institute in Turkey (NIT).

Regarding my methodology, I also want to mention the limitations of my research. First, my research only covers the period between November 2020 and March 2022. Second, the scope of my research is limited to a specific kind of memorialization practice in Turkey: memory walks. And I will not cover all the memory walks (there are also memory walks organized by academicians, artists, etc.,

in different contexts), but only three different memory walks and focus mainly on the Karakutu walks. Third, my research sample is not representative of the different actors involved in the memorialization practices in Turkey. My research subjects are limited with regard to their age, residency, class, and education. They are primarily young adults between 20 and 30 years old living in Istanbul (apart from the participants of SEHAK memory walks). They are all either studying in university or have graduated. Especially in the case of the Karakutu Association, the age limit pertains to the institutional objective of working with young adults. Looking at the entire memory field or examining all the memory walks organized in Turkey would be an impossible task. My aim in this thesis is to use my case studies to demonstrate the entanglements of memory, walking, and emotions and to think further about how people relate to the stories of the past and face the past in the everyday.

CHAPTER 3

MEMORY WALKS:

A CRITICAL SPATIAL PRACTICE OF WALKING AND PLACE-MAKING

This chapter will focus on the practice of walking and the making of places through walking. I will conceptualize walking as a critical spatial practice and a performative practice. The previous chapter has outlined the different frameworks related to facing the past and introduced a framework of the everyday. Drawing on the theories of the everyday, I have given a picture of everyday city life and the experiences of people living in cities. Including diverse practices and experiences ranging from the blasé attitude to the flâneur, the ordinary everyday is shaped by the ways of looking, sensing, and experiencing the city. What I have called the extraordinary everyday is mainly characterized by a heightened awareness of the city and urban spaces. Rather than an indifferent or unconscious attitude or relationship with urban spaces, the extraordinary everyday denotes a (rather transitory) time and space, making alternative and new ways of looking and sensing the city possible. The extraordinary everyday is a gathering of many things: thinking, reflection, knowledge, imagination, feelings, making and performing memory, and more.

This chapter will demonstrate the role and significance of walking in shaping this everyday. Walking in the memory walks can be seen as a performance of memory, a form of memory work that enables everyday encounters in and with urban spaces and between memories, places, and people. I will argue that walking is also performative, meaning that places emerge through walking (along with storytelling). As I will show, these places cannot be considered everyday ordinary places or sites of memory; they are places in-between. Through the memory walks, ordinary or

unrecognized urban places turn out to be places that are (re)discovered. These everyday places are (re)imagined, (re)thought, and (re)made through the coming together of places, bodies, stories, memories, and emotions. I will call these places extraordinary places to emphasize their transitory and imagined characteristics.

Moreover, in this chapter, I will argue for a critical understanding of walking. Giving examples and connecting with other walking practices (mainly in the city), I will draw a theory and practice of walking by taking the memory walks as a case study. My conceptualization of walking as a critical practice will be based on the relationship between walking and thinking, finding tactics, exploring, claiming the city, feeling, and making or performing memory.

First, I will give a detailed description of the three different memory walks organized in Turkey, which I will take as my case study, and outline their general characteristics. Then, I will elaborate on the performative aspect of walking and conceptualize the places that emerge through the performances in the memory walks. Emphasizing the in-betweenness of these places, I will call them extraordinary places and give examples of the kinds of places in the memory walks. Then, drawing on the vast literature on walking from different disciplines and fields, I will conceptualize walking in the memory walks as a critical spatial practice. To illustrate the critical aspect of walking, I will give examples from memory walks and other kinds of walks and walking practices and elaborate on a couple of aspects of walking: 1) thinking, 2) writing the city and finding tactics by walking, 3) exploring the city, and 4) inhabiting and claiming the city.

3.1 Memory walks

As I have outlined in the previous chapter, memory walks are one-day-long city walks consisting of different performances of memory and everyday encounters with urban public spaces, people, and stories. Sharing this basis, each type of memory walk has its differences. Yet, overall, memory walks share a couple of common characteristics. Firstly, they are all collective, on-site, and voluntary walks. They consist of performances and performatives, from which places are (re)made. They pertain to an extraordinary everyday, a combination of everyday life, performances (of walking, storytelling, interviewing, filming), and bodily, sensory, and affective encounters. The stories consist of not publicly known, visible, or discussed histories and memories of marginalized individuals and communities of different ethnicity, religion, sex, gender, class, etc. All of these characteristics, I believe, make the basis for the critical aspect of the memory walks, which I will demonstrate shortly in this chapter. Now, I will examine the types of memory walks organized in Turkey by Karakutu Association, SEHAK, and SU Gender Center and point to their similarities and differences.

3.1.1 Karakutu walks

Karakutu (Black box in English) Association³⁵, founded in 2014, is named after the black box, the electronic data and voice recording device in aircraft that facilitates the investigation of accidents. The black box is a secret box that safeguards the records of past events for people to acquire knowledge about how the events unfolded. The name is chosen as a reference to this black box because the association aims to make an archive of and safeguard the figures from the past, past events,

³⁵ I will sometimes call it Karakutu for short.

atrocities, and human rights violations that are not publicly known, acknowledged, or discussed in Turkey, and make them public. The association aims to “raise voices of the alternative narratives that were suppressed by official history and [...] introduce different perspectives about the past to society, especially to youth” (Karakutu, 2019). Its main activities are the online broadcasted *In Search of Justice Seminars* (2017-present), the volunteer program called Memory Journey Program (*Hafıza Yolculuğu Programı*), and the memory walks in Istanbul. Karakutu also participates in various national and international projects collaborating with several foundations, associations, and initiatives.

In total, there are approximately 50 active volunteers of Karakutu, who are young adults between 20-30 years old, university students, or graduates living in Istanbul. In most cases, they are people who are already interested in the histories and memories of the city even before becoming a volunteer. The main aim of the volunteer program is to make “young people explore and question the injustices against the historically marginalized groups, based on religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, and political view” (Karakutu, 2019). Around 20 to 80 people join the program each year, and they become active volunteers. After a three-day-long training, the program continues with different workshops throughout the year. The volunteers become the storytellers in the walks; they choose, create, and tell the stories in the walks. When a new memory walk route is being prepared, the volunteers pick a place from the list of suggested places or come up with their own place. Then, they conduct archival and oral history research for a couple of months and prepare a Place Identity Card and a story, which they tell in the memory walks.

Until today, Karakutu organized approximately 100 memory walks in which over 1000 people participated. The walks are primarily open to young adults between

18-30 years old and sometimes to older adults. Apart from these publicly announced walks, Karakutu organizes special walks for high schools, universities, foundations, associations, and platforms when requested. Memory walks are five hours long interactive walks, including the workshops at the beginning and the end. There are walks in eight different neighborhoods: Beyoğlu, Şişli, Sultanahmet, Cağaloğlu, Balat, Kadıköy, Yeldeğirmeni, and Beşiktaş. In each walk, there is a maximum of 15 participants. After the introduction session in an indoor location, participants are divided into groups of three or four. Each group is given a puzzle they must solve to find out where to go. After they solve the puzzle, they walk to the designated place and meet with the storyteller (Figure 1).



Figure 2. A storyteller with the memory walk participants at Ülker Street
Source: [<https://fonzip.com/karakutu/yasgunudestek>, May 2022]

The stories mainly consist of the life histories of people and marginalized groups such as women and LGBTQI+, ethnic and religious groups, stories of past atrocities and human rights violations, and stories of the cultural and daily life in the city, covering the late Ottoman era until the recent history of Turkey. Usually, each group listens to three stories and then walks back to the meeting location for the discussion session, in which they reflect on and discuss the stories. In these moderated sessions,

the participants and storytellers talk about the common points between stories, the connection of these stories with today, and their thoughts and feelings (Figure 2).



Figure 3. Discussion session at the end of Karakutu memory walk
Source: [<https://www.karakutu.org.tr/2019da-hafiza-yuruyusleri/>, May 2022]

3.1.2 SEHAK walks

Another type of memory walk is the one organized by SEHAK. The history of SEHAK dates back to the initiatives such as Say Stop to Racism and Nationalism Platform (*İrkçılığa ve Milliyetçiliğe DurDe Girişimi*) and the Association of Civil Society Development Center (*Sosyal Değişim Derneği*) that carried out important campaigns against racism and inequality in Turkey. Since its foundation in 2014, SEHAK continues to work on civil and ecological rights. Its civil rights-based vision focuses on human rights, hate speech, inequality, discrimination, and anti-Semitism. One of the main projects of SEHAK over the last years was the project named the Education of basic human rights and democratic values through the life story of Anne Frank (*Anne Frank'ın yaşam öyküsü üzerinden temel haklar ve demokratik*

değerler öğretimi) between 2017-2019.³⁶ The project aimed to raise awareness of the recent history of Turkey, especially the histories of Jews and other non-Muslim communities, and promote a critical attitude towards the relationship between historical events and contemporary issues in Turkey. The main activities of the project involved 1) the creation of educational materials and curriculum for history lessons, 2) the organization of memory walks, 3) the educational seminars to teach the method of the memory walks to young educators, and 4) the creation of the Anne Frank – A History for Today Exhibition with stories of Jews in Turkey.

SEHAK was introduced to the Anne Frank Memory Walk designed and implemented by the Anne Frank House in Holland. The challenge for SEHAK was to figure out how to adapt these walks to Turkey. The Anne Frank Memory Walk was a five-day-long youth educational model based on monuments. The walks encouraged the participants to think about why monuments are built, what they mean, and how people react. One of the main differences between the SEHAK walks from the Anne Frank Memory Walks was the shifting focus from the monuments to everyday places. SEHAK thought that the history and culture of monuments in Turkey were not quite suitable for critical history writing and thinking. The monuments in Turkey are predominantly built by the state in the name of historical political figures.

In contrast, SEHAK wanted to focus on the histories and stories of non-Muslim communities that were not represented in the state-made monuments and memorialization practices. So, SEHAK redeveloped a different type of memory walk that focuses on the everyday places and encouraged the participants to conduct a kind

³⁶ The partners of the project were the Anne Frank House in Holland, the International Association for Intercultural Education in England, Istanbul Bilgi University, the Center for Sociology and Education Studies (*Sosyoloji ve Eğitim Çalışmaları Merkezi*) (SEÇBİR), the Network of Sport and Body Movement for Vulnerable Groups (*Sosyal Güçlendirme için Spor ve Beden Hareketi*) (BoMoVu), Independent Research Information and Communication Foundation (Babil), and *Avlaremoz* Platform. The EU financed it.

of “archeological excavation” (Interview with Güneş) of these places, which are connected to the histories and cultures of Jewish, Rum, Armenian, and other non-Muslim communities in Turkey. Rather than claiming to represent the truth, the walks aim to make the participants curious about the histories of the city.

Between 2017-2020, SEHAK organized memory walks in five different cities, namely Mersin, Çanakkale, İzmir, İstanbul, and Edirne. A typical SEHAK walk consists of approximately 20 participants living in the city, primarily young people between 20-26 and a couple of older adults. The SEHAK team consists of an anthropologist, a sociologist, a film director, and young mentors who assist the participants throughout the whole process. The structure of the three-day-long event is as such³⁷: The first day consists of theoretical lessons on memory and place and methodological and technical lessons on interviewing and filmmaking. The second day takes place on the street. The participants are divided into two groups, each working on a different topic in a pre-determined neighborhood. First, each group meets and listens to local historians in the street. Then, they start walking and interviewing the people on the street or in shops.

In contrast to other memory walks, the participants do not walk to pre-determined places. Instead, they walk around the neighborhood to find people who accept to be interviewed. In the interviews, they ask people what they remember and know about the past residents of the neighborhood, the built environment, and the cultural life back then (Figure 3). The interviews and the filming last all day. The

³⁷ See the *Memory Walk Handbook* by Işıl Demirel and Özden Dönmez for detailed explanations of SEHAK memory walks, including the theoretical and technical lessons, the fieldwork, and the comments from the participants of the walks: <https://en.calameo.com/read/00697082951e9f9c38cad>.

third day starts with workshops on script making and film editing. At the end of the day, each group presents their film and discusses it with the other groups.³⁸



Figure 4. Interviews from the SEHAK memory walk in İzmir, 2018

Source: [<https://www.sehak.org/2018/12/sehak-izmirde-hafiza-yuruyusu-etkinlikleri-duzenledi/>, May 2022]

3.1.3 Curious Steps walks

Founded in 2015, the SU Gender Center also organizes gender and memory walks, among other programs.³⁹ The walks are called Curious Steps (*Cins Adımlar*). The word curious in English refers to interest and eagerness to know or learn something and also means strange and unusual. The word *cins* has multiple meanings in Turkish, such as species, weird, and odd. It is also etymologically related to sex and gender as in *cinsiyet* and *toplumsal cinsiyet*. The words curious and *cins* are most

³⁸ Later on, the films are published on the SEHAK website and Youtube channel. To watch the films, see the Youtube channel:

https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PL8_pSeO5XgGHBWrmQL5BrAVIzsjp3lO5T.

³⁹ Other activities are the Purple Certificate Program, the Transformative Activism Program, and the Gender Equality Program. They focus on the issues of gender equality and gender awareness and work with different actors such as high school teachers, activists, civil society volunteers, and institutions.

likely chosen for their close connection to the word queer, which means strange and usual in English and refers to the LGBTQI+. Curious Steps are inspired by other gender-focused walks in Europe and Latin America and by the Militourism (*Militurizm*) Festivals in Istanbul, Izmir, and Ankara between 2004 and 2006. Like the Karakutu and SEHAK memory walks, the Curious Steps also focus on everyday places. The walks by Andrea Pető in Budapest⁴⁰, which have been one of the major inspirations of the Curious Steps, concentrate on monuments and counter-monuments. On the other hand, the Curious Steps focus on everyday places and tell the stories of apartments, streets, parks, etc. Like the places in the Karakutu and SEHAK memory walks, these places are mostly not monumentalized in a concrete way.

The first Curious Steps gender and memory walk took place on the 18th of September, 2014, in Beyoğlu as part of the *Mobilizing Memory for Action* workshop organized by Columbia University Center for the Study of Social Difference, Columbia Global Centers Turkey, and SU Gender and Women's Studies Forum.⁴¹ Since 2014, there have been over 60 walks with more than 1300 participants.⁴² There are walks available for three neighborhoods in Istanbul: Beyoğlu, Kadıköy, and Balat. Most of the walks are open to the public, and some of them are organized specially for groups when requested. Curious Steps are three hours long collective walks with a group of approximately 20-25 participants, mostly young people and women, plus the storytellers. With 20-25 people walking together, Curious Steps is the most crowded walk of all three. Also, the walks do not begin and end indoors;

⁴⁰ Andrea Pető is a professor in the Department of Gender Studies at Central European University in Vienna, who organizes feminist tours in Budapest, Hungary. Her walk is focused on the history of the Holocaust and the Second World War, focusing on state-made monuments, people's reactions and interventions to them, and the counter-monuments they make (Interview with Ecem).

⁴¹ To watch Silvina Der-Meugerditchian's video of the walk from that day, see <https://vimeo.com/107553682>.

⁴² Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the walks stopped in 2020, and there was only one walk in 2021.

there is no training or a planned introductory or discussion session as in the Karakutu and SEHAK walks. The group is on the streets the whole time. After gathering at the meeting location, the group starts walking and stops at the designated places to hear the stories (Figure 4). The last stop is usually a public park such as Yoğurtçu Park in Kadıköy and Gezi Park in Taksim, where the storytellers ask if anyone wants to add or discuss something. Sometimes, when the walk ends, the participants and the storytellers sit at the park to talk and discuss more (Figure 5).



Figure 5. Participants listening to a story in front of the Süreyya Opera, from Curious Steps gender and memory walk in Kadıköy
Source: [Selen Çatalyürekli, available at: <https://journu.com.tr/turkiyede-hafizacalismalari>, May 2022]



Figure 6. Participants sitting at the park and listening to a story, from Curious Steps gender and memory walk

Source: [<https://memorializeturkey.com/memorial/cins-adimlar-toplumsal-cinsiyet-ve-hafiza-yuruyusleri/>, May 2022]

The storytellers in Curious Steps are mostly university students or people working in civil society between 20-35 years old. After participating in various workshops on storytelling, gender, and history, they conduct research and bring in their stories, which are added to the walks. The walks aim to raise awareness about the relationship between the city, memory, and gender by questioning how the silences and ruptures in collective memory reflect on places. The stories mainly consist of the histories of women and LGBTQI+, their movements, and resistances.

Personal memories make up a considerable part of the stories in Curious Steps. Mostly, the storytellers tell their story, emphasizing their reasons for choosing this story, their memories of getting to know the person, the place, or the event they tell. Sharing their own memories, feelings, and thoughts offers a space for the participants to express their memories too. So, it can be concluded that personal and

collective memories come together through performances of storytelling in the walks. This is also the case in the Karakutu and SEHAK walks.⁴³

In sum, by examining the types of memory walks organized by these three different organizations, I have outlined the common characteristics and the differences between the memory walks. Before elaborating on my conceptualization of walking as a critical practice, there is one common characteristic of the memory walks that I would like to examine: the performative aspect of walking. I will explain how walking (re)makes everyday places and demonstrate the in-betweenness of these places with some examples from the memory walks.

3.2 Walking makes places

Walking, among everything else, is an activity of making. New meanings, relationships, identities, and places are made through walking in the city. For the scholars who define place and space in relation to movement, walking is an embodied experience in which the self, others, and places are (co-)produced (Pink, 2008; Lee & Ingold, 2006; Anderson, 2004). For example, Jon Anderson (2004) argues that places “are not only a medium but also an outcome of action, producing and being produced through human practice” (p. 255). Walking can be counted as one of these practices.

Drawing on Pink (2009), Casey (1996; 2001), Ingold and Lee (2008), the concept of place will be at the core of my analysis. I will see place as non-fixed and open-ended, created through perception and movement. As Ingold and Lee (2008) point out, places do not exist by themselves, they happen. They are produced from movement. Ingold and Lee’s main point in seeing place in relation to movement is

⁴³ In SEHAK walks, this pertains to the coming together of the participants' memories, the memories of the people they interview, and the historical information given by local historians.

that places do not arise out of a vacuum, they are always already there. In other words, we are always already emplaced because we are constantly moving, whether within or between places. As a result of its relation to movement, places are not fixed; they are always in the making.

Places also gather and deconstruct (Casey, 1996). Many things such as meanings, memories, and emotions get attached to places, which become their bearers and transmitters. According to Anderson (2004), attributing meanings to places results from the reciprocal relationship between place, identity, and time. Similarly, Casey (2001) holds that the relationship between place and identity is one of constitutive co-ingredience, where “each is essential to the being of the other” (Casey, 2001, in Anderson, 2004, p. 255). So, it can be said that places and identities (re)make each other repeatedly.

The conceptualization of place as non-fixed and open to change and its relation to movement will be the basis of my understanding of the relationship between place and walking. Drawing on the literature on performativity, I will argue that walking is a performative practice that (re)makes everyday places in the memory walks. Like John L. Austin’s (1962) performative utterances, where speech acts actually make something happen rather than describe it, walking makes places happen. Moreover, in line with Butler’s (1998) conceptualization of performativity, where gender identities are constructed through speech, gestures, movements, etc., places are constructed through movements of the body and speech, that is, collective walking and storytelling in the memory walks. These performances are performatives that remake everyday places; they turn unrecognized places into places of discovery. Through various feelings such as curiosity, wonder, empathy, anger, hope, etc.,

places are (re)imagined and (re)made in the extraordinary everyday in the memory walks. I will elaborate on the characteristics of these places in the next section.

3.3 In-betweenness of places

Defining walking as a place-making practice raises an important question: How can we describe these places in the memory walks? I will discuss various concepts that illustrate the relationship between memory and place and point out the in-betweenness of the places in the memory walks. By in-betweenness, I mean how they bear the characteristics of both the memorial and the locus, *milieux de memoire* and *lieux de memoire*, the voluntary and involuntary memory. I will see this in-betweenness in connection with the extraordinary everyday of the memory walks and call these places extraordinary places.

In his extensive writings on memory, Connerton (2009) mentions a particular kind of memory dependent on topography, place memory, and lists two types: the memorial and the locus. What distinguishes the two is their different relationship with the process of cultural forgetting. Memorials are powerful memory places that have a reciprocal relationship with forgetting; they are built due to a fear of cultural amnesia, yet, by creating a monument, the obligation to remember is discarded and only particular things are permitted to be remembered. In contrast to the memorial, which demands attention, the locus, consisting of the house and the street, is experienced inattentively, in a state of distraction. According to Connerton, our acceptance of the locus “as a fact of life, a regular aspect of how things are” (2009, p. 34) gives it the ultimate power.

However, the places in the memory walks are neither memorial nor locus. They have similarities and differences with both of them and lie just in-between the

two. On the one hand, the places in the memory walks resemble the locus because they are everyday places that are experienced inattentively in the course of daily lives. Yet, unlike the locus, the everyday places are discovered in the memory walks. People look at them with attention and curiosity. As most storytellers describe it in the interviews, the places where they pass by everyday are seen with different eyes now. So, the ultimate power of these places does not lie in their acceptance as ordinary as in the locus. It lies in the rediscovery of these places as what they actually are and what they might be.

On the other hand, these places cannot be categorized as memorial because they are not (re)built for the sake of remembering and they do not take on the obligation to remember. According to Connerton, memorials take off the responsibility to remember from the individuals by taking it on themselves. However, in the memory walks, places invite people to remember and demand their active engagement. The storytellers and participants in the memory walks become the bearers and transmitters of memories that are invisible, unknown, or erased from history.

Another pair of concepts to think together with the places in the walks is Nora's (1989) concepts of *milieux de memoire* (real environments of memory) and *lieux de memoire* (sites of memory). Accordingly, the sites of memory are the "ultimate embodiments of a memorial consciousness that has barely survived in a historical age that calls out for memory because [memory] has abandoned it" (Nora, 1989, p. 12). They emanate from the lack of spontaneous memory embodied in *milieux de memoire* and the institutional and systemic insistence on remembering. The sites of memory express the need to create exterior signs, archives, and celebrations to remember. According to Nora, these sites contribute to the

constitution of the nation-state and the national identity. The concept of *lieux de memoire* is quite influential and widely used to designate the monumental structures and museums and sites that commemorate the past.⁴⁴

Although it has been widely used, I think the concept of the site of memory does not cover all the diverse kinds of places that bear and transmit memories. Firstly, the sites of memory mainly consist of the places that are intentionally built or turned into places of commemoration, whereas there are also places that bear and transmit memories, although they have been cast aside, erased, or distorted. Nora's sites of memory primarily refer to how certain places became the ultimate public bearers of memories. When visiting a site of memory, one cannot help but remember what the place stands for. Yet, the everyday places in the memory walks are not out in the open, waiting to be remembered and visited like a site of memory. Rather, these places are left to be forgotten in the daily course of life. Their stories about the past atrocities, human rights violations, violence, and discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, gender, etc., are also repressed and left to be forgotten. Like the sites of memory, they attain mnemonic significance, but their relationship with history is linked to repression and violence. In this sense, these places are not monuments or sites of memory.

In the memory walks and the interviews, I observed that these everyday places gather people, stories, and memories together and become bearers and transmitters of repressed, distorted, and marginalized memories. However, their significance does not depend on the places themselves but on the performances that remake them. Like the researcher that pulls together experiences, memories,

⁴⁴ Challenging the nationalist and conservative aspects of Nora's framework, many global and local initiatives and organizations worldwide use the concept of *lieux de memoire*. By creating and maintaining sites of memory, they aim to challenge the nationalist historiography and state-made monuments, celebrations, and museums. Unlike Nora's framework, these sites demonstrate the links between nationalism, colonialism, and racism.

imagination, and many other things to make ethnographic places (Pink, 2009), here, the collective performances of the storytellers and participants in the walks pull together these things and make places. Again, neither *milieux de memoire* nor *lieux de memoire* can be used to describe the places in the memory walks.

Introduced by Walter Benjamin (1968) and used by Aleida Assmann (2014), the concepts of voluntary and involuntary memory are also relevant for the conceptualization of places in the memory walks. According to Assmann (2014), voluntary memory concerns places that are selected and maintained by the society for their potential to reinforce the national history and reproduce cultural values. Mostly, they are visible and touristic sites. On the other hand, involuntary memory is associated with places that are not intentionally chosen for a memorial purpose. They are mostly regional and local places that people stumble upon unexpectedly. Assmann states that they contain a mnemonic energy that haunts people and generates an affective surplus that calls for people to tell their stories. Surfacing unexpectedly, these places “confront the society with a history that it had preferred to forget” (Assmann, 2014, p. 138).

Assmann’s concept of involuntary memory fits into the memory walks because the participants in the memory walks encounter the everyday places unexpectedly too. Also similar to the involuntary memory, these places are part of the histories that are forcibly silenced or left to be forgotten. Yet, they are also different from involuntary memory because the places are intentionally chosen, researched, and turned into a story by the storytellers as part of their memory work. In that sense, the places also share similarities with voluntary memory. Once again, they do not fit into the categories of voluntary or involuntary memory but lie somewhere in between.

Rather than designating whether the places and memories in the memory walks are planned/spontaneous, expected/unexpected, or real/out of duty, etc., which ultimately ends up in a neither/nor situation, I think we must acknowledge their in-betweenness. For that matter, a conceptualization of the places in the memory walks must start from this in-betweenness. I believe the concept of the extraordinary can be helpful here. As I have elaborated in the previous chapter, the extraordinary everyday refers to how the everyday that is characterized by inattentiveness turns, for a limited time, into a time and space for exploration, thinking, feeling, knowing, and imagination. This everyday does not last forever; it is transitory and refers to a state of in-betweenness. In-between everyday life and performances of walking and storytelling, the extraordinary everyday comes to life.

In this extraordinary everyday, places are created and imagined by the storytellers and participants. Imagination has an essential role in the creation of these places through performances. Defne mentions that “when you are right there in Hazzo Pulo passage, for example, you can imagine that event, September 6-7, while listening to that story” (Interview with Defne, Karakutu storyteller). So, by listening to that story in that place, a passage known by its tea shop today turn into something completely different. Similarly, Gizem describes how being in that place makes it easier for her to imagine the events. Going to Ülker Sokak in 1993 in her imagination, she asks: “From which windows people were standing at, and from which window to window people were shouting? What was happening?” (Interview with Gizem, Karakutu storyteller).

3.4 Extraordinary places in the memory walks

I will give a couple of examples of the extraordinary places in memory walks. The categories of places will be based on my observations in the memory walks and the interviews I have made. The common point of these places is that they are imagined within the extraordinary everyday in the memory walks.

The broadest category is the everyday places that become unfamiliar. This category includes almost all of the places in the memory walks. As mentioned, walking in the memory walks turns the everyday places that are unnoticed, ordinary, and boring into discoveries. Through a different way of looking and sensing, characterized by heightened awareness and curiosity, these places are seen as if for the first time and realized as unfamiliar. This defamiliarization enables the participants to make new bonds with places and sometimes even feel more personally involved and connected to them. As the participants learn about the histories and memories that these places embody, they become familiar but still remain a source of curiosity. The best examples for this category are the places that are still in use but not known for their histories. The Süreyya Opera House, the Farewell Fountain (*Ayrılık Çeşmesi*), Baylan Bakery in Kadıköy and the Kohen Sisters Bookstore in Beyoğlu can be listed.

Another broad category is the places where personal memories meet the story. Firstly, the storytellers include their memories in the stories, and these memories make the stories more personal and intriguing. Secondly, this kind of storytelling opens up a space for the participants to recall and talk about their own memories too. The entanglement of the personal with the collective happens mainly in the stories about the recent past, such as the murder of Hrant Dink, Gezi Protests, protests of Saturday Mothers, Boysan's life story, and so on. The participants and the

storytellers remember these events or people. Listening to the story, they recall what they did and felt back then. Reimagining the event is an essential part of the making of these places. For example, Çağla mentions how she started to imagine the events that she remembers from her childhood when listening to the story about Hrant Dink and his murder:

While she was talking, we were right there, looking at those photos. And as I said, they were images that I remembered from the news. [I felt] as if there was a community behind me. Voices came alive in my ears. We were listening to it on the news, I was a kid at the time, living in X. “We are all Hrant, we are all Dink”⁴⁵ posters came to life as I was listening to her at that moment. (Interview with Çağla, Karakutu memory walk participant) (See Appendix E, 2)

The next category can be described as places where sound becomes essential. As mentioned, when there are no physical traces of the stories in the places, it is harder to connect the story and the place. In such cases, songs can contribute to making and imagining places by building such a connection. Songs are mainly used when stories of a musician or a composer are told. The Mühürdar Casino in Kadıköy is an example, where a story about the entertainment life in the early years of the Turkish Republic and the life story of a famous Rum singer called Mermaid Eftalya (*Deniz Kızı Eftalya*) is told. There is no physical trace of the casino in the neighborhood.

Another example is the Cumhuriyet Pharmacy in Şişli, where the Armenian composer Gomidas Vartabed supposedly lived before the 24th of April when he was sent to exile. The story is told in front of the pharmacy, but there is no clear evidence that it was the apartment that he lived in. In both cases, the connection between the

⁴⁵ Here, I quote from my interviewee without changing her words. In fact, the popular slogan she refers to is “We are all Hrant, we are all Armenians”. The fact that Çağla remembers the slogan without the second part “We are all Armenians” can be an example of a “broken performance” (Arslan, 2021) in the form of parapraxis, defined as a Freudian slip, an error in speech in psychoanalysis, including slips of the tongue, misreadings, mishearings, and temporary forgetting, etc. In chapter four, I explain more about how I understand broken performances in connection to facing the past.

story and the place is relatively weak. Listening to songs enables the storytellers and the participants to reimagine the place and the story together.

The places of urban transformation are another category that demonstrates the social, demographic, economic, architectural, and ecological changes in the city. They are characterized by how they have been transformed, destroyed, renovated, or left standing idle. Whether or not it is the story's purpose, these places demonstrate the effects of urban transformation. In this sense, they stand right between the past and the present, between the violence of the past and the capitalism of the present. The Pink Villa (*Pembe Konak*) in Cağaloğlu is an example. Once the headquarters of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) and then the Cumhuriyet newspaper, the villa is now demolished. When listening to the villa's history, all that the participants see is the parking lot that replaced the building. As Beril, a Karakutu storyteller, mentions, seeing the current state of those places creates a different effect on people. It makes them realize that there is nothing that memory can hold on to because "some of these places have not been preserved, some do not tell that story at all, or some tell a completely different story" (Interview with Beril). Both the storytellers and the participants mentioned that it is pretty challenging to imagine and feel a personal connection with these places as they do not have any physical traces. In these cases, being in place does not really contribute to the stories. The participants feel like they could have been anywhere. These places are like non-places, once existing, but not anymore. There is almost nothing to remind them. Although the participants do not feel connected with the stories as intended, they are left with unintended experiences and sensations regarding the transformation of the city and the places that are lost in this process.

Some places still stand but are left idle, have been renovated, and put into another use after renovation. These places are not non-places. They are places that involve multiple stories of what they used to be and of their transformation in recent years. The transformation of these places is linked with the socio-economic changes in the neighborhoods and the gentrification processes and policies, which turn them into profit-making enterprises. Some examples are the REXX Cinema in Kadıköy, where the story of the first Muslim theatre actress, Afife Jale, is told, and the Don Kişot Social Center (*Don Kişot İşgal Evi*), one of the first squat houses in Istanbul now turned into a café, and the Narmanlı Inn, renovated and turned into a shopping mall, where its old residents including cats are kicked out and made into statues. Listening to stories of these places in the walks gives the participants the opportunity to see the city's transformation with their own eyes.

The last category refers to the places characterized by difficult stories of loss, violence, and absence. The phrase “difficult stories” was used by many interlocutors to describe the stories such as the 6-7 September Istanbul pogrom in 1955 against the religious minorities in Turkey, the forced disappearances in the Southeast of Turkey in the 1990s, the Taksim Square massacre in 1977, the 24th of April 1915 and the Armenian Genocide, the hate crimes against the LGBTQI+ communities, the life histories of Hrant Dink, Zabel Yesayan, Gomidas Vartabed, and so on. Through the telling of these stories, everyday places such as Taksim Square, Galatasaray Square, Hazzo Pulo Passage, Ülker Street in Beyoğlu, and Tatavla neighborhood in Şişli, places are reimagined as places of loss and violence. It must be noted that some of these places and events are publicly known and commemorated, whereas some are not. Not only streets and squares but also an apartment, a newspaper headquarters, or a publishing house can become signifiers of violence and loss. It must be noted that

the stories are primarily micro-stories such as life histories or histories of built structures. The storytellers underline that telling micro-stories is a better way to tell these difficult stories because the participants are more curious and can relate more to the stories.

These categories will give a general picture of the extraordinary places in the memory walks, which are imagined places that stand between the past and the present, memories and sensory experiences, and the familiar and the unfamiliar. Here, I will not delve into a detailed examination of these places. Rather, I will turn to the practice of walking, which makes these places in the first place. I will conceptualize walking as a critical practice, which will provide me the grounds to explore the experiences of facing the past in memory walks in the next chapter.

3.5 Walking as a critical spatial practice

Walking is considered a critical practice in many fields and disciplines such as literature, philosophy, art and performance studies, urban studies, anthropology, sociology, and political sciences. To demonstrate the critical aspect of walking in the memory walks, I will draw on the literature on the everyday practices of walking, art, architecture, performance, and urban life. According to Schechner's (2006) continuum of performances mentioned in the last chapter, the performances in the memory walks lie between daily life, arts, and identity constructions. These performances cannot be categorized solely as artistic performances or daily and habitual performances, although they resemble all of them. At this point, the literature on architecture, art, and performance will provide me with some conceptual tools and insights, a starting point, so to say, for a conceptualization of walking as a critical practice.

Among the limited amount of works on the memory walks in Turkey, Yağmur Yıldırım's master thesis (2020) on the spatial practices of feminisms in Turkey has drawn my attention. Following Jane Rendell's (2008) concept of critical spatial practice, Yıldırım examines the practices of various groups and individuals working in different fields in Turkey, such as the practices related to art, performance, and architecture, one of which is the Curious Steps memory walks. In her thesis, Yıldırım focuses on the feminist sensitivities, tactics, and tools of these practices to identify the traces of a feminist perspective of spatial production in Turkey.

Inspired by Yıldırım's reading of Rendell, I will suggest seeing the memory walks as a critical spatial practice. Exploring the relationship between art and place/space, Rendell (2008) suggests thinking of art as a spatial practice rather than art in a site or as a place. Her understanding of art as a practice is based on de Certeau's definition of space. De Certeau (1984) makes an analogy between linguistics and space, draws on Saussure's linguistic notions of *langue* (the rules and conventions that constitute a language) and *parole* (the practice of speech), and offers that "space is a practiced place" (p. 117). As Rendell (2008) underlines, for de Certeau, space is dynamic and socially produced through practice, whereas place is rather more fixed and passive. Inspired by Massey's (1994) definition of place, which regards place as dynamic, unfixed, and multiple, Rendell argues that art can express the critical potential of place by turning into one of de Certeau's tactics. Following Rendell, I will think about walking as a critical spatial practice too.

My conceptualization of walking as a critical spatial practice will be grounded in a couple of aspects of walking that I find significant in this respect.

Firstly, I believe that the reflexive aspect of walking lies at the core of the critical potential of walking. From the Ancient Greek philosophers to contemporary scholars who write on and practice walking, almost all mention the connection between walking and thinking and argue that walking enhances thinking. In the first subsection, I will elaborate on this reflexive aspect and show how thinking is linked with the body's movements and the body's relationship with the environment.

The critical potential of walking is also connected with the idea of tactics by de Certeau (1984). De Certeau associates walking with a speech act and describes the practice of walking with the concept of writing the city. In his analysis of everyday practices, de Certeau (1984) pays attention to the trivial ways of intervening in the public space. He calls these interventions the creative tactics of ordinary people.

Studying the artistic practices in urban spaces, David Pinder (2005) also argues that the critical aspect of walking practices is related to the creative ways in which the walkers intervene in and make use of urban spaces. He expands the practices of writing the city to “all kinds of media, registers, and modes of performance . . . adopting different textual strategies and voices as well as modes of (counter)mapping” (p. 403). In his understanding, walking can be a way to “produce ‘anti-texts’ within the text” (Rossiter and Gibson, 2000, in Pinder, 2005, p. 401). In the second subsection, I will examine the tactics concerning the performances of memory in the memory walks, seeing them as re-writings of the city in alternative ways.

The exploratory aspect of walking also contributes to an understanding of walking as a critical practice. Focusing on the history of avant-garde experiments and contemporary artistic performances, Keith Bassett (2004) and David Pinder (2005) point out the critical potential of exploring the city by walking. Bassett (2004)

defines walking as “an aesthetic practice and a critical tool” (p. 397) and sketches the long tradition of walking in the city, starting from the nineteenth century until today. In “Arts of urban exploration” (2005), Pinder also examines the artistic practices that explore public spaces in the city and discusses how artists use forms of urban exploration, especially walking, to critically engage with and intervene in the cities. He argues that these modes of exploration play a significant role in forming critical approaches about the city. In the third subsection, I will engage with the exploratory aspect of walking and examine the role and significance of sensory experiences in (re)defining the relationship with the city, including the places and stories.

The concept of the right to the city makes up another aspect of critical walking. The right to the city was first introduced by Henri Lefebvre in *Le Droit à la Ville* (The Right to the City) in 1968. Taken on by David Harvey and many other scholars since then, the right to the city signifies the common right to “make and remake our cities and ourselves” (Harvey, 2008, p. 23) and to reclaim the cities against the social inequalities and effects of urbanization and capitalism that shapes the cities. The right to the city embodies different kinds of rights related to urban life, such as the rights to participation, mobility, habitation, leisure, etc. Various social movements, grassroots initiatives, and artists have taken on the call to change the cities and our experiences in the cities. Walking, among many other practices, is one of the practices to reclaim the city. Feminist marches that reclaim the city and the night, the political ecology walks that reclaim urban nature, and the memory walks that reclaim forgotten or repressed histories and memories can be listed as examples. In the fourth subsection, I will think about how collective walking in the city can be critical in this respect.

3.5.1 Thinking while walking

The philosophers, poets, and writers of the eighteenth century, especially the Romantics, did not only walk regularly but wrote extensively about walking. For them, walking was a reflexive practice, a way to think, to become aware of the self, the body, and the senses, signifying a heightened awareness of both the inner and the outer world. Since then, many scholars and walkers have mentioned the reflexive aspect of walking.

In *Wanderlust: A History of Walking*, Solnit (2001) outlines how the eighteenth and nineteenth century philosophers saw walking. For Jean-Jacques Rousseau, walking is an emblem of the simple man, solitary in nature and outside society (Solnit, 2001). Søren Kierkegaard also walked solitary, which gave him the opportunity to be present but detached from the world, being “more than an audience but less than a participant” (Solnit, 2001, p. 23). For them, walking enables a detachment from the world as they see it as a way to withdraw from the distracting world and think. Being solitary is seen as key to being detached from one’s membership in a group or class. Neither immersed in society nor totally withdrawn from it, one is drawn into actions but is also detached like a traveler rather than a worker or a member of a group. When walking, one is free, that is, one is without responsibilities, which makes walking an excellent opportunity for them to think.

Although the depictions above regard walking as a solitary practice, in which the walker either turns inwards to the self or observes the outer world from a distance, the connection between walking and thinking does not necessarily depend on the solitude of the walker. Walking, in all its forms, whether in the country or the city, alone or collective, enables and encourages thinking (Solnit, 2001).

The experiences of walking in the memory walks can be given as an example. As I have mentioned, the memory walks mainly consist of walking in the streets of a city to find the designated places or stories, lasting for a couple of hours. In the interviews with the storytellers and the participants, some describe walking as a way to “process the stories”. For them, walking between the designated places provides a time and space, in which they reflect on the stories, process their thoughts and feelings, and share them with the other participants. Utku, a Karakutu storyteller for many years, describes the connection between walking and thinking as such:

They [the participants] walk 15 or 20 minutes between two routes. The organizers ensure that the walks last this long. I think this is partly for one thing: after people listen to a narrative, and because the narratives are unfortunately heavy, it is like opening a time for them to process; try to process and think while they are on the move but having them get the second slap before they can do it. (Interview with Utku, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 3)

As a matter of fact, the reflexive aspect of walking is closely connected to the walker’s interactions with the environment and other beings. That is to say that walking is a social activity too. The memory walks demonstrate both a turn towards inwards to the self and outwards to the environment. The two are not contradictory; in fact, one is not possible without the other because the reflexive dimension of walking depends highly on one’s perceptions, senses, and experiences of place and walking.

One of the most mentioned aspects of walking is the issue of rhythm, which is used in a double sense. It refers to the rhythm between walking and thinking, body and mind, and indicates the coming together of the two. It also refers to the rhythm between the walker and the environment and in-between the walkers if it is a collective walk. In both senses, rhythm depicts the sociability of walking; it illustrates how the walker is tuned in with the environment. In *Rhythmanalysis*

(2004), Lefebvre rethinks the urban everyday life through the analysis of rhythms, which he sees in connection to interactions between place, time, and energy. Rhythm, for Lefebvre, is linked with repetitions, linear and cyclical processes, beginnings and endings. It must be noted that rhythm has many different forms and it should not be understood as a reference to the alignment of the body with the environment or a harmony (Lefebvre, 2004). Rhythm also includes conflicts, tensions, co-existence as well as equilibriums. So, the sociality of walking, connected to the notion of rhythm, includes various kinds of interactions of the walker with other human and non-human beings and the environment as “the walking body must continually adapt to the contingencies, flows, materialities, and interruptions experienced while walking down a street” (Edensor, 2010, p. 73).

According to Pink’s (2008) definition, ethnography is the practice of attuning oneself to the environment and other people’s practices and understanding one’s own emplacement in the field. In her sensory ethnography, Pink uses walking as a research method to become attuned to the town and the practices of slowness she was trying to comprehend (2008). Her own embodied experience was fundamental to understanding the environment and other people’s practices. Pink describes this social dimension of interacting with and attuning to the environment and the other beings with the concept of sensory sociality:

The tour, along with the materiality and sensory sociality of the research encounter and the invitation to share the imaginings of the committee thus enabled me to experience Mold [the town] as a slow place; it was by walking and eating with others, sharing their gazes, rhythms, sounds, smells and more and by attuning my imagination to their own imaginings for the future material, social, sensory environment of the town that I arrived at an ethnographic place with a remembered past, a direct present and an imagined future. (Pink, 2008, p. 193)

Note that Pink considers the practices of attuning herself to the environment as the basis for the making of ethnographic places. In the previous sections, I have already

elaborated on the role of walking in (re)making the places in the memory walks and underlined the role of imagination. I want to underline here that the making of places in the memory walks is clearly connected to the reflexive aspect of walking, which provides an opportunity for thinking and imagination for the participants. For example, Ateş recalls his first time participating in a memory walk:

While walking from one place to another, as if you are really under the influence of a substance, you delve into a dream about the history of places and ask, “what is the history of this place?”, “where are we?” and “what were these streets like in the past”. Therefore, walking and the distance between the stops provides a good opportunity for both thinking and dreaming. (Interview with Ateş, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 4)

As depicted in the concept of sensory sociality, walking is a multi-sensory practice involving sensory experiences such as sight, hearing, movement, touch, and smell. In the Romantic tradition and the writings of the philosophers of the era, walking is associated with closeness to nature, attention to details in the environment, and the recovery of sensory experiences, all of which are deemed to be impossible in modern urban life (Lee and Ingold, 2006; Edensor, 2000). For the walkers of the era, walking is a retreat from the city, which is characterized by the rapid and mechanized movement of the bodies that are “highly regulated, defensive, passive, sensually deprived, performatively inert, and therefore not conducive to reflexive practices” (Edensor, 2000, p. 85). Rather than enhancing sensory experiences, the overstimulation in the city is a restriction of the sensory experiences, leading to a blasé attitude (Simmel, 1950). According to the Romantics and alike, the sensory experiences of walking in the country “generate reflexivity through philosophical and intellectual thinking or aesthetic contemplation, states of mind that are believed to be difficult to achieve in an urban context” (Edensor, 2000, p. 86).

However, walking in the country is not intrinsically connected with such a potential for thinking and freedom. Regardless of their whereabouts, all kinds of

walking consist of bodily techniques and discipline (Edensor, 2000). Walking is part of the modern practical conventions and codes (our shoes are an example!). But, as Edensor (2000) mentions, alternative forms of walking may challenge some of these conventions and codes. Walking in the city as well as the country can hold the potential for disruption.

As a way of “welcom[ing] the unknowability of a heterotopic nature, a sensual body, and a multiple sense of place” (Edensor, 2000, p. 102), walking in the city can reject the practical conventions adjusted to the timetable and clocks. It can include “moments of confrontation, of self-displacement” (p. 102) and “a different sort of reflexivity, one which embraces the difference, the alterity of nature, the contingent, the heterogeneous, the decentred, the fleeting and the unrepresentable” (p. 102). Almost all of the storytellers and participants in the memory walks underline that their experiences of walking have encouraged them to reflect on and question how they use the city, what the city means to them, what they know about the city and the places, in sum, how they relate to the city and the histories and stories within the city. One of the Karakutu storytellers, Ela, mentions how the memory walks can become a way to form a “meaningful” relationship with the city as an alternative to the blasé attitude of the city-dweller, for whom the city is only a décor:

Identifying that place, that person, or that event can also be an event with each other. In fact, by giving some meaning to place. By dressing the place with meaning, I think. Because instead of saying that the writer X lived here, I think it is like dressing the place with the injustices that the writer X has experienced if there is such an injustice in his past. You won't be able to look at that place any other way. It happens to be that for you. This, of course, opens very good doors in your mind, I think. Because the city seems a bit like a decoration to me. Now, when someone walks down the street, you don't actually know the inside of the houses, but there are different lives going on in all of them, but actually, it is a decoration for you. It is a thing, a place that doesn't exist unless you get into it. I think what Karakutu is doing is actually bringing that décor into your life. I would say it's like putting that place into

your daily life as something meaningful and taking it out of being a decoration. (Interview with Ela, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 5)

3.5.2 Writing the city

Introduced by de Certeau, the concept of writing the city is grounded in an analogy between speech acts and everyday urban practices. In *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1984), de Certeau attempts to draw a theory of everyday practices and examines practices such as reading, talking, walking, dwelling, cooking, etc., which he calls tactics.⁴⁶ A tactic is “an art of the weak” (Certeau, 1984, p. 37), he says, “within the order established by the ‘strong’” (p. 40). In the chapter “Walking in the City”, he explains how the city transforms into a text when looking at it from up from an all-seeing god-like position. Looking down, the complexity of the city becomes readable. The walkers or the “ordinary practitioners of the city [that] live ‘down below’, below the thresholds at which visibility begins” (p. 93) make use of spaces that they cannot see and “follow the thicks and thins of an urban ‘text’ they write without being able to read it” (p. 93).⁴⁷

⁴⁶ He distinguishes between a strategy and a tactic. A strategy is “the calculus of force-relationships which becomes possible when a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from an ‘environment’” (p. xix), whereas a tactic is “a calculus which cannot count on a ‘proper’ (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality. The place of a tactic belongs to the other.” (p. xix). Against the strategies of the powerful, de Certeau puts the tactics of the weak.

⁴⁷ De Certeau’s dualistic understandings of high vs. low and strategy vs. tactic have been criticized by some scholars. For Pink (2008), de Certeau’s framework falls short of regarding the everyday practices “as diverse, subjective, and embedded in hierarchies of power that are contingent rather than simply binary or structural” (Pink, 2008, p. 182), but it also provides a basis for understanding these practices as “slow urban contestation” (p. 182). According to Pinder (2005), de Certeau’s binary understandings results in “a romanticized version of ‘resistance’” (p. 401), which falls into the trap of considering all kinds of everyday practices as subversive. I agree with Pinder that the concept of the tactic remains to general and elusive in de Certeau, just like his concept of the ordinary practitioner/man. All kinds of creative practices ranging from coming up with a shortcut to, crossing the red light, or to participate in public demonstrations, which are quite differently subversive, are all categorized under the same category called tactics. Phillips (2005) underlines that de Certeau associates the low position of writing the city with blindness (the walker is not able to read and to see, and the tactics are invisible) and questions what it might look like to “[t]o imagine movement in the city on a different paradigm, in which encounters with and of the visual are recognized and taken into

De Certeau's conceptualization of walking as an everyday tactic is significant as it acknowledges the critical capacity of walking. Moreover, de Certeau's emphasis on walking demonstrates the importance of giving attention to everyday practices in analyzing the interventions in urban spaces. By describing walking as writing the city, de Certeau likens walking to a speech act. As in speaking, the walkers have their own rhetoric; they choose between and actualize possibilities and give different meanings and uses to places, different from what is intended by the architects and planners of urban places. For de Certeau, the walkers are "neither an author nor spectator" (p. 93). By using tactics, they can escape "the totalizations produced by the eye" (p. 93) and "elude discipline without being outside the field in which it is exercised" (p. 96). Looking at the urban life from a street-level perspective like de Certeau enables us to notice the detours, that is, the creation of different stories and meanings and the (re)making of places, which are different from the spatial organization of the city based on capitalism, consumerism, and surveillance (Pinder, 2005).

Walking in de Certeau is a practice that makes the everyday and the ordinary rather than breaking the habitual and routinized everyday life and turning it into an extraordinary everyday. The exploratory aspect of walking remains limited because de Certeau does not clarify how and by whom the tactics are created and used. So, the concept of the walker remains too ambiguous. He does not clarify who the walkers are, why and how they walk, and what they experience. The ambiguity of the walker, combined with the vague conception of tactic, does not acknowledge the multiplicity of everyday life and the different capabilities and freedoms that determine how the walkers move in the city (Pinder, 2005).

account" (p. 512). As pointed out by these scholars, perhaps the walker or walking can be imagined differently.

Acknowledging the limitations of de Certeau's conceptualization, I will follow Pinder in continuing to think about different ways of writing the city and define it in a broader sense to include not only the walking practices of the ordinary pedestrian but also alternative or unordinary kinds of practices. The performances of storytelling and walking in the memory walks are examples of writing the city in this sense.

Writing the city through the memory walks is mostly related to the transmission of memory through performances of storytelling and walking in the walks, which I also call performances of memory. By performances of memory, I mean the transmission and sharing of memories with other people. This includes the histories and memories that are not publicly discussed, unknown or repressed, such as the histories of non-Muslim and non-Turkish communities in Turkey or the histories of important but not well-known women and LGBTQI+, etc. Encountering and engaging with these mostly unknown histories and memories, the participants and storytellers get a glimpse of the layers of history within the city. They leave the walk with a curiosity about histories and memories that are waiting to be discovered and with an urge to remember and share the ones they have encountered in the walks. As Mina, one of the Karakutu storytellers, mentions, they become "bearers of memory": "Everyone who attends a memory walk turns into a bearer of memory. All the 20 people who participate in the walk tell a friend about the places [in the walks], on another memory walk or while walking there on another day" (Interview with Mina).

Besides getting a glimpse of and sharing these mostly unknown memories, the memory walks revive personal memories about the places and the stories. Recalling, rethinking, and sharing personal memories and feelings are a fundamental

part of the memory walks. In the interviews, most of the storytellers underline this aspect of storytelling and describe the performance of storytelling as a performance of telling personal memories and feelings too:

Why did each person telling these stories want to tell that story? Because the stories are chosen voluntarily. They tell a part about why they wanted to tell and how they made a connection to their own life, and everything is free there . . . So, people can talk about current discussions or anecdotes from their personal lives while establishing the connection between themselves and the stories. (Interview with Ecem, SU Gender employee and Curious Steps storyteller) (See Appendix E, 6)

The recalling and sharing of personal memories and connecting them with the broader histories and collective memories regarding the city are examples of the gathering power of places. The memory walks build on the gathering power of places; they make of the opportunities to intervene in the city and write their own stories, memories, and feelings in urban places. Challenging the politics of memory in Turkey, which is predominantly based on the construction of a homogeneous national identity, the memory walks bring out new ways and objects of remembering. Moreover, writing the city is not restricted to recalling memories and making new ones connected to the stories in the walks. This aspect depends on chance events, that is, unexpected encounters that add new insights to the stories. For example, some storytellers mention their encounters during the walks with the characters in the stories or with people who know them. Gizem, one of the Karakutu storytellers, mentions the time when she bumped into GÜNGÖR abla in one of the memory walks, who is an important character in the story of the LGBTQI+ community living on Ülker Street in the 1990s:

One day I'm waiting by the stairs, waiting for my group. A man came down from the hill and shouted, "Güngör abla, look, I brought you a tenant," he said. And from inside the apartment, a woman shouted, "Oh, come on, come on!". GÜNGÖR abla, whom I have been telling about for years, is still living there. I mean, there is no way for me to experience such a thing without going

to that place. (Interview with Gizem, Karakutu storyteller & board member)
(See Appendix E, 7)

Moreover, it must be noted that writing the city in the memory walks consists of particular sensitivities performed by the storytellers. These are sensitivities mostly about being in public and storytelling, which can be divided into three main categories: 1) feeling safe while telling stories in public, 2) keeping the participants interested but not ‘traumatizing’ or shocking them, 3) paying attention to form a non-discriminatory, non-sexist, and non-homo/transphobic language.⁴⁸ These sensitivities refer to the challenges and breaking points of being a storyteller as each storyteller positions themselves differently. The subject positions of the storytellers differ according to their attitudes towards the stories and the participants. They do not always agree on how to tell stories and what to pay attention to. Some storytellers refrain from giving details on violence, whereas some do not. Some pay attention to not ‘traumatizing’ the participants and try to lighten up the story, whereas some use literary tactics to shock and impress the participants. Some do not use the phrase genocide as not to ‘lose the participants’, whereas some use it if they see fit. Therefore, writing the city is bound by these sensitivities and the different subject positions of the storytellers.

In sum, the memory walks involves performances of memory that challenge the dominant politics of memory in Turkey by offering ways to intervene in the city and (re)write the city with unknown or repressed memories and memories of one’s own.

⁴⁸ My observations in the memory walks and my interviews with Ateş, Dilan, Irmak, Mina, Nisan, among others has given me insights on these sensitivities.

3.5.3 Exploring the city

Toprak, one of the Karakutu storytellers, draws attention to the connection between walking and exploring the city in the memory walks as such: “Walking is also valuable in that respect because people are not only discovering those three places but actually re-exploring the streets of a district. This exploration is valuable” (Interview with Toprak). Exploring the city by walking has a long tradition, including the flâneur, the Dadaist and Surrealist practices, the *dérives*⁴⁹ of the Situationists, and the contemporary walking practices (Bassett, 2004). Especially with the revival of flânerie and *dérive* in arts and sciences in recent years, the exploratory aspect of walking in the city has been celebrated for its critical potential. A variety of artist groups, social scientists, civil initiatives, and alike have taken part in reviving and recreating new forms of urban exploration based on walking (Bassett, 2004; Kramer and Short, 2011). For many social scientists, walking is a research method or a practice that contributes to their research, projects, or collaborations.⁵⁰ The rising interest in walking in the city, especially with a critical attitude, has been coupled with the creation of online and printed guides and maps, mobile applications, and social media-based walk projects. These projects call the audience to walk in the city with a different way of looking and sensing than they are used to.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Developed by a group of artists and intellectuals which called themselves Situationists, the *dérive* (drifting in English) is a method and theory that maps out the psychogeographical effects of the city through walking (Debord, 1956). Tom McDonough (2009) notes that *dérive* bears resemblance to flânerie because of the privileged position of the walker, who travels through various places without being noticed and who is free of daily life responsibilities.

⁵⁰ For works that center around walking, see *Palestinian Walks* (2008) by Raja Shehadeh and *Istanbul 2023* (2014) by Sinan Logie and Yoann Morvan, For walking projects initiated by social scientists and researchers, see the sensory walks by Ümit Hamlacıbaşı, the Purple Route (*Mor Rota*) memory walks organized by Funda Şenol Canteke, and the walking project *Encounters in the Liminal Space* by Aylin Vartanyan.

⁵¹ A couple of examples of online or printed maps and guides in Turkey: the *Beyoğlu I Will Survive Map* (*Beyoğlu Yıkılmadım Ayaktayım Haritası*) by the Center for Spatial Justice (*Mekanda Adalet Derneği*) (MAD), the guide book *A City that Remembers: Space and Memory from Taksim to Sultanahmet* (2019) by Asena Günel and Murat Çelikkan, *Çamlıbel/Mersin Map* by Kültürhane,

Let us first look at the *flânerie*, an act of strolling and idling in the nineteenth century. Derived from the Scandinavian verb *flana*, meaning a person who wanders, the term *flâneur* was included in the dictionary in nineteenth century Europe as the one who wanders aimlessly, who likes to do nothing. The *flâneur* is a character of modernity, a wanderer, observer, and explorer found in the cities, mostly alone. As opposed to the blasé attitude, the *flâneur* is not paralyzed by the stimuli; it pays attention to the environment, takes in and processes the sensory stimulations, and gets amazed, shocked, curious, etc. One aspect that has been criticized about the figure of the *flâneur* is that it was originally imagined as a man, who has the privilege to leave his responsibilities aside and wander around the city, almost in a state of invisibility.⁵² Benjamin also (2002) examines the emergence and transformation of the figure of the *flâneur* from a critical perspective that pays attention to the phantasmagoria of urban life and capitalism.

Although the figure of the *flâneur* has been criticized for the right reasons, I think it offers a starting point to think about the experiences of walking in the city, especially the experiences, where the everyday bestows a pinch of the extraordinary. Through the act of *flânerie*, the ordinary everyday turns into a source of exploration.

Ankara Discovery Map Pusu'la by Lavarla, the *Antakya Walkable City History Guide* as part of the Walkable History project by Tuğçe Tezer, and the maps for children by the initiative City Detective (*Şehir Dedektifi*) by Gizem Kıyığı. The mobile application called KarDes is a multicultural memory tour guide by the Hrant Dink Foundation, which is designed as a guide to discover the multicultural legacy of Istanbul through walking. The so-called memory tour involves written and visual material on places, buildings, and lives of people as well as video clips of interviews.

⁵² The dominant narrative on the *flâneur*, especially the imagination of the *flâneur* as a man, has been challenged by many scholars (D'Souza & McDonough, 2006; Elkin, 2017; Heddon & Turner, 2012). Although some scholars dismiss the idea of the *flâneuse*, the feminine version of the *flâneur*, arguing that women cannot be invisible in the streets or free of responsibilities as much as a man is, Lauren Elkin (2017) suggests redefining the concept by pointing out to the already existing examples of women wanderers. In her book *Flâneuse*, she reflects on the works and the life stories of women authors and artists and examines their and her own relationship with and experiences of walking in the city. For example, the women character in Virginia Woolf's piece "Street Haunting" (1948) who goes out for a walk with an excuse for buying a pencil is an excellent example of the *flâneuse*. Elkin (2017) also offers a different perspective to look at Baudelaire's famous poem To a Passer-By (*À une passante*), in which, a man walking in the street encounters a woman, who passes by and leaves him with admiration and curiosity of who she is. Although the man, the speaker in the poem, is mostly regarded as the *flâneur*, Elkin (2017) asks us to (re)think the woman as a *flâneuse* too.

Walking, as in the *flânerie*, can heighten one's awareness of the environment and offer a different way of looking and sensing (different from the *blasé* attitude), which welcomes new encounters, surprises, observations, and adventures.

Moreover, according to Chris Jenks and Tiago Neves (2000), the *flânerie* “involves the observation of people and social types and contexts; a way of reading the city, its population, its spatial configurations whilst also a way of reading and producing texts” (p. 1), which they resemble what urban ethnography does. They draw parallels between the *flâneur* and the urban ethnographer in terms of their position in the field, their resistance to “the spectacle and the ‘blasé’ attitude” (p. 10), and the poetics of both of their writings. Moreover, they suggest seeing the *flâneur* as a “positioning, or more strongly perhaps, as a way of organizing the city” (Jenk and Neves, 2000, p. 5).

So, what is the ‘positioning’ of the walker when exploring the city? To answer this, we must first elaborate on the term exploration. The term exploration has been widely used in colonial contexts and contexts where exotic geographies are to be discovered and tamed (Pinder, 2005). Pinder (2005) offers an alternative usage of the term that refers to “the critical re-evaluation of the politics and potentialities of urban space” (p. 389) and gives examples from contemporary artistic walking practices that question the urban geographies and the socio-spatial relations by reimagining and remapping the urban space. Although “the transformative potential of walking and performing appears weak, powerless, and foolish” (Pinder, 2005, p. 401) in the face of the late capitalism and its effects on the cities, practices of walking can offer a poetics and politics that unsettle the organization of the public space. The critical potential of these walking practices is related to how they blend the boundaries between performance and everyday life and thereby open up the

everyday for intervention and inquiry. This potential holds also for all kinds of exploratory walking practices, including the memory walks.

Most of the time, exploratory walks are combined with games, rules and instructions, and chance events of different kinds (Pinder, 2005). The participants actively engage with urban space; they play games, follow rules and instructions, and discover new places and things (Pinder, 2005). For example, while trying to follow the instructions of a game, the participants may bump into a building that blocks their way. They may lose their way, discover new places, or find themselves meeting new people on the street. Yaprak, a Karakutu storyteller, mentions the significance of playing games in being an active participant in the memory walks:

They [the memory walk participants] decipher the codes and go from one place to another, like a treasure hunt. Well, when you go to a museum, there is a certain line, they tell you something with a very linear flow, maybe it is a narrative that you can't get involved in, and then you go home. But that is not the case in Karakutu. The narrative that is established is not quite like that. You decipher the code and go to one place, then you decipher another code and go to the other place. This is how you become an active participant. (Interview with Yaprak) (See Appendix E, 8)

Here, Yaprak compares playing a game while walking with going to a museum. As opposed to following a linear narrative and the organization of space in a museum, walking in the memory walks is shaped more by the participants' decisions and actions. And, they are much more open to surprises. The encounters with new things (places, memories, feelings), including the totally unknown, the unexpected, or the familiar lies at the core of exploratory walks. Moreover, these walks manifest the multi-directionality and open-endedness of places, which refers to the multiple and changing meanings and perceptions of places. As Mina puts it, places change through walking in the memory walks:

Taking the wrong paths, going to the wrong places, seeing different places even when walking in the right place, recording the place with your eyes, or the perception of that road, of that place changing while walking... Because

maybe it's a road you have walked before or that you will walk the next week. Seeing and walking in that sense is the most important thing that enables the transformation of the perception and memory of that place, actually. (Interview with Mina, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 9)

The changing meanings and perceptions of places while walking are linked with the bodily and sensory experiences that the walks offer. The exploratory walks enable different ways of looking and sensing the city by turning the everyday into a source of discovery. In the memory walks, these bodily and sensory experiences affect how places are perceived, stories are listened to, and connections between places and memories are made. One of the outstanding characteristics of the memory walks is the walkers' heightened awareness of the environment and a feeling of curiosity that is directed into previously unrecognized places. The interlocutors often describe their curiosity by underlining that they started to look at their environment more attentively during and after the walks. This curiosity includes not only the places in the stories but also the places they pass by. Beren and Ela mention how their curiosity has spread to other places too:

I expected the experiences in those places to affect me. But as we walked between the stops, my teammate and I had an awareness between those stops too. We didn't have any information, but we started to look around more. We realized that we started to catch clues around us more, and this was not something we expected much. (Interview with Beren, Karakutu memory walk participant) (See Appendix E, 10)

. . . even when you go to the next place after listening to a story, you start to look around. It adds awareness to you. You look at the place with different eyes, wondering what happened in this house, what is this building, and who is living here. (Interview with Ela, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 11)

I will discuss curiosity further in the next chapter. For now, I will pay attention to a relevant aspect: The interlocutors mostly associate their curiosity with looking. They describe their experience as a way of looking, for example, "a new and different pair of glasses" (Interview with İpek, memory walk coordinator), "looking with a

different eye” (Interview with Gizem, Karakutu storyteller & board member), “walking with a different eye” (Interview with Defne, Karakutu storyteller & employee), and “an eye-opening experience” (Interview with Anıl, SEHAK memory walk volunteer & employee). Likening it almost to a baby’s gaze, they mention that they feel like looking at their surroundings as if for the first time.

Some of the major works that explore the issues of perception and the body about the urban life and walking in the city also focus on the vision (see the works of Erving Goffman, Georg Simmel, Guy Debord, John Urry, and Walter Benjamin). Arguing that visuals and spectacles dominate modern urban life, they regard vision as the most important sense in urban life. Yet, the focus on vision neglects the significance of other senses in perception, making meaning, and interaction. Over the last decades, various academic disciplines have been interested in the study of senses, including anthropology, human geography, sociology, archeology, tourism studies, arts and performance studies, and applied practices (Pink, 2009), which have started to draw attention to the significance of all of the senses. For example, for Pink (2009), not only seeing but also smelling, hearing, tasting, and feeling are important in doing research and understanding the dynamics of cultures, bodies, and places. Hence, Pink’s (2008) research that uses walking as a method regards all senses as essential elements in understanding the sociality in the field.

Inspired by these works, I will acknowledge the multi-sensorial aspect of walking and being in place. Seeing, hearing, smelling, feeling, and touching are all constituents of the urban experiences of walking. For example, the weather condition is a crucial aspect that affects the sensations while walking. Another example is the significance of sounds. The audio walks are an excellent example that highlights the auditory aspect of walking. Created mostly by artists, dancers, and performers, audio

walks are solo or collective walks that enable the participants to interact with the environment and the city differently. The participants wear headphones and start walking according to the instructions of the voice-over or the sounds. Some examples can be listed as the walks by Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller⁵³, the project called Remote Istanbul by Beykoz Kundura⁵⁴, the project called Yellow Route (*Sarı Güzergah*) designed and directed by Zinnure Türe⁵⁵, and the walk called Audio Choreography *Gazhane* designed by Filiz Sızanlı and Mustafa Kaplan.⁵⁶ There are also sensory walks, for example, the ones organized by the sensory ethnographer Ümit Hamlacıbaşı, who defines place as a skillscape of different sensory experiences (Yıldırım, 2019).⁵⁷

The memory walks also involve multi-sensory experiences of various kinds. As mentioned, they have a visual aspect, which is mentioned as a fundamental way to experience and observe places. The participants also get to look at various visual materials that support the stories. Besides, there is an auditory aspect, which is the basis of the storytelling. Through listening to stories, the participants start to look around and imagine. The streets almost become a theatre scene, where the past and the present mingle and start talking with each other. Listening to songs is also a crucial part of some stories, especially the stories that have no physical traces in the city. Whereas some interlocutors have complained about the city's unwelcomed noises and the people's looks and interventions in the memory walks, most of them

⁵³ The *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* (2012) is a solo walk, where the lines between present and past, and fiction and reality are blurred. The experience is described as a "meditation on memory" (Cardiff and Miller, 2022). See the short Youtube video clip of the 26 minute piece: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sOkQE7m31Pw>.

⁵⁴ This is a priced event, where the participants walk around the streets of Istanbul with the guidance of a synthetic sound. The walk is described as a play where the streets become a stage and the participants become the performers (Beykoz Kundura, 2022).

⁵⁵ Part of the multi-disciplinary program of the collective *A Corner in the World* (2017-2019), this is a sensory walk, in which the participants explore the memories of the district Bomonti in Şişli, Istanbul.

⁵⁶ This is a collective audio walk that explores the transformation of *Gazhane* from an industrial to a cultural complex.

⁵⁷ These walks take place in the Grand Bazaar in Istanbul with a group of 30 people.

consider their sensory experiences of being in the streets and in places fundamental for changing their relationship with the stories and the city.

When it's a story in your head, you get upset when the teacher is telling it in the first grade, maybe you talk about the results, maybe you do something about it, but it remains like a theoretical part in a book. When you see it in real, different questions come to mind. Where was my grandfather that day? When you put the truth, things change. Therefore, with this approach, if I look at these streets together with Karakutu and think about what happened there, the question arises: Did X take place here? It stimulates curiosity. It slightly changes your communication with the street that you normally walk by and use as a means. (Interview with Mete, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 12)

As Mete mentions, asking new questions, many of which are troubling ones indeed, is another crucial aspect of the memory walks. Exploring the city, after all, brings questions. I will elaborate on why I consider these questions troubling and how they are related to facing the past in the next chapter. For now, it will be sufficient to note that these questions are intimately connected with the different ways of feeling and knowing in the memory walks. Realizing that one does not know at all or enough can be a troubling thought and feeling by itself.

Overall, exploring the city has a long history, including different walking practices. The common points of these practices are the walkers' heightened awareness of their environment, the new and rich sensory experiences, the aspect of playfulness and discovery, and the encounters with the unknown and the familiar, both as sources of exploration. It can be concluded that these exploratory walks have a critical potential to unsettle, challenge, or make use of the ordinary everyday and the spatial and temporal organization of the modern city. In this sense, exploring can be seen as a critical way of engaging with the city and its histories and memories.

3.5.4 Claiming the city

The concept of the right to the city was first introduced by Lefebvre and taken on by many other scholars following him. Briefly, it can “be formulated as a transformed and renewed *right to urban life*” (Lefebvre, 1996, p.158), including various rights such as the right to freedom, habitation, mobility, socialization, participation, etc. In “The Right to the City”, Harvey (2008) also engages with this concept and traces the connections between urbanization, capitalism, and changing urban spaces and ways of living in different examples. Both Lefebvre and Harvey point out the importance of urban social movements in expressing the demands concerning the right to the city. Formulating and expressing their demands about the capitalist organization of urban life and spaces, these oppositional social movements acknowledge that the right to the city is a common right, which calls for “the exercise of a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization” (Harvey, 2008, p. 23).

I will understand the right to the city in relation to the formulation and expression of various collective demands about the city and urban life. It must be underlined that there are many different demands and ways to express them. In the scope of this chapter, I will give a glimpse of the demands expressed through collective walking in the city. I will consider the formulation and expression of these demands by walking in the city as a practice of reclaiming the city and give some examples of walking practices. My examples will be: the feminist and LGBTQI+ walks that demand access, participation in, and safety in the city, the political ecology walks that demand participation in the decisions about the ecological transformation of the city, and the memory walks that demand acknowledgment and facing the histories and memories of the city. Examining these examples, I will show

that walking can be a way to reclaim the city by collectively expressing demands, inhabiting places, and making alternative archives.

Moreover, I will demonstrate that walking in the city can be a political act. In “What is Freedom?” (2006), Hannah Arendt argues for the connection between freedom and politics. She states that the freedom is a part of the everyday life that pertains to the political realm as opposed to the belief in inner freedom or negative freedom, implying freedom from politics. Drawing on the Greek and Roman conception of freedom, Arendt notes that “[t]he *raison d’être* of politics is freedom, and its field of experience is action” (2006, p. 145). So, free action is equivalent to political action. According to Arendt, free action is based on principles that “become manifest only in the performing act itself” (p. 151). Her conception of political action has a strong affinity with performing arts as she defines politics as an art, not as a product of making but as a product of action. Following Arendt, walking practices can be seen as an example of political action, where the demands concerning the right to the city are manifested by walking collectively.

Bringing together the discussions on politics, movement, and freedom, Lepecki (2013) introduces the concept of choreopolitics and examines how the dancer, a particular political subject, transforms “spaces of circulation into spaces of freedom” (p. 20) by combining planning and experimentation. Through “a redistribution and reinvention of bodies, affects, and senses”, the subject “experiments with...movement” and “learn[s] how to move politically” (p. 20) and freely. Inspired by Lepecki’s choreopolitics, I will understand the walking practices of reclaiming the city similarly. These practices reinvent and explore bodies, emotions, and senses through walking in the city and combining spontaneity and planning. In his conception of choreopolitics, Lepecki draws on Rancière’s definition

of police and politics. I think this passage from Rancière (2010) is crucial in understanding how walking can be political, that is, how the walking subject transforms space through movement:

The police is not the law which interpellates individuals (as in Louis Althusser's "Hey you there!")...and its slogan is: 'Move along! There's nothing to see here!' The police is that which says that here, on this street, there's nothing to see and so nothing to do but to move along. It asserts that the space for circulating is nothing but the space of circulation. Politics, by contrast, consists in transforming this space of 'moving-along', of circulation, into a space for the appearance of a subject: the people, the workers, the citizens. (Rancière, 2010, p. 37)

Similarly, in the walking practices of reclaiming the city, the subjects transform the everyday places of circulation, consumption, and construction that are not experienced attentively or even not recognized at all, at least for their use-value, into places of exploration and intervention. These places, which I have defined as extraordinary places earlier in this chapter, are created by collective walking. So, the walking subject is a political subject that transforms urban places by reclaiming them and giving them a different meaning and use than 'moving along'. Through collective walking, places come to express the right to the city and the collective demands of walkers.

Now, let us look at a couple of examples. The practices of feminist and LGBTQI+ movements are examples of reclaiming the city. They perform many diverse practices and ways to inhabit public spaces, ranging from protests to walks, events, and picnics. The most well-known ones in Turkey are the eight of March Feminist Night March, the 25th of November March against sexual harassment and violence against women, the Pride Week, and the Pride March.⁵⁸ In these marches,

⁵⁸ There are also other kinds of collective feminist and LGBTQI+ walks around the world and in Turkey, which are different from the rather traditional marches and events that mostly take the form of a protest and a celebration. These walks also reclaim the city, but in a different way. They do it by calling their participants to explore the city with a gender-focused perspective and pay attention to the histories and memories of women and LGBTQI+ in urban places. Although they differ in structure

being together and walking together becomes a way to express demands; for access to urban spaces, change and action, and be seen, heard, and acknowledged. In her master’s thesis on the 2019 Istanbul Feminist Night March, Ege Akdemir (2021) explains the satisfaction that comes from walking and shouting together and argues the collective corporeal experience of the participants intensifies their emotions and their capacity to act, leading to satisfaction and a good feeling. Collective bodily action in the Feminist Night Marches is “both a form of resisting and a celebration” (Akdemir, 2021, p. 63) (Figure 6).



Figure 7. Istanbul Feminist Night March in 2019

Source: [<https://catlakzemin.com/bubirfeministisyandır-8-mart-2019-feminist-gece-yuruyusleri/>, May 2022]

and content, they are all collective walks that aim to make invisible histories of women’s and LGBTQI+ visible. Some examples can be listed: walks that are organized by Andrea Petö in Budapest, Novi Sad Tourist Organization in Serbia, Soledad Falabella in Chile with the Women Mobilizing Memory group, Margarida Queiros and Alexandra Luis in Lisbon, *Frauenarchiv ausZeiten* feminist archives in Bochum, the LGBTour in Amsterdam by Sanne Pols, the Queer Walking Tours by walkinglabs, and so on. *Şişli Çarkı* is another example of an Instagram-based memory walk project in Turkey, which aims to preserve the LGBTQI+ spaces in urban memory.

Also, encounters with the police are an expected and typical aspect of these marches. Each year, the organization committees prepare alternative plans and strategies for possible encounters with the police. And, each year, the police try to break the crowd into smaller groups, block them from coming together at the meeting location, or not let them walk when they manage to come together. Insisting on walking and coming together rather than walking has become the cornerstone of these events, especially in the last years.

Another kind of collective walking practice that reclaims the city, this time differently, is the political ecology walks. These walks focus on the transformation of the rural and urban spaces in the face of urbanization, the expansion of the cities to the outskirts, and the construction projects that affect forests, wildlife, and green areas. They refer to a way of reclaiming the city, especially urban nature, by exploring, experiencing with the body and senses, and creating an archive. Like the feminist and LGBTQI+ marches, walking is a critical practice and a way of resistance. Yet, it is a different kind of resistance, a subtle one that almost takes the form of hiking. The critical aspect of these walks is that they offer new encounters with the unknown parts of the city and new ways of experiencing and sensing the city through collective walking.

Furthermore, they aim to create an archive of photographs and videos that record places, their memories, stories, and experiences of walking. Inspired by the works on the politics of archives, I will consider archive-making as a political act, an act of resistance against the rapid transformation of the city and the destruction of the green areas on the outskirts of the city. Archives, as Ann Stoler (2002), underlines, are sites of knowledge production rather than collection. So, archives do not simply record the facts and events but produce the facts, which cannot be separated from the

destruction, dismissal, and silencing of particular histories and voices (Trouillot, 1995). Through keeping, classifying, publicizing, or destroying the archives, the public and private institutions “keep the *order* and give an *order*, for thinking about the past, the present and the future” (Ahıska, 2006, p. 13). Archive-making can also take a critical turn and contribute to the dissolution of the order by keeping and publicizing alternative voices, memories, and histories. The making of archives in the political ecology walks is a political act in this respect. They produce alternative archives; collect, keep, and publicize visual and auditory materials of urban places that are left to be forgotten and destroyed by urban megaprojects.

Nazlı Tümerdem’s walking project called Istanbul Walkabouts is an example. Istanbul Walkabouts started in 2016 as solitary walks and then turned into collective walks with 250 participants.⁵⁹ The walkabouts provide an opportunity to experience and record the transformation of northern Istanbul through walking as opposed to tracing the changes from the satellite images, maps, or photographs (Salt Galata, 2018). The walks are based on an understanding of walking as “an alternative methodology of critique and resistance” (Future Architecture, 2022). Another example is Serkan Taycan’s walking project called Between Two Seas (*İki Deniz Arası*, 2013-present), a four-day-long collective walk on the outskirts of Istanbul, from the Black Sea to the Marmara Sea (Figure 7).⁶⁰

Overall, both of these walks offer a new way of looking, sensing, and experiencing the city. Through walking on the outskirts of the city, including the agricultural areas, green areas, and wetlands, the participants reflect on their

⁵⁹ See the Instagram account for information on the latest walks:

<https://www.instagram.com/istanbulwalkabouts/>. See the Youtube channel for the videos:
<https://www.youtube.com/c/IstanbulWalkabouts>.

⁶⁰ See the webpage of the project for more information:

<https://ikidenizarasi.wordpress.com/yuruyusler/>. See the Facebook page for announcements:
<https://www.facebook.com/ikidenizarasi/>.

relationship with the city and have the chance to relate to their environment differently. Also, in both of these walks, the participants collect visual and auditory materials such as photographs, videos, and dioramas (Figure 8).⁶¹ These digital archives give a glimpse of how places are experienced and imagined through the walks. More than a collection of facts and figures of the places and their transformation, these archives contribute to the making and keeping of stories and memories of walking on the outskirts of the city. They are alternative archives that make these peripheral and forgotten places visible.



Figure 8. A group walking on the outskirts of Istanbul, from Serkan Taycan's Between Two Seas political ecology walks
Source: [<https://www.arte-util.org/projects/between-two-seas/>, May 2022]

⁶¹ Dioramas are scenic representations, in which figures and details of the environment, people, or animals are displayed in a way that looks real. Tümerdem defines her dioramas as “performative representations of a particular walk formed with photographs taken during the walk” (Future Architecture, 2022).



Figure 9. Diorama named *Deus Ex Machina* created by Nazlı Tümerdem in 2017 shows the animals, humans, and urban infrastructure of Istanbul in the same frame
Source: [<https://saltonline.org/tr/1825/yararli-sanat-ofisi-konusmalari-nazli-tumerdem>, May 2022]

Memory walks are another example of reclaiming the city by walking. Like the walks mentioned above, they are collective walks that formulate and express demands. These demands are related to the politics of remembering and forgetting and discussions of facing the past. Critical of the invisibility of the histories and stories of women, LGBTQI+, non-Muslim and non-Turkish communities, the memory walks contribute to the dissemination of repressed, unknown, or publicly invisible histories and stories. The walks aim to open up a space for learning, reflection, remembering, and transmission of memories. They express their demand for the visibility and acknowledgment of particular stories by telling them in public. And, they express their demand for facing the past by creating everyday and

affective encounters between storytellers, participants, everyday places, and stories of the past.⁶²

Walking together is fundamental in the memory walks too. The walking body communicates and transmits meanings through rhythms and gestures (Edensor, 2000). Walking together communicates its own meanings too. First of all, collective walking attracts attention. It sparks curiosity in the people around. It may refer to a protest, a celebration, a commemoration, or a religious ritual. It may be welcomed or considered as a suspicious event. In all its versions, collective walking is a powerful act that calls for different meanings, encounters, and possibilities. In the memory walks, collective walking turns into a political act. Ecem, one of the Curious Steps storytellers, mentions how walking together turns into a demand on its own when the memory walks are faced with the interventions of the police:

Even walking as a group can be like a protest because civil police come and say, for example, why did you gather . . . Why did you gather? Because we wanted to gather. But they come and ask. That's why even walking or not being able to walk together can turn into a thing, into a political action. (Interview with Ecem, Curious Steps storyteller) (See Appendix E, 13)

In the Curious Steps walk that I participated in, I experienced the interventions of the police firsthand. The police did not stop us but followed us from behind and intervened to demand us not to stop at particular places such as the Galatasaray Square and the Taksim Square. They warned us to “cut it short” and “keep moving”. This experience has made me realize that the memory walks are indeed political acts, although most of my interlocutors have stated (or even complained) that the walks are not political enough or not politically courageous enough. It is clear that just by

⁶² Aylin Vartanyan's collaborative walking project with Armenian, half-Armenian, and Islamized Armenian women pertains to a similar kind of facing the past through everyday and affective encounters. She facilitates walks in the chosen neighborhoods and places in Istanbul combined with photography sessions and visual storytelling on digital platforms. She states that her project aims to challenge the 'denialist habitus' regarding the Armenian genocide by bringing silenced histories and stories to the surface. Influenced by expressive arts therapy and theory, she holds that searching for stories is an attempt to unravel “the knots in one's psyche” (Vartanyan, 2019, p. 22).

walking together, the walks attract the attention of the police and are considered a suspicious event to be monitored, intervened, or blocked.⁶³ These interventions created tension during the walk, but I surprisingly observed that they were also kind of welcomed. They are welcomed in the sense that they show that the police see and acknowledge these walks as political acts too.

Although the police do not really intervene in the other memory walks, walking is still a political act. Ecem mentions that even just seeing that some places are already closed by police barricades etc. gives one the feeling that “we’re doing something political”. Again, not being able to walk to particular places but insisting on telling stories about these places becomes a way of reclaiming these places.

For example, we normally tell a story in front of the İHD in Taksim. We haven’t been able to go there for a long time because the street has been closed by the police. Trying to go there, then seeing that the İHD is closed, the listeners see and become aware of the situation for the first time, and we say that we normally tell a story there, but we can’t go there right now. Because not everyone participating in the walks is extremely political or follows everything. Or most people do not go to Beyoğlu for many years, and they go there for the memory walk and see how it is today. For example, the police have surrounded the place where the Saturday Mothers stood and protested. The front of the İHD is closed. When we go to Gezi Park, civil police surround us. The fact that we can’t even be there to walk and tell stories gives people the sense that maybe we’re doing something political. (Interview with Ecem, Curious Steps storyteller) (See Appendix E, 14)

Moreover, even if there are not any direct or indirect interventions of the police, there is still the possibility that other people on the street may hear the stories and stop by to listen to them. Although it is welcomed and in no way prevented, this is something that the storytellers are intimidated by. Yaprak mentions that it “can also be unsettling because you’re so open at the time, and anything, anything could happen” (Interview with Yaprak, Karakutu storyteller). People may react in every possible

⁶³ It must be noted that these comments came from the storytellers in the Karakutu memory walks, which do not face police interventions as often as the Curious Steps walks. In the Karakutu walks, five to six people walk together, whereas the number of people rises up to 25. The higher number of people of walking together attracts more attention of the police. So, Curious Steps faces more intervention.

way; they can be curious, they may want to talk about their own knowledge or memories, or they can get mad, for example, “if a nationalist from the street passes by, there may be some things that will provoke him” (Interview with Ateş, Karakutu storyteller). Listening to these concerns has made me realize that even if my interlocutors did find the walks courageous or political enough, they actually find it challenging to tell some of these stories in public and indicate that ‘they are doing something political’ indeed.

I elaborated in this chapter that walking is a reflexive, tactical, exploratory, and political practice that enables different kinds of everyday encounters. This chapter has focused more on the encounters between walkers and urban places. In the next chapter, I will add another dimension to these encounters and look at the memory walks with a focus on emotions. I will read the affective encounters in the memory walks as experiences of facing the past, that is, experiences that bring people closer to or away from facing the past in the everyday. Indicating a political sphere beyond the encounters with the police and other people, the memory walks enable different ways of feeling and knowing, consisting of troubling questions about one’s relationship with the past and emotions and thoughts about facing the past.

CHAPTER 4

“OPENING A DOOR” TO FACING THE PAST:

AFFECTIVE ENCOUNTERS IN THE MEMORY WALKS

This chapter will give a glimpse of the encounters in the memory walks by examining some of the emotions that caught my attention during my research. Since I will focus on the emotional aspects of these encounters, I will call them ‘affective encounters’. In the previous chapter, I explained that walking offers a different and critical way of sensing and experiencing the city. I looked at how places in the memory walks are (re)made through walking and storytelling. Now, I will add the emotional aspect into the picture to answer the question: What do the memory walks *do* to their participants?⁶⁴ Drawing on how the participants express and talk about emotions, this chapter will examine different ways of feeling and knowing in the walks. As the participants learn and unlearn from the stories they tell or hear, they are moved in different ways: they reflect on their relationship with the neighborhood and the city, interpret their connection to the stories differently, question or confirm their position and role in the stories, and sometimes ask themselves troubling questions such as “Why am I here?”. Walking in-between memories, they come close to or move away from facing the past. This chapter aims to read these emotions in connection to facing the past in the everyday.

The ‘affective turn’ in the humanities and social sciences in the recent decades has encompassed a variety of fields and aroused interest in psychology, neuroscience, anthropology, sociology, political sciences, philosophy, critical and literary theory, media and cinema studies, gender studies, and more. There are

⁶⁴ Here, I refer to all people that contribute in the memory walks.

various understandings of and perspectives about affect, as well as debates over the differences between the concepts of affect, feeling, emotion, and sensation (Abu-Lughod & Lutz, 1990; Ahmed, 2013; Berlant, 2011; Berlant & Stewart, 2019; Damasio 2003; Hochschild, 1991; Lindholm, 2007; Lutz & White, 1986; Shouse, 2005; Stewart, 2007; White, 2017).

In their overview of the anthropological research on emotions, Catherine Lutz and Geoffrey M. White (1986) elaborate on the tensions between two different approaches to emotions: the universalist and positivist ones and the relativist and interpretive ones. Charles Lindholm (2007) also differentiates between the biological and essentialist approaches that search for primary emotions⁶⁵ and the cognitive and interpretive approaches that argue for the centrality of culture with regard to emotions. Whereas the essentialist approaches overvalue the psychobiological process at the cost of social interactions, the interpretive approaches focus on discourse at the expense of the body.⁶⁶ Yet, emotions cannot be understood without acknowledging the foundational role of the social as well as without giving credit to the role of the body.

The distinction between affect and emotion is relevant for this discussion too. The definition of affect as a prepersonal and “non-conscious experience of intensity” (Shouse, 2005, p. 77) pertaining to the increase or decrease in the body’s capacity to

⁶⁵ For example, Lindholm (2007) argues for the existence of universal fundamental emotional impulses in each individual but notes that these impulses are shaped but not fully determined by culture, history, and structure.

⁶⁶ The scholars of the interpretive approaches are rather skeptical of the universality and predictability of emotions and choose to focus on social interactions. For example, Catherine Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod (1990) draw on Michel Foucault’s (1972) understanding of discourse and take discourse as the “point of entry for the study of emotion” (Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990, p. 10). By examining the discourse on emotions and emotional discourses, they seek to understand how emotions attain meaning in the public sphere. For them, emotional discourses are “pragmatic acts and communicative performances” (p. 11) that can be observed in social interactions that are mostly verbal. Indeed, my analysis of the emotional aspect of the memory walks consist of verbal social interactions, emotional discourses so to say, but are not limited to them. The experiences of the body, as explained in the previous chapter, play a significant role in the memory walks as the interlocutors often mention the effects of walking and ‘being in places’ in how they feel and think.

act owes much to Spinoza's definition of affect as the "ability to affect and be affected" (p. 77). The body is crucial for the concept of affect (Massumi, 2002; Shouse, 2005; White, 2017). Emotion, on the other hand, is defined as "the projection/display of a feeling" (Shouse, 2005, p. 77) through expressions and as "feelings that fix into place through a variety of discursive practices" (White, 2017, p. 177). As insightful as these definitions are, they are also criticized by some scholars for creating an "overly polarized model of feeling that divides emotion from affect" (p. 178). Daniel White (2017) points out that there may be alternatives to the clear-cut separation of affect from emotion, alternatives that do not equate the two but work with the *affect-emotion gap*, that is, the irreconcilable gap "between how bodies feel and how subjects make sense of what they feel" (p. 177).

Sara Ahmed's discussion of René Descartes' remarks on emotions attends to the *affect-emotion gap* (2004). According to Descartes (1649), we love or hate an object, not because of the nature of the object but because we perceive it as harmful or beneficial. Our perception of an object depends on the contact we have with them and how we are affected by them. Ahmed points out that

"[t]his dependence opens up a gap in the determination of feeling: whether something is beneficial or harmful involves thought and evaluation, at the same time that it is 'felt' by the body. The process of attributing an object as being or not being beneficial or harmful... clearly involves reading the contact we have with objects in a certain way." (Ahmed, 2004, p. 6)

Rather than offering a singular theory of emotion, Ahmed focuses on the concept of contact. Her example of the encounter between the child and the bear examines how encounters are shaped by the past histories of the subject and others but not totally determined by them (p. 7). The concept of contact constitutes her model of the sociality of emotions. Moving away from the inside-out and outside-in models of emotion, Ahmed argues that the boundaries and surfaces of inside and outside are

made through our contact with objects and others. For her, movement, as well as attachment, is crucial in examining the circulation of feelings and objects of feelings.

Inspired by my interlocutors, who describe the memory walks as a “contact work [temas çalışması]” (Interview with Mete, Karakutu storyteller) and as “encounters between places, different people, and the histories of places” (Interview with Ateş, Karakutu storyteller), my understanding of emotions will also draw on the concepts of contact and encounter.⁶⁷ My “contact zone” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 14)⁶⁸ will be the memory walks that bring together bodies, places, and stories. I will focus on the emotional aspect of these encounters and call them ‘affective encounters’.

My use of the term encounter is also inspired by how Meltem Ahıska (2019) reads Bracha Ettinger and defines memory as encounter. The Saturday Mothers is an example of memory as encounter⁶⁹, which potentially brings together different experiences and memories, crossing over the categories of ethnicity, class, gender, generation, and identity, which according to Ettinger, “open[s] up to possibilities for transforming the ways we join in the traumatic events of others” (Ettinger, 2006, in Ahıska, 2019, p. 146). As my interlocutors Mete and Ateş mention, the memory walks also open up a space to encounter others by bringing together different places, histories, and people. Thinking of the memory walks as encounters will help me demonstrate the walks’ potentiality in terms of feeling, knowing, relating to the other, and facing the past. It will also help me underline the openness and in-betweenness of the experiences in the walks.

⁶⁷ I will use the concepts of feeling and emotion interchangeably and I will use the phrase ‘affective encounters’ to underline the aspect of contact.

⁶⁸ Ahmed calls her archive of different texts a “contact zone” (p. 14).

⁶⁹ A number of other works can be given as examples of memory as encounter. These include encounters between different narratives of the past and the present, between objects and people, between senses and memories, between monuments and people, etc. (Gökarıksel, 2019; Navaro-Yashin, 2009; Seremetakis, 1994).

In this chapter, I will first examine how the memory walks “open a door” regarding the distribution and visibility of the stories and experiences of facing the past. Then, I will elaborate on the connection between this opening and the ways of feeling and knowing. Thinking outside the binary of facing/not facing the past, I will look at the different ways of feeling and knowing and the troubling questions that the participants and storytellers deal with. I will read the emotions and questions about one’s responsibility and privileges as instances of thinking about one’s role and position in the past histories and today’s inequalities. In this respect, facing the past in the everyday consists of questioning one’s situatedness in the stories. The situatedness will refer to one’s relations with the histories and memories that shape the stories, the subjects of the stories (the others), and the city and urban places.

In the second half of the chapter, I will focus on particular emotions that (do not) come up in the memory walks: shame, empathy, hope, anger, curiosity, and wonder. I will see these different ways of feeling and knowing as instances of facing the past in the everyday, shaped by the different encounters between people, places, and stories. Examining the affective encounters in the memory walks will enable me to understand the connections between facing the past, walking, and ‘being in places’. Focusing on these particular emotions, I aim to give a picture of how the memory walks make their participants comfortable and uncomfortable in different ways and demonstrate how emotions can go in different directions, from denial and unequal relationships to solidarity and action.

4.1 Opening a door

As some of my interlocutors express it, the memory walks have the potential to “open a door”.⁷⁰ This opening consists of different experiences and feelings interpreted differently by the participants. What does it mean to “open a door”? Firstly, it is an opening to new or different kinds of stories, stories that are silenced, repressed, denied in the public sphere, stories that are not talked about in the public sphere, stories that are not taught in schools and history books, and stories that most of the people do not know (enough). These are the expressions used by my interlocutors when I asked them to describe the kind of stories included in the memory walks. So, this opening is related to the debates over the degree and extent of the visibility of stories in public and private spheres.

In their discussion on the liberating capacity of stories in relation to the questions of power and inequality, Francesca Polletta et al. (2011) point out that all stories are embedded in the “distribution of the sensible” (Rancière, 2006) that deems some stories credible and worth hearing, and others not worthy. The distribution of the sensible is a term by Jacques Rancière, who defines it as “the system of self-evident facts of sense perception that simultaneously discloses the existence of something in common and the delimitations that define the respective parts and positions within it” (2006, p. 12). In this regard, the memory walks aim to open the door to an alternative distribution of the sensible by bringing out less visible stories in public, especially stories about ethnic and religious communities and minorities and women’s and LGBTQI+ movements in Turkey.⁷¹

⁷⁰ The phrases “opening a door” or “half-opening a door” are mentioned by many of the interlocutors (Interviews with Karakutu storytellers Deniz, Ela, Mina, Mete, Gizem, Beril, and memory walk coordinator Güneş). They also used phrases with similar meanings such as “opening a space” (Interviews with Karakutu storytellers Beril, Gizem, Mina, Yaprak).

⁷¹ The range of stories included in the walks is of course limited. This is criticized by some of the storytellers as they find the collection of stories not inclusive enough. For example, the stories about

Besides the content, storytelling is a form of communication that opens up space for different experiences. Almost all of my interlocutors mention that even each telling of the same story is different. They underline that the flexibility and instability of the stories are what keep them interested and motivated to keep participating in the walks. So, I believe the aspect of performance, of not knowing what will happen and where the story will start or end this time, constitutes the heart of the experiences for the storytellers. The participants also underline the aspect of performance because they notice that each storyteller has their own way of storytelling and their own memories, feelings, and experiences that they share with the participants. Storytelling in the walks shares one of the most crucial characteristics of storytelling in other contexts and versions: it is a performance.

Walter Benjamin, whose writings on storytelling have been an inspiration for many scholars, describes storytelling as a craftsmanship that “is coming to an end” (2007, p. 83) because experience has lost its value against the technologies of war and inflation as a consequence of the First World War as well as the rise of the information in the twentieth century as a new form of communication.⁷² The source of storytellers, for Benjamin, is the “experience which is passed on from mouth to mouth” (p. 84). The rise of the novel, which is not based on oral tradition but printing, has marked the beginning of a different era. Comparing stories with novels,

refugees, children, disabilities, women, LGBTQI+, Alewives, Kurds, working class, etc. are found to be not represented enough. So, this alternative distribution is indeed a distribution and it is not an all-inclusive one: The Curious Steps stories are focused on gender and sex. The storytellers come up with their own suggestions of related topics. In SEHAK memory walks, the facilitators give some general topics, mostly about the non-Muslim communities in Turkey, and ask the participants to hear out the stories of the local residents in the city. On the other hand, Karakutu stories are either chosen from a list of suggestions shared with the participants or the participants choose another topic they are interested in. Overall, all the walks are limited in different ways. They choose to tell particular stories and not to tell others. But, my observation from the memory walks is that these stories, although not all-inclusive, sometimes call other stories into the walks. These stories are brought up especially in the discussion sessions; given as examples and discussed in connection to the stories in the walks. That is why I consider the everyday in the memory walks as multi-directional.

⁷² So, Benjamin’s understanding of storytelling has a particular socio-economic context. For him, the art of storytelling belongs to a particular era that has given way to modernity and the storyteller is almost like a craftsman, who vanishes together with their craft.

Benjamin makes insightful remarks: The storyteller draws his material from their experience of that of others and “makes it the experience of those who are listening” (p. 87), whereas the novelist is solitary, “uncounseled and cannot counsel others” (p. 87). Stories leave questions out in the open, whereas novels have a definite ending. The end of the storytelling era is also connected with the dissemination of another form of communication, which is much faster, plausible, and claims to be verifiable: information. The main characteristic of information is that it explains everything it tells and aims to be plausible, whereas “it is half the art of storytelling to keep a story free from explanation” (p. 89).

Unlike Benjamin’s storytelling, the stories in the memory walks are based not only on orally transmitted stories. They are products of archival and oral research. They are also shaped by personal and collective memories. Also, in contrast to the opposition between information and story in Benjamin, the stories in the memory walks contain both: information and the feelings of the storytellers, their connections with the stories, and personal memories about places and stories. Sharing these feelings and memories is partly planned and partly spontaneous: The storytellers plan and rehearse what they would tell and how they would tell it before the walks. They also think about their own connections to the story and reasons for choosing this particular story. But, as they tell the story in that particular moment, they do not tell it according to the plan and the written material. This brings us to the main common point in Benjamin’s stories, and stories in the memory walks: the open-endedness in the performances of storytelling.

Rather than giving information or revealing the ‘truth’, the memory walks aim to make people ask questions and leave them unanswered. Each telling of a story is different, even if it is the same story. In each telling, the storyteller tells it in a

different order, with a different mood, adds or takes out some details, and focuses on a different aspect of the story. Also, in each telling, the participants react in different ways, make different comments and thereby give the stories a different direction. Moreover, the environment, that is, the place where the story is told, is never the same: different encounters happen on different days. Therefore, even when meticulously planned, the stories remain open. They are never finished; things may be added, taken out, or changed as a result of the contributions of storytellers, participants, interviewees, and passers-by.

Besides being an opening to different stories and performances of storytelling, the memory walks are an opening to facing the past, or at least to discussions on facing the past. When asked if the memory walks provide an experience of facing the past, my interlocutors gave such diverse answers that it must be said that there is no consensus on this matter. First, I was surprised by the range of their answers: some say absolutely no, some yes, and some are not certain. But, almost all of them agree that “it might facilitate the very beginning of facing the past [belki de çok çok başlangıcı ile ilgili bir şeye imkan tanıyordur]” (Interview with Yaprak) and that it “opens the door slightly [kapıyı minicik aralıyor olabilir minicik]” (Interview with Gizem) to such an experience. Through this opening, facing the past is described and experienced as an everyday and affective matter that involves practices of memory work and practices of walking and ‘being there’. Nisan mentions that she understands facing the past as an indirect and personal practice that starts from one’s personal life and extends to others:

What we do is a practice of confronting a past indirectly. First, while doing a research in our personal little lives, we try to find a different narrative about the difficult past that was forgotten and distorted. For this, we are trying to go beyond the sources given to us in the mainstream history already given. This is primarily a practice of facing the past in our own little lives. Then we tell it

to other people. So we have a claim to face the past. (Interview with Nisan, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 15)

Most interlocutors differentiate facing the past in the memory walks from facing the past in legal and policy-related meanings. The memory walks are defined as a time and space that opens the discussion of a more personal way of facing the past. Here, facing the past is “only a start”. It is indirect, and it becomes possible by turning everyday places into extraordinary places, places that are in-between and imagined. As Deniz underlines, being there is crucial in being influenced by stories and opening oneself to (new) ways of feeling and knowing, which are seen as the first steps of facing the past:

How is that not impressive? It offers a direct facing of the past, and there is something physical as well. You are in the place, you are there with your presence, and you are listening to the story of the place. The issue of facing the past is, of course, a very big word. Is this exactly what it means? It is not, but it opens a door. It leaves a question mark in people’s minds, an emotion [about the fact that] there is something that has happened here [in this place]. Facing the past, I think, is a much more comprehensive thing. Can we do it with a memory walk right away, no, but this is a step. And, I can say it seems like a very impressive step. (Interview with Deniz, Karakutu storyteller & board member) (See Appendix E, 16)

4.1.1 Situatedness: Ways of feeling and knowing

The opening of a door to different stories and experiences of facing the past is intimately connected with different ways of feeling and knowing that emerge through encounters with everyday places, stories of the past, and people in the stories, in the walks, and the streets. Let me point out that these feelings and knowledge do not have to be new. There can be new *ways* of feeling and knowing them. By ‘ways of feeling and knowing’, I mean how the memory walks call all of its participants to feel and know in particular ways by moving them closer to or away from places, people, and stories. They not only call the participants to feel in particular ways but also draw the boundaries of what, when, towards or against whom, and whether they

feel something. In the following sections, I will draw a picture of these emotions and the ways in which they “go round,” as Ahmed (2004, p. 16) puts it into words. Now, I will elaborate on how the ways of feeling and knowing are related to situatedness.

I want to turn to the literature on representation, which argues for the irrepresentability of an event. Looking at a couple of examples that extensively deal with this issue in the context of the Holocaust can provide some answers. For example, the testimonial text of Primo Levi (1959) and the work of Giorgio Agamben (1999) based on Levi’s and other testimonial texts are skeptical about the possibility of bearing witness to life and death in the concentration camps. The theoretical works of Marc Nichanian on the *Catastrophe*, as he refuses to use the word genocide, also point out the impossibility of bearing witness and mourning as well as “the disintegration of language” (Nichanian 2016, in Artuç, 2021, p. 2). According to Nichanian, the *Catastrophe* cannot be put into words or turned into a coherent and complete narrative (Artuç, 2021, 2022; Yıldız, 2021). I will not delve into the discussions on the possibility of bearing witness⁷³, but I want to point out that a complete representation of an event or a representation of an event ‘exactly as it was’ is neither possible nor aimed when telling stories.

In “Regarding the Pain of Others” (2003), Susan Sontag gives examples from photography and points out that, even if the photograph is not staged (created by the directives of the photographer), it cannot be seen as an exact replica of an event. In photography, as well as other forms of representation, there is always a subject that

⁷³ Debates on bearing witness are not limited to the above-mentioned points or works. There are also works that define witnessing in alternative ways that expand the boundaries and possibilities of bearing witness (Felman & Laub, 1992; Hirsch, 2012; Taylor, 2006). For example, examining the gatherings of the Saturday Mothers, Meltem Ahıska (2019) critically engages with the separation of victims and bystanders as well as the past and the present, which creates the boundaries of what is and what is not witnessing (inside-outside). Accordingly, the Saturday Mothers “offer a political performance and witnessing that creates a new space-time for the dialogue between the inside and outside in both meanings” (2019, p. 139).

determines the boundaries of what to include and exclude. Every representation is constituted of a frame and a point of view.

A similar logic applies with regard to storytelling too. In their article on the Curious Steps memory walks, Bürge Abiral, Ayşe Gül Altınay, Dilara Çalışkan, and Armanç Yıldız (2019) underline the situatedness of knowledge, bodies, and places as well as the lack of knowledge, silences, and gaps. Drawing on Donna Haraway's concept of "situated knowledges" (1988), they describe the walks as "situated feminist storytelling". Coined by Haraway, the term "situated knowledges" is a move away from the objectivity-relativism duality to an acknowledgment of the partiality of perspective and vision without letting go of the claim of objectivity. Neither the understanding of objectivity as impartiality, as the "god trick of seeing everything from nowhere" (Haraway, 1988, p. 581), nor the denial of any claim of objectivity, Haraway offers an understanding of vision that is partial, embodied, incomplete, and contradictory (Rogowska-Stangret, 2018).

I agree with Abiral et al. (2019) that the memory walks⁷⁴ are made of "situated storytelling" that offers "new meanings, new understandings, and new ways of knowing" (p. 99). In the memory walks, situated storytelling refers to the flexible, partial, and incomplete character of the stories that differ from the official histories circulating in the public sphere and are shaped by the dominant politics of memory in Turkey. The difference between situated storytelling and the god-like perspective is related to the content and form of the stories. In terms of content, they are mostly micro-stories such as the life history of a person, the history of a building, etc. In terms of form, the stories are not necessarily chronological or filled with information.

⁷⁴ They only mention Curious Steps walks but I include Karakutu and SEHAK memory walks too.

They are told in different ways in each walk and they contain personal memories, feelings, and thoughts.

The situated storyteller is a subject that thinks about their own position with regard to the stories. When telling their story, they consider their positionality and tell the story accordingly. They are not necessarily a subject that knows and tells but rather a subject that thinks about the stories and their relation to them. Abiral et al. (2019) give importance to situatedness because reflecting on it can mean reflecting on the privileges or disadvantages one has concerning ethnicity, religion, gender, etc., not only for the storytellers but also for the participants of the walks.

Beyond the institutional privileges, the participants and storytellers often share their own stories of privilege and access during the walks or the discussions that often follow them. One of the potentially transformative characteristics of Curious Steps is its invitation to all walkers to reflect on their own “situatedness” and privileges. (Abiral et al., 2019, p. 101)

To Abiral et al.’s argument, I would add that the memory walks also offer (new) ways of feeling, ways that can change their relationship with not only the city, the past, and the present but also themselves. I use the word ‘offer’ to underline that the memory walks do not necessarily change how people feel, make meaning, and relate to the places, pasts, and themselves but provide such an offer, which I call, an opening. Thinking about this opening with a focus on emotions will contribute to the discussion of experiences of facing the past in the everyday, which is connected to questions about one’s relationship with the past, one’s investments and attachments with the ongoing structures of denial, violence, inequality as well as one’s acknowledgment or detachment from them. In this sense, reflecting on and asking troubling questions regarding privileges shows their role in these structures and their situatedness.

4.1.2 “Why am I here?”: Troubling questions

Whether accepted or cast aside by the participants, the memory walks bring out some questions. Each participant makes their own mind about what to do with these questions. As I call them, these are troubling questions because they directly or indirectly call the participants to question their own relationships and roles in the stories they hear. The questions can be about one’s relationship and way of living in the city, one’s knowledge of and beliefs about the past events and atrocities that have shaped and continue to shape the society and politics in Turkey, one’s own position, privileges, and disadvantages (if there are any) concerning ethnicity, class, gender, etc. and one’s reactions and feelings about the stories that deal with these issues. I see these questions as troubling because finding what to do with them, let alone answering them, can make one uncomfortable. As I see it, feeling uncomfortable can signify that one leaves the ways of feeling and knowing that one is used to. I argue that the memory walks provide neither a ‘sheltered’ experience of (re)confirming nor a total shattering of one’s position and accustomed ways of feeling and knowing. Instead, the walks provide experiences that lie somewhere in-between, between feelings of comfort and discomfort, and between facing the past and denying or escaping from it.⁷⁵

To understand the connection between one’s “situatedness”, ways of feeling and knowing and facing the past, I will focus on a common issue that all three of the memory walks deal with: the formation of the national identity and the denial, repression, or invisibility of memories that do not quite fit into the official and dominant historiography. Therefore, I will now turn to the scholars who write on the formation of national identity and look at how they understand the connection

⁷⁵ It can be argued that the in-betweenness of the experiences in the memory walks is a sign of the failure of the walks, but I think that the in-betweenness is something to hold on to understand this opening.

between emotions and national identity. For example, discussing how Turkishness is constructed, maintained, and questioned, Barış Ünlü (2016) describes Turkishness as a “bundle” (p. 400), a collection of privileges, knowledge, and emotions.⁷⁶ More specifically, it is defined as “a patterned but mostly unrecognized relationship between Turkish individuals’ ethnic position and their ways of seeing, hearing, feeling and knowing – as well as *not* seeing, *not* hearing, *not* feeling and *not* knowing” (p. 398, original italics). The so-called Turkishness contract is secured not only by various legal, economic, ideological, and coercive policies of the state but also by “strategies of escape [that] protect the individual from feeling potentially dangerous moral emotions about the ethnically oppressed, massacred and marginalized” (p. 400). These moral emotions, specified as shame and guilt, destabilize one’s comfort in the privileges one has. In this framework, escaping refers to an active effort of not knowing, unknowing, and not feeling, whereas not escaping is associated with feelings of shame, guilt, and loss of privilege and comfort.⁷⁷ So, feelings and positions of comfort pertain to how the subjects hold on to and invest in their positions and privileges, whereas feelings of discomfort are related to the experiences of facing one’s privileges, investments, and relationships with the past.

⁷⁶ I refer to the discussions and concepts introduced and examined by Barış Ünlü (2016; 2018) as I believe his conceptualizations will contribute to my understanding of the role of emotions in experiences of facing the past. Inspired by critical whiteness studies, Ünlü examines the relations of ethnicity and privilege in the history of the Turkish Republic and proposes to see Turkishness as a contract.

⁷⁷ Feelings of shame and guilt may not be the only feelings when people face their privileges and question their position within the structures of inequality, violence, and racism. Or, escaping may involve feeling in addition to not feeling. Overall, one’s relationship with regard to one’s identity, national identity in this example, may not simply be categorized under escaping or not escaping.

Offering a different definition of Turkishness than the contract⁷⁸, Umut Tümay Arslan (2015) draws on Butler's (1997) reading of Foucault and sees power as a political and psychic force that forms the subject's subjectivity. Rather than an external force that the subject internalizes, power shapes the very conditions of the existence of the subject. In this view, Turkishness constantly demands emotional investment and participation from its subjects; it cannot be seen as a closed agreement. It is defined as

a form of social power that repeats itself in different political discourses, produces its subjects, becomes invisible, and vanishes in thin air when subjects speak with a belief in their own autonomy, in short, it succeeds in turning subjects back to themselves again and again. (Arslan, 2015, my translation) (See Appendix E, 17)

According to Arslan's definition of Turkishness, identities are constantly (re)produced and invested in. Different from Ünlü's framework, this framework makes more room for multiple experiences that cannot be categorized under a fixed schema of feeling, knowing, and escaping. My analysis of the emotions in the memory walks an attempt to examine the ways in which the participants walk around in-between facing and not facing the past, between feeling comfortable and uncomfortable. Rather than looking at the walks from a binary perspective of facing and not facing the past, I see walking as a critical experience that can ignite comfortable as well as uncomfortable feelings, thoughts, and positions, where the participants struggle to position themselves in what they hear and learn. Walking in-between, one can go in different directions.

In this respect, I find Arslan's (2021) offer to examine how we fail to face the past quite significant as it moves away from the binary understanding of facing/escaping and feeling/not feeling. The "broken performances" (p. 136) with

⁷⁸ According to Arslan (2015), the idea of the contract falls short of explaining how Turkishness is constructed and maintained on a daily basis because it refers to an agreement that is finished and closed, an agreement that succeeds to keep its subjects together.

regard to facing the past demonstrate how we attempt to face the past, fail again and again in different ways, and return to denial and investing in the ethos. I agree with Arslan that examining the broken performances, or as I call them, the in-between performances can be more insightful than examining successful scenes of facing the past. These performances can show us more about how and why it is difficult to deal with a difficult past. They can teach us why a total overcoming of the past is impossible and why it should not be the aim. Also, they can push us to think about our actions, privileges, and emotional investments today, showing us that the past is not in the past, that it has been rewritten in the present, and we have a part in it. Overall, these performances can make us realize that there are multiple ways of seeing and relating to the past, and how we see the past changes the present.

In which ways are the memory walks in-between experiences? As mentioned, many storytellers of the memory walks underline that a total facing of the past is not possible only by walking in the city and note that it can only “open a door”. Clearly, attending a one-day event is not a self transformative event through which individuals change their way of living and seeing things, their perspective on the world, the past, and the present, and how they define themselves. The memory walks are only a step into such changes if one decides to take this route.

Many of the stories in the walks demonstrate the ways in which the Turkish Republic and Turkishness are constructed through eliminating, deporting, discriminating, and making invisible the ethnic and religious others. Hearing these stories, the participants think about the meanings and consequences of being a Turk, a Muslim, a Sunni, or not being one. Encountering these stories, the participants may take the step to face their own situatedness. For example, even a simple question as

“Why I am here?” can turn into a questioning of one’s identities, privileges, and relationship with others:

As I said, there is a type of person accepted by the Turkish Republic: secular, Hanafi, Sunni, Muslim, Turkish. I actually fit all of them. I do not have any minority background . . . At first, it actually seemed very strange to people that I was there. For a while, I questioned that too. I wonder why I am here? . . . I wonder if I have to be here? I was thinking about these for a while. (Interview with Irmak, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 18)

I am not in any of the groups that are “targeted”. Myself and my family. I mean, ethnically. A thought occurred to me about this. I am defending the worldview I am in right now, but I am defending it without being subjected to such bullying. Those people paid a much higher price for it. [After the walk] I also felt bad, I remember that I could not get out of its influence for a few days. If I had stayed in such an environment with my own worldview, would I have been maintaining the same view with the same force? In these few days, I was both happy to learn these things, and frankly, I went through a process where I questioned myself. (Interview with Beren, Karakutu memory walk participant) (See Appendix E, 19)

These questions are troubling because they turn the gaze back to oneself. In line with Arslan’s (2016; 2021) point on the importance of turning the gaze back to ‘us’ when facing the past, they offer a chance to reflect on how we carry the burden of the past generations, how we are directly or indirectly involved and implicated in the past events and the present conditions and structures of inequality, violence, and denial. Creating an uncomfortable position for the self, this gaze calls oneself to question one’s position and role, belief in innocence, and involvement in the habitus one lives in, which denies, normalizes, or covers up past crimes. If one chooses to tackle these questions, they may lead to feelings of discomfort, which Clare Hemmings (2012) calls affective dissonance, that is, the lack of fit between our embodied sense of self and the self we are expected to be. For Hemmings, different affects such as rage, frustration, desire for connection, and more can be the basis of affective dissonance. In my analysis of emotions in the memory walks, I will see the feelings of discomfort as examples of affective dissonance. Offering an alternative approach to feminist politics, Hemmings argues that experiences of discomfort

may be a productive basis from which to seek solidarity with others, not based in a shared identity or on a presumption about how the other feels, but on also feeling the desire for transformation out of the experience of discomfort, against the odds. (Hemmings, 2012, p. 158)

If one follows this opening that comes with new ways of feeling and knowing, which can sometimes be troubling, such an alternative relationship with the past and the others may indeed be possible. I will now explain how particular ways of feeling tackle this opening.

4.2 Feeling too much or too little

The experiences of feeling and not feeling are popular among storytellers, especially in cases where they describe some stories as “difficult”. When asked to explain, the interlocutors refer to stories of violence, death, and loss, such as the Armenian Genocide, 6-7 September Events, the murder of Hrant Dink, the life story of Gomidas Vartabed, and so on. What they mean is not that the stories are difficult, but that their encounters with these stories are difficult. Especially the storytellers, who spend much more time researching, writing, and telling these stories, talk extensively on the issue of difficulty: To what extent should they bear the heavy burden of a story? To what extent should they distance themselves? All of these concerns and their responses to them are referred to as experiences of “dealing with difficult stories”. Responding to my questions on what they think and feel about telling the same stories over and over and how they deal with difficult stories, they raise their thoughts and concerns on feeling (too much) and not feeling (feeling too little).

When telling stories, the storytellers aim to make the participants interested, curious, and connected to the stories. That is, they aim to make them feel. To do that, they tell their own connections with the stories, for example, why they have chosen to work on and tell this story, what they find interesting or significant, and what the

story means for their personal history. On the other hand, they are also careful not to overload and “traumatize” the participants. In the case of difficult stories, they pay much more attention to different kinds of “sensitivities” of people. For example, they try to use politically correct and inclusive language. They refrain from giving details of violence as giving excessive details is considered to result in the traumatization of people or a state of emotional overload such as a shock.

Besides the concerns about the participants’ relation to the stories, their own relationships with the stories are also a topic of discussion. Some storytellers mention that they find it difficult or heavy to work on, do research, and tell some of the stories. For example, conducting research on torture, doing oral history research with the Saturday Mothers, or telling the same stories over and over are considered to be emotionally difficult:

If I had cried in my first narration, I would have said that I could not stand this emotional load, and I cried, but in my tenth narration, not one, not two, not three, but tenth, I could not hold back my tears because it was too heavy . . . We work on difficult subjects, namely tortures, prisons, migrations, genocides, the subjects that turn people’s lives upside down. We unearth them and explore them thoroughly, and then we tell people about it. Now, it is not an easy thing to deal with this . . . Here, we often ignore the researcher. (Interview with Nisan, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 20)

Nisan also mentions that the difficulties that the storytellers may face are sometimes overlooked.⁷⁹ By that, she means that memory walks should not be treated as an experience only for the participants of the walks but that they include the experiences of the storytellers, too, such as the difficulties they face and the emotional aspect of their memory work. She resembles the storyteller to a researcher and the storyteller’s work to the researcher’s work. As mentioned in chapter one, memory work is compared to or considered a form of research on memory. In the interviews, most of

⁷⁹ Memory studies also do not quite pay attention to the position and emotions of the researchers that study the traumatic memories of others. There are also scholars that deal with how the researchers are affected, how they feel and deal with the difficulties they face. The works on memory work can be an example (Kuhn, 2002; 2010).

the storytellers underlined the emotional aspect of their work and stated that the memory walks cannot be examined only by focusing on the experiences of the participants.

When I asked my storyteller interviewees about the difficulties they face, they mentioned their need to talk more about what they go through in the research and storytelling processes. In cases where they find themselves overburdened with feelings, they may feel the need to distance themselves. Whether there is a space to share experiences, feelings, and coping strategies is crucial in handling these difficult encounters. If there is no such space or it is not enough, distancing oneself is seen as a way to prevent traumatization and ensure one's emotional well-being. Distancing may involve changing the story one tells or, as Nisan mentions, retreating from storytelling altogether for a while:

At that time, I was very obsessed with the Armenian Genocide. I was constantly reading and writing about it . . . I could not deal with this issue for a long time. After that, I took distance. I left all this for a while. I said okay, I do not want to work, I do not want to see, I do not want to know. So, it was a protection mechanism. It was not something I did very consciously. But for a while, I was distant. How is it now, you ask? I feel like I have distanced myself. It seems like I can tell it much more easily now. (Interview with Nisan, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 21)

On the other hand, telling the same story over and over may create a distance too.

This is rather an involuntary distance, also referred to as alienation by the storytellers, resulting from the routinization of storytelling. In these cases, the storytellers start to feel disconnected from the stories, they get used to them and tell them in a monotonous and cold way, as if they are “on automatic pilot” (Interview with Ateş, Karakutu storyteller) or by heart, but without any feelings:

Storytelling can become a monotonous, daily activity after a while. I think it has a bit of a result of looking at the issue from a cold place. So when I say a cold place, I mean getting away from the issue [the story] itself. I mean, because it becomes monotonous, it is like a memorized activity that has been

done many times for the storytellers who have memorized the texts.
(Interview with Sidar, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 22)

This is another kind of distancing associated with not feeling or feeling too little, whereas the former version is associated with feeling too much and not being able to deal with it. So, we can say that there are multiple and contradictory experiences that oscillate between feeling and not feeling. Suppose we understand it as a spectrum of feelings with different ends. In that case, the two opposite ends that I have mentioned here result in a distancing, moving away from having a relationship with the stories and backing away from positioning oneself in the picture. I will now look at the feelings and ways of feeling that lie between these opposites. Various feelings such as empathy, hope, anger, curiosity, and wonder shape how the storytellers and participants⁸⁰ in the walks position themselves and relate to the stories, others, themselves, and the city.

4.3 Relating to the pain of others: shame and empathy

Relating to the pain of others is usually associated with feelings like empathy, shame, compassion, pity, or guilt, which denote different kinds of relations with the other. Here, I will only mention shame and empathy, as they came out as relevant for the experiences of facing the past in the memory walks in my research. I will argue that feeling and not feeling shame and empathy, although in diverse ways, enable one to move away from taking on the responsibility for the past and facing the past.

Before my field research and interviews, I expected shame to be one of the much-referred feelings when talking about the difficult stories of violence and loss.

But, neither in the memory walks nor in the interviews I encountered a thorough

⁸⁰ I will not differentiate between the participants and storytellers but it must be noted that some feelings are much more associated with the participants, whereas some others with the storytellers. But, the emotions I will examine in this chapter are relevant for both groups, although in different degrees and ways).

discussion or expression of shame. What I encountered, to my surprise, was the denial of and avoidance of talking about or expressing shame. Shame was only mentioned once when my interlocutor Cansu was explaining her thoughts on whether the memory walks can be seen as a practice of facing the past:

If I think of the people who did it at that time as a lineage, then I should perceive them as if they were my lineage and feel ashamed of myself, that is, my own lineage. But I did not personalize it in any way . . . Because it was happening everywhere and it was a policy. (Interview with Cansu, Karakutu memory walk participant) (See Appendix E, 23)

As Cansu clearly points out, feeling shame seems out of context for the participants of the memory walks because shame is associated with responsibility. In their view, since they are not responsible for what happened, they do not (have to) feel shame. There is an understanding of responsibility that involves a direct causal relationship; to be responsible for something means that one's direct actions have caused harm for another. Other understandings of responsibility, such as collective responsibility, are not discussed. I believe that seeing responsibility only related to direct individual actions affects what the participants think and feel about facing the past. Asking my interlocutors if the walks provide an experience of facing the past, I realized that most of them are not sure: some say yes, some no, and some say yes and no. The ones who say no underline that facing the past is a long and complex process that cannot be actualized just by one day of walking. They think of the walks as a door that opens to such an experience or a starting point. There are also ones that say no because they think they do not need to face the past since they do not have any responsibility. Facing the past, like shame, is linked with direct responsibility. It is described as a matter that concerns state policies and legal procedures, or the perpetrators and victims, but not them, the post-generations:

In other words, I think it [facing the past] both exists and does not exist because, at one point, you are saying that I did not do this, I did not cause

this, I cannot take responsibility for something that those before me did. But from now on, I can make an effort to make sure that nothing like this happens. (Interview with Ela, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 24)

So, talking about facing the past from this perspective may result in the denunciation of responsibility and the denial of acknowledging one's involvement and implicatedness.⁸¹ As I have seen, talking about feeling shame and not feeling shame throws us back into the common-sense definitions of facing the past and does not provide a space to discuss the everyday experiences of facing the past that the walks make possible.⁸²

Another way of relating to the other, which can be discussed in relation to facing the past, is the feeling of empathy. In the walks and the interviews, empathy has been much more referred than shame. In the context of the walks, empathy can be a feeling that covers up the implicatedness of the subject by distributing and demonstrating care. It also (re)produces an unequal relationship, where the focus is on the one who empathizes. But, empathy also involves a desire to connect with and understand the other (in the stories). As I go through various aspects of empathy, I will show that empathy works in different ways but ultimately sets a boundary between the self and the other and prevents facing the past and the other.

More of a twentieth century word, empathy is a kind of fellow-feeling, where the one who empathizes comes close to understanding and feeling the way the other

⁸¹ In *The Implicated Subject* (2019), Rothberg introduces the concept of the implicated subject: a figure that stands between the victim and the perpetrator, but also cannot be categorized as the bystander. The implicated subject is “the one who participates in injustice, but in indirect ways” (p. 20). His usage of the concept of implication refers to the forms of indirect participation, “where indirect agency and complex causality are at play” (p. 14), such as responsibility in structural inequalities. Aiming to move away from a discourse of guilt to an understanding of historical, political, and collective responsibility, Rothberg suggests the concept of implication as it “draws attention to how we are ‘folded-into’ (im-plied-in) events that at first seem beyond our agency as individual subjects” (p. 1).

⁸² In her analysis of expressions of shame in the case of the Sorry Books in Australia, Ahmed (2004; 2005) looks at the expressions of shame and concludes in a similar vein. She points out how expressing and feeling shame works to throw off the responsibility and recover the national identity. In her case, expressing shame is a way to jump to the feeling of national pride for non-aboriginal Australians. The expression of shame does not result in facing the past, although it has been commonly associated with matters like responsibility and apology.

feels. Lynne Henderson (1987) defines empathy as a mode of understanding with three meanings: “feeling the emotion of another; understanding the experience of that other person; and...the specific feeling of sympathy and or compassion for a person” (Woodward, 2004, p. 64). In “open[ning] a window on the experiences of others” (Hemmings, 2012, p. 151), empathy challenges the opposition between feeling and knowing, the self and the other. The boundaries between feeling and knowing conflate as the one who empathizes comes to ‘know’ the feelings of the other.

Also, empathy is usually understood as an individual emotion and a matter of personal agency (Garber, 2004), or even a capability. For example, one of the storytellers, Irmak, mentions that volunteering in Karakutu has enabled her to get out of her “confined space” and helped her to improve her empathy skills. Clare Hemmings (2012) also mentions that some scholars think of empathy as “a minimal requirement for caring for others at all” (p. 151).⁸³ So, empathy is a positive feeling associated with care, understanding, and openness. It can be described as an enlargement of one’s world because it opens up the self to the world of the other. If not a total understanding and feeling of the other, at its least, empathy refers to a desire to do so. As well as a desire to connect, it is also a reason to stay connected too, as Deniz mentions:

And every time I attend a walk, I think that more than half of the people get goosebumps and everyone is very impressed, [they] bond, learn new stories, and actually the reason they love the environment is that they somehow empathize with it. (Interview with Deniz, Karakutu storyteller & board member) (See Appendix E, 25)

As a desire for connection, empathy has a certain amount of potential. It takes courage to try to understand someone else, open eyes and ears, and see and feel things from their point of view. Empathy, as an act that opens the self to the

⁸³ In feminist discussions on empathy, the understanding of empathy as a form of care is criticized as it can easily lead to the idea that empathy is a natural gift of women (Hemmings, 2012).

unknown experiences of the other, is considered a ground for coming together and solidarity (Woodward, 2004). The question is: Solidarity with whom? I will argue that it is solidarity with the fellow empathizers, that is, the storytellers and participants in the case of the memory walks and not solidarity with the others one empathizes with.

A couple of points hinder empathy from being a relationship of solidarity with others. Firstly, empathy presupposes that the pain of the other can be understood or felt. But, in fact, pain is a solitary experience⁸⁴ that no one else can experience or understand to the fullest extent (Ahmed, 2004). Ahmed points out that we must begin not from the assumption that we can understand the others' pain but from the realization that the others' pain is unachievable and incomprehensible to us. As opposed to the empathetic identification that ironically results in "rather a 'passive' posture" (Woodward, 2004, p. 71), Berlant and Ahmed offer other ways to relate to the other, which emphasize more involvement and action.

Secondly, when it is assumed that one can understand and feel what the other feels, empathy becomes a relationship of care and understanding, which does not necessarily lead to action, or, most possibly, overshadow it. Feeling empathy, seen as a demonstration of care for the other, can become a celebration on its own. The scene of empathy can become a scene of peace, reconciliation, and healing that denies or disregards the need to take any other action other than showing care. Establishing an equal relationship with the other or acknowledging one's direct and indirect involvement in the pain and suffering of the other is out of the picture when empathy becomes a way to redeem oneself.

⁸⁴ Although solitary, it is not a private experience because it requires a witness that cannot understand (Ahmed, 2004).

Thirdly, empathy prioritizes the position of the one who empathizes, but not the one who is empathized with. Therefore, by focusing “on the reflexive capacities of the empathetic subject as the primary way of resolving difficulties of misrecognition or hostility” (Hemmings, 2012, p. 152), empathy reinforces the unequal relationship between the one who gives empathy and who receives it. One of the Karakutu storytellers, Ateş, also mentions: “When you make too much empathy, it comes to a stupid point. I do not want to turn into Angelina Jolie, who takes pictures with black kids.[Çok da empati yaptığımızda gerçekten saçma bir noktaya geliyor. Siyahi çocuklarla fotoğraf çektiren Angelina Jolie'ye dönmek istemiyorum ben.]” (Interview with Ateş). As a result of the focus on the empathizer, it is usually assumed that if one empathizes in the right way⁸⁵, the other will unquestionably accept it. Empathy assumes reciprocity, but the other side of the relationship is overlooked. There can be cases when the other side does not want to be part of this relationship; they may not desire to be understood, and they may be angry at, disgusted by, or afraid of the one who empathizes.

For all of the reasons above, I will not consider empathy as a way to face the past, the other, and the self. My observations in the memory walks and my interviews also proved these points, showing that empathy is a relationship with the other (or a desire for a relationship), but it is highly that the other is not there (or wants to be there). Instead, empathy is a way to feel good about oneself by feeling bad. Feelings of empathy in the memory walks result in solidarity with the fellow participants and storytellers rather than solidarity with the others in the stories. The participants and

⁸⁵ It is assumed that there are good and bad forms of empathy and some of the above-mentioned problems such as not leading to action or assuming that one feels and knows the other’s feelings can be argued as failed or bad forms of empathy. Although distinguishing between good and bad forms might be valuable for some discussions, it misses out that the other party, the one who is empathized with, can choose not to accept this kind of relationship no matter if it is good or bad (Hemmings, 2012).

storytellers come together by feeling bad about others. Here, the focus is not on the complexity and incomprehensibility of others' experiences but on being together to show a desire to understand. In sum, it can be concluded that feelings of empathy in the memory walks start from a desire to understand the other but end in an unequal relationship, in which one demonstrates care rather than thinking about one's implication in the stories.

4.4 Ending with or beginning from hope

Another emotion frequently referred to in the interviews, and the memory walks is hope. There is no clear answer whether feelings of hope lead to facing the past or not, but clearly, hope provides an openness and a purpose. Most importantly, hope keeps people going. Hope in the memory walks has different versions. In the case of hopeless hope, as in cruel optimism (Berlant, 2011), hope can result in waiting for a never coming return. But, in the case of an alternative hope, to keep going can refer to an openness to change and letting go at the same time (Ahmed, 2004). Feelings of hope in the memory walks are grounded in a feeling of community. Who constitutes this community? How does this community come into existence?

One version of hope in the memory walks can be summarized as “ending with hope”, meaning that the ending of each storytelling and memory walk is expected to end with positive feelings like hope. To keep the participants positive when bringing them together with difficult stories is one of the aims of the memory walks, as most storytellers and memory walk coordinator İpek mention:

Sometimes the topics are really heavy, but in fact, it [the memory walks] has a goal of not telling the topics too heavily. In other words, trying to explain without dramatizing it and connecting it to a place that gives hope in the end, [for example], a struggle. Or, let us say, if the protagonist of the story could not struggle, it could also be talking about the following [and ongoing]

struggle to keep it remembered . . . We try to do that a little bit, so we aim not to end it with a hopeless ending. (Interview with İpek) (See Appendix E, 26)

Although this is the aim, some storytellers mention that they sometimes find it difficult to feel hopeful or positive and struggle with ending with hope. Ending positively or with hope refers to an end that highlights the resistances of the people that fight against the injustices in the past or today, the social movements, protests, and any kind of legal or political success. But, it may not be possible to end every story this way or not every storyteller may choose to end this way. Besides, even when the stories end positively, not every participant may accept the calling to end with hope. Although it is an alternative calling that stands against the current political regime, it jumps over the part where people question their own involvement in the current order and their implicatedness in the past atrocities or the part where they feel sad, angry, or bad in general. Accepting this hope would be an easy way out.

‘Ending with hope’ can be seen as another example of cruel optimistic attachments that Lauren Berlant (2011) examines. According to Berlant, cruel optimism is “a relation of attachment to compromised conditions of possibility whose realization is discovered either to be impossible, sheer fantasy, or too possible, and toxic” (p. 24). In cruel optimistic attachments, for example, in hopeless hope, one invests in the object of hope and waits for the return of the investment, but the return is endlessly deferred. Ahmed (2004) calls these cases hope as a lost object. Hope as a positive ending in the walks is also a cruel optimistic attachment because hope loses its object too. It loses its object by sticking to it so much that one does not think about it anymore. This version of hope can mean that the participants leave the walk with a hopeful and positive feeling without ever thinking further about what they hope for, what they stand against, what kinds of actions they can take to

contribute to the future, and so on. Hope, in this scenario, is an ending rather than a beginning.

Anna Potamianou's (1997) discussion of hope in relation to stubbornness is relevant here. Potamianou argues that hope can function as a stubbornness that includes attempts to sustain optimism for irreparable objects. Here, stubbornness is the insistence to cling to an object that does not return one's investment, that is, a lost cause. Clinging to a hopeless object is a way of not letting go of the things that are not of service. The stubbornness prevents one from seeing that one may have to let go of certain things, invest in new things, and make new attachments to keep going. In 'hope as an ending', stubbornness is an insistence on feeling good instead of feeling bad or desperate. The stubbornness for ending with a positive feeling turns into a way to overlook troubling questions that open the door to facing the past. Without investing in or dealing with these questions such as "Why am I here?", "What can I do now?", etc., there cannot be a facing of the past in the everyday.

Hope as a positive ending is not the only kind of hope, though. Sometimes hope comes not from the ending of the story in particular but from the experiences of collective listening and walking. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the memory walks offer a critical way of coming together and walking together, in which the everyday overflows the ordinary and habitual ways of walking and experiencing the city. Through collective walking and listening, each walk creates a community consisting of storytellers and participants, which Abiral et al. (2019) call "a liminal community of witnessing and co-resistance" (p. 99). I am a bit skeptical to define the encounters in the memory walks as co-witnessing and co-resistance, as Abiral et. al (2019) argue in their article on the Curious Steps memory walks. The article gives the example of the Galatasaray Square as a space characterized by intersections of

“various episodes of violence and displacement of . . . religious and ethnic minorities” (p. 97). Most of the Curious Steps walks in Beyoğlu since 2014 includes a stop at Galatasaray Square. There, the life story of Maryam Şahinyan, an Armenian woman photographer, and her studio at the square, Foto Galatasaray, as well as the story of the Saturday Mothers/People are told. Since most of the walks take place on Saturdays, the walkers also encounter the Saturday vigils of the mothers. They stop and stand there, and take part in the vigils. Drawing on the encounters at the Galatasaray Square, Abiral et. al (2019) argue that “a liminal community of witnessing and co-resistance” (p. 99) is created during each walk.

I do not think that the aspect of witnessing and resistance can be expanded to each memory walk and each stop because it is only at the Galatasaray Square that the participants encounter the events unfolding before their eyes. Besides the encounters between the Saturday Mothers and the memory walk participants, the memory walks do not necessarily bring on these kinds of encounters, in which the memory walk participants and the people in the stories meet. Of course, these encounters could happen since these kind of chance encounters are part of the practice of walking. Therefore, if we would call the walks co-witnessing and co-resistance, the question arises: What is that one witnesses? With whom does one resist? The resistance, in this case, refers to a ‘we’ that consists of the participants and storytellers in the walks and not necessarily a ‘we’ that consists of the ones who suffer, struggle, and resist.

Although I abstain from calling the memory walks participants and storytellers a community of witnessing and resistance, I definitely agree that it is a community and a rather liminal one, one that creates and exists in a temporary time and space. Through collective listening and walking, a feeling of community and

togetherness arises. As Deniz and many other interlocutors mention, hope is usually described and linked to the feeling of togetherness:

If we end the story with a violation of rights in [the event], I think it spreads a bit of hopelessness. That is my observation. Something happened [in the past], we are telling about the event, and it is like leaving that person there in the past in a pathetic state. I think you should not do that. We have to take [them] there and [then] say, “Come on, look here, similar things are happening today”. This could be a resistance, it could be a violation of rights. People are so impressed. They connect with what happened to them. I always underline this in the [walks I participate]: We are here today, we are together and we have told each other these things, so there is still hope. (Interview with Deniz, Karakutu storyteller & board member) (See Appendix E, 27)

Even when the stories do not have a “happy ending”, togetherness can become a reason to cling to hope. Feeling sad or bad about the stories can lead to feeling good:

I read recently that people are happy when they listen to sad music. The reason for this is knowing that there is someone who understands them, gives them right and feels like them . . . Maybe what we are doing is making us sad, making us think, and you are immersed in your thoughts. I do not know, maybe you say, “nothing will happen, we are struggling for nothing” . . . But you also say, “someone told you this today, someone experienced a similar thing you have experienced” . . . The togetherness actually gives hope. (Interview with Deniz, Karakutu storyteller & board member) (See Appendix E, 28)

Here, togetherness implies a togetherness of sharing feelings, a togetherness of the participants. “Being affected” is what makes one a member of the community.

Knowing that there are others affected by these stories, there are others who care, and others who stand against the injustices of the past gives hope. Explaining how feminist attachments are made and a feminist ‘we’ is formed, Ahmed (2004)

underlines the importance of feeling, also involving the feelings of others:

Through the work of listening to others, of hearing the force of their pain and the energy of their anger, of learning to be surprised by all the one feels oneself to be against; through all of this, a ‘we’ is formed, and an attachment is made. (p. 188)

In Ahmed’s feminist hope, the ‘we’ is formed by listening to others, witnessing their pain and anger, and being affected by them. A direct encounter with the other and their feelings is crucial here. The ‘we’ that Ahmed talks about, in this respect,

consists of the other, too. It is a coming together with ‘I’ and the other, a coming together with the ones that are greatly different from us.

Who is the ‘we’ in the memory walks? I believe that it is a ‘we’ that involves the participants of the walks. Some participants may be more closely connected to or be part of the stories. The participant’s connections with the stories highly depend on various factors such as gender, age, class, ethnicity, religion, and the lifestyles, values, and political views of the participant. But, the ‘we’ of the walks is not necessarily a ‘we’ that involves the other⁸⁶, whom the stories are about, it is only a relation to the other, a move towards the other. The risk here is that hope can again turn into an easy way out, an escape from uncomfortable confrontations with the past and the other.

So, is another kind of hope possible at all? Ahmed mentions that hope is a “question of the future” (p. 183) that makes one attend to the past as well. Furthering her argument that “emotions involve readings of the openness of bodies to being affected” (p. 185), she adds that “hope reads that openness as the possibility of desire or joy” (p. 185). Although hope cannot determine the future, it keeps the future open. I want to make two points about the hope understood as openness. Firstly, the openness of hope refers to a particular relation to the future that cannot be explained by optimism. Rather, hope can be defined as a positive relationship with the uncertainty and complicatedness of the future; it is a way of keeping oneself open to the unknown. Rebecca Solnit (2016) defines hope in a similar way as “an embrace of the unknown and the unknowable, an alternative to the certainty of both optimists and pessimists” (p. xiv). Hope is neither the optimism that “everything-is-getting-better” nor the pessimism that “everything-is-getting-worse” (p. xiii), but it is a look

⁸⁶ I do not want to make a clear-cut and definite separation of the ‘I’ or ‘we’ vs. ‘them’ or ‘the other’. I just want to underline that the participants of the memory walks (both the storytellers and the listeners) do not necessarily coincide with the main characters of the stories they encounter.

into the future that sees endless possibilities. So, the indeterminacy of the future and the openness to face it is an essential part of hope.

I believe the memory walks have the potential to create this kind of an open hope. The crumbs of this hope emerge from the encounters during the walks. The walks are also experiences of indeterminacy and openness. For example, Utku, a Karakutu storyteller, mentions that one time when he encountered a man by chance on the street as he was telling a story. The man was just passing by and stopped by to listen to the story and realized that he knew the person in the story. Then, he joined the conversation, explained his acquaintance with the person, and recounted an adventurous memory about that the time when he went to Greece.

Secondly, the openness of hope refers to an openness and readiness to take action. Rather than falling into passivity or fatalism, hope calls one to take action. As much as it is a relationship with the future and the past, it is a relationship with the present as “[t]he moment of hope is when the ‘not yet’ impresses upon us in the present” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 184). Only supplemented with action, for example, a political action, hope can get us to a point to make a change. Being stubborn, in this case, can be essential to keep fighting for what one stands for and against. As Nesrin Uçarlar (2022) explains it beautifully:

There is no such thing as “*that day will come and we will have peace*”. We will only be a little closer to that day. There may be a recipe for a completely different beauty in the future. Therefore, reality is not “*we will not be able to see it, our children will see it*”, because neither will they. What we want to see, what we call peace, is like a river. We cannot do anything but supply it with water. Everywhere it goes, it will gain a new meaning, it will need to be renewed, rethought, and formulated. (My translation, original italics) (See Appendix E, 29)

This hope is different from hopeless hope because one acknowledges the indeterminacy of the future and “open[s] up...to the uncertainty of future” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 188). Most importantly, it keeps objects close but does not stick to them.

The memory walks can foster this version of hope and be a basis for action. Here, the action includes different kinds of work that aims to shape the uncertain and unknowable future. This work is directed at the past and the present as much as the future. Action, in this sense, can take many forms, such as resisting the injustices of the past and the present, challenging and changing the order of things from economic systems to details of daily life, and ensuring that past atrocities do not repeat themselves. In the memory walks, this work takes the form of memory work grounded in researching, sharing, and performing memories. So, the feelings of hope can encourage people to contribute to this work, whether by becoming a storyteller or participating in the next memory walks after their first memory walk. Besides hope, other emotions such as anger, curiosity, and wonder can also be the basis for action.

4.5 “Holding on to anger”

One of the ways of responding to pain, including the pain of others, is anger. Anger is a response to pain, it is an “againstness” (Ahmed, 2004). Many think that anger is a negative emotion that can easily lead to violence and destruction and see it as a threat. Usually, emotions like love, hope, and compassion are seen as positive emotions that lead to positive, that is, productive action (Cherry, 2021).⁸⁷ But,

⁸⁷ Sara Ahmed (2004) is skeptical about any assumption that takes love as the basis of politics. She criticizes Kelly Oliver’s (2001) definition of love as an ethical and political responsibility that articulates otherness and difference. As Ahmed notes, love cannot be separated from negative emotions such as hate, disgust, and rage. She argues that Oliver’s focus on love with regard to politics “speaks too quickly in the name of love” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 140) as love is intimately connected to idealization. And, love as idealization cannot be separated from the failed ideals and the subjects that fail to achieve ideals. The multicultural discourse, for example, which is rooted in the fantasy that “we all love each other”, requires the existence of others that fail to approximate the ideal. Ahmed suggests a different connection with the others and the world. She offers an understanding of love that describes the “affect of solidarity with others in the work that is done to create a different world” (p. 141). Named as affectionate solidarity, similar to Hemmings’ (2012) affective solidarity, is defined with reference to Jodi Dean as “the kind of solidarity that grows out of intimate relationships of love and friendship” (Dean, 1996 in Ahmed, p. 141). I agree with Ahmed on the role of working together for the same cause but love and friendship is not necessarily the basis of togetherness. A broader range

positive emotions may not necessarily lead to political action and solidarity, whereas negative emotions may indeed be a source for coming together and taking action.

A long line of scholars, from Ancient Greek philosophers to contemporary philosophers and psychologists, argue against anger in all its forms (Cherry, 2021). Fostering the bad reputation of anger, they describe it as destructive, disruptive, distracting, counter-productive, useless, misguided, and inappropriate (Cherry, 2021; Lorde, 1981; hooks, 1996). Also, they argue that anger contains an impulse for revenge, which can quickly lead to violence (Cherry, 2021). Adding to the accusations against anger in general, specific versions of anger are much more generalized and one-dimensionally represented in the media. For example, black and feminist anger are oversimplified, stereotyped, and deemed violent, useless, or inappropriate. The delegitimization of the angry one serves the benefit of the one whom anger is directed: The angry one is put in the spotlight, and the one whom anger is directed is lost out of sight.

Moreover, one-dimensional depictions serve to make other versions of anger invisible. Black anger is unacceptable and cannot be expressed, while white anger is (hooks, 1996). These depictions serve to dismiss the demands of the angry ones because their anger is read “as evidence of poor reason” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 177). Similarly, feminist anger “does not always work because the terms of its reception may ‘undo’ its claim” (p. 177). Anger can also be seen as a sign of powerlessness (hooks, 1996). Or, it can be seen as a stepping stone to more positive feelings, assuming that anger cannot lead to somewhere productive.

In the interviews with the storytellers, anger is mentioned a couple of times. In most of them, though, anger was understood as a rather negative emotion. Mina, a

of emotions such as anger, frustration, desire for connection, curiosity, wonder, etc. can be the basis for affective solidarity, as Hemmings points out.

Karakutu storyteller, mentions that she feels overwhelmed and crushed by the anger she feels about the past and the present and what is said and not said (Interview with Mina). For her, feeling angry is a way of feeling bad. Described as “being crushed by anger”, it follows that anger ties one’s hands and feet and makes one inactive. Anger, in this picture, seems useless indeed.

On the other hand, Ateş, another Karakutu storyteller, prefers anger as an alternative to “feeling sentimental”. Ateş explains that he chooses to tell Hrant Dink’s story with a focus on the process of the lawsuit about his killing rather than a focus on his writings in the newspaper *Agos* and his speeches. The reason for his choice is that “When we tell about his [Hrant Dink’s] writings, people get emotional and so on. I preferred to turn that sentimentality into anger. Because this situation turns into anger in me too” (Interview with Ateş). Here, sentimentality refers to the feelings such as compassion, pity, or empathy, feelings that make one “feel too much”. Feeling too much or whining over the stories is seen as an inactive and useless position. Sentimentality is not juxtaposed or put against reason or coldness but anger. I find this positioning of anger quite interesting. Why is “holding on to anger” preferable?

Sara Ahmed, Myisha Cherry, and bell hooks all argue for the importance of anger in fighting against injustice and taking political action. In their view, anger is an appropriate and justifiable response to pain and injustice. In contrast to the opposite claims, they argue that anger can be productive. First of all, they object to the oversimplified depictions of anger by pointing out the different versions of anger.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ Cherry (2021) explains a number of versions such as rogue rage, wipe rage, resentment rage, narcissistic rage, and Lordean rage. hooks (1996) mentions militant rage and narcissistic rage, whereas Ahmed (2004) focuses on a particular version: feminist anger.

Rejecting the “idea that only positive emotions are the most effective and appropriate ones” (Cherry, 2021, p. 8), Cherry suggests working with anger rather than rejecting or suppressing it.

Cherry’s analysis in “The case for rage” (2021) is focused on a version of rage first articulated by Audre Lorde, a black feminist poet and scholar who has written extensively on feminism, blackness, civil rights, and many other issues. Cherry examines different versions of political anger and introduces a version that she calls ‘Lordean rage’. In her speech later published with the title “The uses of anger” (1981), Audre Lorde speaks of the importance of accepting and expressing anger and translating it into action, drawing on her own and other black women’s experiences of racism:

My response to racism is anger. I have lived with that anger, on that anger, beneath that anger, on top of that anger, ignoring that anger, feeding upon that anger, learning to use that anger before it laid my visions to waste, for most of my life. Once I did it in silence, afraid of the weight of that anger. My fear of that anger taught me nothing. (Lorde, 1981, p.7)

Lorde defines anger as a response to racism and injustice. And it is a response that one does not have to be afraid of. For Lorde, anger can be a source of energy and information. When it is managed accordingly, as Cherry explains in detail in her book, and translated into action, as Lorde suggests, holding on to anger can serve change. Although not an ideal emotion that is always innocent or civil, it is an appropriate and useful emotion for the anti-racist struggle. It applies to all people who are angry at injustice, that is, to all black people and white allies who are angry.

As with every emotion, it cannot be foresaid where Lordean rage can go or whether it will go right or wrong (Cherry, 2021). But, Lordean rage has the potential to go right much more than the other versions of rage Cherry describes. Lordean rage has an inclusive and liberating perspective that shares the idea that “I am not free

while any women is unfree” (Lorde, 1981, p. 10) and expands the idea to all people. Unlike other versions, the target of Lordean rage is the racist system and those who are complicit in racism and injustice. The action tendency and the aim is to make a change in the policies, the system, and one’s beliefs (Cherry, 2021). Anger, in this sense, is directly related to changes in one’s beliefs and relation to the world and one’s empowerment:

And when I speak of change, I do not mean a simple switch of positions or a temporary lessening of tensions, nor the ability to smile or feel good. I am speaking of a basic and radical alteration in all those assumptions underlining our lives. (Lorde, 1981, p.8)

As Lorde puts it, anger and the change that comes from it do not always feel good.

Also, anger may not always translate into or lead to a positive feeling, for example,

love.⁸⁹ As Ateş mentions his feelings about the story of Hrant Dink, there may be

nothing to do with anger and nowhere to “canalize it”. It can “bury one into despair”.

Yes, what are you doing with that anger is a good question. I usually bite my nails. It is not channeled into a very concrete place. It is more like awareness, that is, I get immersed in desperation. Because you go to the 19th of January at most and you follow the courts the most. Okay, you go to Çağlayan. I attended a couple of hearings in Çağlayan. You do these things, but there are other things I can do, like maybe introducing him [Hrant Dink] to other people. (Interview with Ateş, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 30)

What interests me here is how anger is described as an “awareness” that contains

particular practices such as going to the commemorations trials or transmitting

knowledge to others. In fact, these practices are the evidence that anger is canalized

into action indeed. Storytelling in the memory walks or even participating in them is

an action. Some storytellers explicitly mention that they feel the urge, the need, or

⁸⁹ After calling black people to claim their rage and describing how rage can inspire action in the case of militant rage, hooks (1996) ends with a call for love that brings together black people and white allies against racism: “In a *beloved community* solidarity and trust are grounded in profound commitment to a shared vision. Those of us who are always anti-racist long for a world in which everyone can form a *beloved community* where borders can be crossed and cultural hybridity celebrated” (p. 272, original italics). But, is love really necessary to form a community that stands against injustice? Does anger have to end in love?

the responsibility to share what they know, not only in the walks but also in their daily lives when they walk with friends and family.

All the more, since anger also refers to a way of knowing as much as it is a way of feeling, it can also be a source of facing the past. Anger can make a relationship with the other possible, a relationship where the other is actually present (actively and willingly). Listening to others' anger, whether directed at us or not, and sharing anger with others by being angry at the same or similar things (a common direction of anger) is a ground for action, solidarity, and facing the past. As Lorde (1981) mentions, translating anger into action is a process of identifying and getting to know our allies, our enemies, and our differences from them. It is a process of knowing indeed, a process which is linked to knowing oneself; questioning one's role in the system, one's beliefs, perspectives, and attitudes, as Ateş describes: "I hold on to anger . . . Since I do not come from a background of an oppressed identity, I first started to question things by getting angry . . . Therefore, I still maintain the same reflexes" (Interview with Ateş).

I find Lorde's calling in which she welcomes all "who can meet us, face to face, beyond objectification and beyond guilt" (Lorde, 1981, p.10) very valuable and argue that anger can provide an alternative relation with the other, an alternative to empathy or guilt, which leads to action and change. To come together, become allies, and take action against what they fight for, the ones who are more privileged or the ones who directly or indirectly contribute to the injustices have to listen to the anger of the other. As Ahmed (2004) puts it, learning to hear the anger of others involves "accept[ing] that one's own position can anger others and hence allow[ing] one's position to be opened to critique by others" (p. 178). The memory walks can provide such a time and space to work on and think about one's anger as well as the other's

anger. Of course, by holding on to anger, one stands on uncomfortable grounds, in which one can feel bad, useless, or overwhelmed. But, this discomfort is also necessary because it is linked with an openness to “always questioning our own investments” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 178).

4.6 “As if for the first time”: curiosity and wonder

Curiosity and wonder have been the most referred emotions during the walks and interviews. How do these emotions contribute to the experiences of facing the past in the walks? Derived from the Latin word *cura*, meaning care, concern, or trouble, curiosity is defined as a desire to know and learn. Wonder, on the other hand, is a more complex emotion that involves curiosity and surprise. Surprise is a short-lived reaction that is unexpected and can be followed by various emotions such as fear, anger, disappointment, and joy. Due to this, there can be different versions of wonder, such as amazement and awe. Wonder involves contemplation too.⁹⁰ A “critical wonder” is also possible, which is a kind of wonder that tackles troubling questions such as “How did the world come to take this shape?” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 182). Examining the feelings of curiosity and wonder, I will demonstrate that they are encounters that turn the ordinary and familiar everyday into an ‘extraordinary everyday’ consisting of explorations, critical walking and thinking, and different ways of feeling and knowing. Also, feelings of curiosity and wonder can result in feelings of discomfort that push one to tackle unanswered and troubling questions about the invisible histories and memories, one’s relationship with the city, and the past.

⁹⁰ The philosophers of Ancient Greek such as Plato, Aristotle, and Aquinas argue that philosophy has started from wonder (Burton, 2021).

The feeling of curiosity is almost like the trademark of the walks as it pervades the whole experience of memory walks, quickly spreads and attaches itself to other places and stories that are not involved in the walks, and comes to be shared by almost all of the participants. Therefore, curiosity is a rather more inclusive emotion. What I mean is that all the participants do not necessarily feel emotions like anger, hope, and empathy in the walks because their existence highly depends on the kinds of encounters between the stories, places, and the participants. For example, the life history of Zabel Yesayan, an Armenian woman writer and a survivor of the forced deportations from Istanbul on the 24th of April 1915, can incite different emotions in different participants, even when it is listened in the same walk. Learning about the 24th of April 1915 for the first time, getting to know Zabel Yesayan's memoirs and books, drawing connections with the contemporary wars and inequalities, or feeling inspired by Yesayan's resistance to the authoritarian regimes are only some of the possible encounters. Each encounter is unique and each calls for different emotions. But, I believe that curiosity is the common point in all of them.

Curiosity is mostly expressed in relation to the new ways of looking and sensing the city, which ultimately changes one's relationship with the city and the neighborhood. Of course, curiosity is connected to the body and the experience of being in places. As mentioned in the previous chapter, some participants feel more connected to the city or the neighborhood during and after the walks. Or they feel like they belong to the city. Feeling connected or belonging results from knowing more about the city, the neighborhood, and the stories. But, most importantly, it results from the realization that there is so much more to know. What remains unknown makes and keeps one curious. It is said that attaining knowledge settles down curiosity and that the difference between curiosity and wonder is that curiosity

diminishes with knowledge, whereas wonder does not. Yet, in the memory walks, the gaps of knowledge can never be filled completely. Even meticulous research cannot uncover more knowledge and information about particular stories. The stories remain open. Therefore, curiosity in the memory walks goes beyond knowledge. It refers to an attitude. Also, it must be added that curiosity is a highly sticky emotion; it starts from somewhere and spreads all over. Nisan describes her experiences in the memory walks and explains how curiosity and knowledge keep calling each other in loops:

Listening to the story of the park, the garden, the house, the building, the mosque, and the church, etc., where I spend my day on a daily basis and walk by everyday, both by placing it in the historical context and associating it with the stories of the people who lived there, aroused an incredible curiosity in me. Not just about the place I am listening to. But about what is in this city, what more can I learn, what is there, what is here, let us take a look at this and that too. Let me search the Internet a little more and see what has been written and drawn. (Interview with Nisan, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 31)

Many other storytellers and participants mention that listening to stories about the everyday places that they normally do not pay attention to in their daily lives become places of exploration. They mention that they “see something different in the things they normally pass by” (Interview with Mete) and realize that “they do normally not raise their heads, and if they do, they did not know that there were stories like these” (Interview with Beril). So, in the memory walks, curiosity does not diminish with knowledge, it spreads.

When describing wonder, Ahmed (2004) underlines Descartes’ definition of wonder as “the first of all the passions” (Descartes, 1985, in Ahmed, 2004, p. 179) and connects wonder with an experience of “first-ness” (p. 179). Accordingly, in scenes of wonder, the subject encounters the object as if for the first time. Wonder is described as “a departure from ordinary experience” (p. 179). The ordinary and the

familiar are associated with non-feeling or feelings of comfort; they “resist being perceived by consciousness” (p. 179), or they are recognized but taken for granted. Wonder is an encounter with an object that transforms the ordinary into the extraordinary. Ahmed underlines that the ‘as if’ does not mean that history is forgotten or erased. On the contrary, wonder brings history to the light, which the ordinary conceals.

The role of wonder does not only pertain to the feminist wonder that Ahmed talks about, but it applies to the experiences of wonder and curiosity in the memory walks, where the ordinary and the familiar are recognized as if for the first time. Ahmed’s understanding of the ordinary turning into the extraordinary is quite similar to the transformation of the everyday in the memory walks. Through the encounters in the walks, the everyday places transform from ordinary and familiar places into foreign and extraordinary places that incite curiosity and wonder. Still described as everyday places, they are sources of exploration, knowledge, feeling, and critical thinking.

Moreover, through defamiliarizing everyday places, wonder and curiosity encourage learning about the city and its histories. Most of the interlocutors mention that they leave the walks with a desire to learn more. When they go home, they do research on their own, follow up on what interested them, and leave them with questions. For example, Dilan, a Karakutu storyteller, mentions that in the first walks she attended as a new volunteer, she was really surprised and excited by the stories and she remembers going home after the walks and reading on some of the issues for a couple of days (Interview with Dilan). Not only the participants of the walks but also the storytellers keep learning new things as the participants ask different questions in each walk:

From there, a different door of curiosity arises for you, so you say, “I need to research this immediately, I will provide you with the necessary information” and you pursue a new research, enriching that narrative, or maybe just adding something to yourself personally. Frankly, I love that it opens a door like that. (Interview with Mina) (See Appendix E, 32)

This new opening is not necessarily a joyful and playful opening, where one childishly explores and learns. It also includes an opening to which was unknown or invisible, making one uncomfortable. Troubling questions pop up: “Why am I here?”, “Why did I not know about these?”, “What will I do with all of this?”, etc.

I think Ahmed’s point about how feminist anger and feminist wonder make subjects uncomfortable and do not let themselves “sink . . . into the spaces” (2004, p. 178) is also relevant to the encounters in the memory walks. Neither anger nor curiosity and wonder provides comfortable positions and spaces for the participants of the memory walks. Feelings like hope and empathy, although they provide comfort, cannot be sustained. Shame (or guilt), usually considered a necessary confrontation with the other, can become an escape or a dead-end in terms of facing the difficult past and acting on it. As the ‘door’ to new ways of feeling and knowing opens, it becomes much harder or uncertain that the comfortable positions are maintained easily. Feelings of discomfort or even a tiny crack in the comfortable positions are an opening to turn the gaze back to oneself, the present, and facing the past. Walking in-between feeling too much or too little, feeling comfortable or not, or feeling this way or that way, many things remain unclear and unanswered, also with regard to facing the past. But, one thing is sure: “I mean, it opens a door in your mind, it actually puts you at the beginning of a path, a road. You keep walking on that road because after that hour, I think it is impossible not to walk” (Interview with Ela, Karakutu storyteller).⁹¹

⁹¹ “Diyorum ya zihninde bir kapı açıyor aslında seni bir patikanın başına, yolun başına koyuyor. Sen o yoldan yürümeye devam ediyorsun çünkü o saatten sonra bence yürümemen mümkün değil.”

Overall, experiences in the memory walks are “only a start” to facing the past. The memory walks put the participants and storytellers at the beginning of a road in two senses. First, it is a road in the city that turns everyday urban practices, such as walking and experiencing the city, into critical spatial practices that rethink, explore, write, and reclaim the city. Through collective walking and storytelling, the ordinary everyday becomes extraordinary. The everyday urban places that are unnoticed in daily lives become extraordinary places that involve characteristics of memorial and locus, *lieux de memoire* and *milieux de memoire*, and voluntary and involuntary memory. Although the memory walks are not necessarily a self transformative event with lasting consequences shaping daily lives, the affective encounters in the walks certainly leave their mark on the participants and storytellers’ ways of feeling, knowing, and relating to the histories and memories in the city. Emotions such as hope, anger, curiosity, and wonder can be a basis for solidarity and action when one “keeps walking on that road”. This road, in a second sense, refers to a spectrum of experiences about facing the past. Facing the past in the framework of the everyday is not an achievement or a failure but a process. Combining memory work and everyday and affective encounters, the performances of memory in the memory walks, such as walking and storytelling, are ways to learn, share, and act on invisible and repressed histories and memories. Facing the past in the extraordinary everyday of the walks is a practice of learning, exploring, listening, and storytelling while walking in-between memories.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

I cannot take responsibility for it. Then I have to think of myself as if I am part of something collective and give myself an identity. But why would I do this? Because I did not do this. I did not cause those traumatic things to happen. Of course, if such a society needs to be transformed and changed so that the same things do not happen again, I have to work for this. So, I will work. (Interview with Ela, Karakutu storyteller) (See Appendix E, 33)

When I asked about the relationship between listening to and telling difficult stories in the memory walks and facing the past, Ela, one of the Karakutu storytellers, gave such an answer, adding that the walks do and do not have a connection with facing the past. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these ambiguous and indecisive answers about facing the past in the memory walks were pretty common in my interviews. As can be seen in the quotation above, the reason for this ambiguity lies in the idea that facing the past is related to direct and individual responsibility. I believe that is why most interlocutors mentioned their views about responsibility, mainly stating that they do not feel responsible when I asked them if there is any experience of facing the past in the memory walks. They mentioned that they do not “personalize it” (Interview with Beren, Karakutu memory walk participant), meaning they do not see the stories as connected to themselves or their ancestors directly. They did not do these things, so they cannot take responsibility or be expected to take responsibility. One of the interlocutors even mentioned their migration history to show that he was not involved in the past atrocities that go back to the end of the nineteenth century. Here, the migration history confirmed that he and his family were exempt from the discussions on responsibility and facing the past. In his view, facing the past was not a matter that concerned him. It was not a problem he caused. Therefore, it was not a problem that he had to face. Yet, there he was, devotedly

volunteering for the memory walks for a couple of years. I believe, even in his case, although he suggests otherwise, there is something indeed that can be read in relation to facing the past.

As I see them, these ambiguous ideas about facing the past are ultimately related to the transitional justice and nation-state-centered frameworks of facing the past. These frameworks, as I have tried to show in this thesis, are pretty crucial in the conceptualization, discussion, and implementation of the policies, laws, mechanisms, and processes about facing the past in the contexts such as the transition to democracy or the end of (authoritarian) regimes. In these frameworks, facing the past comes up as a bundle of principles, mechanisms, and practices that first and foremost concerns the responsible parties that have caused these past atrocities, such as the nation-state and the perpetrators. Besides, the nation-state is considered the primary responsible actor for securing the necessary conditions and implementing facing the past processes.

This thesis offers another framework to understand and analyze the experiences of facing the past in the everyday, which I believe fits the above mentioned in-between experiences of the participants and storytellers in the memory walks. When I asked the interlocutors directly about their opinions about facing the past in the memory walks, and whether it happens in the walks, they gave me different answers, most were indecisive and refrained from saying yes or no for sure. Besides, they opened the subjects of responsibility, family history, and shame, even though I was not asking about their personal connections. I realized that their answers come from the transitional justice and nation-state-centered frameworks because they were thinking and talking with legal and policy-related discourses. But, in addition to that, there is something else that I have come to notice when I kept

thinking about how to make sense of their indecisive answers. I believe this makes the core of the experiences of facing the past in the memory walks. I have concluded that the interlocutors immediately mentioned their connections and disconnections from the stories about difficult pasts because they have indeed started to think about the stories in a different way: they were thinking about their own relationship with the stories and how they are implicated in the stories.

As Rothberg (2019) introduces the concept of the implicated subject and examines by looking at diverse examples, implication extends the subject positions of victim, perpetrator, and by-stander to a point where individual responsibility or agency is not the decisive point. Although the events lie beyond one's agency, the subject is implicated as it indirectly or unconsciously participates in the injustices of the past and their continuation today. In this sense, thinking about and reflecting on implication can be a way to let go of the discourses on shame, guilt, and direct/casual responsibility and attain an understanding of historical, political, and collective responsibility that addresses structural inequalities and their implications for the post-generations.

So, how can it be possible to acknowledge and think more about our responsibility in the past inequalities and violence that has shaped today? What kinds of practices can enable us to move beyond the discourses of guilt and attitudes of defense and denial? Can recognizing oneself as an implicated subject be a start for facing the past? This thesis brings out these questions for further research. Tracing the examples of implication in other contexts is essential to uncover more about the experiences of facing the past in the everyday context.

My findings in this thesis show that facing the past is an open-ended experience consisting of troubling questions, uncomfortable feelings, as well as

thoughts and feelings that move one away from facing the past. So, we cannot conclude that the memory walks result in acknowledging one's implicatedness in the past histories and memories, let alone acting on them. Yet, we can conclude that it opens the door to do so if one takes the road. Performances of walking and storytelling create a time and space for the everyday and affective encounters consisting of critical ways of experiencing the city, thinking about the past, and acting on it. Overall, the experiences in the memory walks are so diverse that they cannot be limited and categorized as a simple facing of the past or escaping from facing the past. They consist of in-between performances that must be examined closely and delicately. In examining the affects/emotions that come up in the walks, I have tried to show that the walks do not allow for comfortable and stable positioning for the participants and storytellers. Whether they describe their experiences as facing the past or think further about the stories of the past and question their position and role in them, the everyday of the walks are made of encounters with people, places, and stories that come with uncomfortable feelings and thoughts.

This thesis attempts to open a discussion of facing the past in the everyday context. Examining how memorialization practices, or as I call them, performances of memory enable everyday and affective experiences concerning facing the past, I show the in-betweenness and open-endedness of the memory walks in multiple aspects, tracing the implications of the walks in the everyday, urban places, and experiences in the memory walks. I aim to draw an understanding of facing the past as a process, that is, a bundle of different experiences consisting of different relationships with the past, the others, the city, and urban places. In my analysis of the affective encounters, I demonstrate which directions emotions can go, how they are understood and experienced, and what they make possible. Looking at the

particular emotions in detail shows us that emotions can denote an unequal relationship with the others in the stories, a move away from reflecting on the past, solidarity with the fellow participants of the walks or the others, and (political) actions that contribute to sharing the critical ways of feeling and knowing. Overall, the thesis shows that emotions have a fundamental role in the experiences of facing the past. Therefore, we need more research on the everyday and affective encounters, tracing their implications in facing the past in the everyday.

Moreover, the thesis attempts to conceptualize walking in the city as a critical spatial practice. By examining various walking practices, including but not limited to the memory walks, the thesis draws on the vast literature on walking, bringing together the discussions in philosophy, art and performance studies, critical theory, geography, urban sociology, and everyday life theory. Walking in the city, however, cannot be limited to the examples provided in this thesis. Therefore, the thesis calls for further research on walking and its relationship with sensory, bodily, social, and political aspects of living in the city. Besides walking, the thesis also calls for further research on other critical urban practices consisting of other ways of moving, using, and reclaiming the city. Last but not least, the thesis contributes to the literature dealing with the relationship between memory and the city. Pointing out the limits of the existing concepts to describe and define places in relation to memory, the thesis aims to expand our understanding of everyday urban places and our relationship with them in terms of creating, sharing, and performing memory.

The thesis also has its shortcomings in relation to its methodology and topics. First, the thesis limits itself to the urban memorialization practices in the form of memory walks. This allows for a detailed examination of the memory walks but falls short of examining other memorialization practices and performances of memory in

the urban context, including private and public spaces. Searching for the connections between different memorialization practices and examining their interaction with each other will allow for a more profound understanding of the role of memorialization practices in our everyday life, as well as their significance for urban life.

Secondly, as I have mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, facing the past in the everyday can be further analyzed in relation to the concept of implication. Also, facing the past is related to many other memorialization practices, as well as other practices that are parts of our everyday lives, such as literature, art, cinema, and various other media. Therefore, this thesis covers a limited part of the discussions of facing the past in the everyday. It also falls short of connecting the memory walks with these other instances and experiences of facing the past in the everyday. Facing the past is indeed a broad topic that must be backed up by further research. Moreover, the existing research on facing the past, including the works focusing on transitional justice, the nation-state, and the cultural and artistic productions, must be brought together and read in dialogue with each other in future research.

APPENDIX A

THE STORY OF GOMIDAS VARTABED

Welcome. Today, we met in front of this pharmacy, the *Cumhuriyet* Pharmacy. You already know from the puzzle that we will talk about Gomidas. The reason we met at the pharmacy is that this is where Gomidas used to live between 1910-1915. Before, there was a sign indicating that Gomidas lived at this apartment building, but it was later removed. The April 24 commemorations were also held in front of this pharmacy. But in fact, we learned from our research that it is not certain that Gomidas actually lived here. We know that he lived in a flat in Şişli with a friend, but we do not know for sure whether it was this building or this parcel. That is all I will say about the building. If you want, there is a park nearby, and we can go there to sit and listen to the rest of the story.

(We walk to the park.)

Today I will tell you the life story of Gomidas. Have you ever heard of someone named Gomidas Vartabed? Yes, few people know about him because he is not a well-known person in Turkey. Gomidas is a well-known composer, compiler, musicologist, educator, and clergyman, especially in Armenia. And he has compiled Turkish, Kurdish, Arab, and Armenian music in Anatolia. He has a lot of compilations. Although he is not well known in Turkey, he is pretty famous in Armenia and has schools, streets, etc., in his name.

Now, about his life... Gomidas was born in Kütahya in 1869. His real name is Soğomon Soğomonyan. He lost his mother first and then his father when he was seven years old while studying at the seminary in Bursa. The seminary was asked by the Etchmiadzin seminary, which is the center of the Armenian church, to choose a

boy with a beautiful voice. Soğoman was nominated for this. However, like many Kütahya Armenians, he did not know Armenian. He spoke Turkish with the head of the church, the Catholicos. By the way, the head of the church is called a Catholicos. And the Catholicos asked him to sing a song in Armenian, and he sang a hymn. He was accepted into the school. He studied at the Etchmiadzin Kevorkyan Seminary. He had an excellent talent for music and he got more and more adept over the years. The Armenian musical note system of that time differed from today's note system. He learned and mastered it. After completing his education, he became a music teacher at the same school.

And then, in 1893, he decided to become a priest. His name changed when he became a clergyman. He took the name Gomidas. His surname Vartabed is actually a title in Christianity, and he took this surname in 1895. In fact, the name Gomidas comes from a Catholicos and composer who lived in the Middle Ages, a person named Gomidas Ağtsetsi. After that, Gomidas started to do a lot of work on music. He took classes on music theory. And with the permission of the Catholicos of that period, he went to Germany to study music. His expenses were covered by a wealthy Armenian businessman. Between 1896-99, he began to take music lessons at the Kaiser Wilhelm Royal University in Berlin, including lessons such as music history, instrument knowledge, and music theory, as well as private lessons on piano, composition, singing, and orchestration. He was highly respected. When the International Musical Society was established, consisting of world-famous musicologists, Gomidas joined this society as a founding student member.

Another crucial thing about Gomidas is that he was a compiler. Even as a student, he asked his friends to compile the folk songs they heard in their hometowns. Especially his classmate, linguist Manuk Abeghian, collected many

songs. Together, they collected around 3-4 thousand poems and songs. And they published some of them. Although they did not get to publish all of them, Gomidas continued to compile and record songs wherever he went. He went to various villages to compile songs and asked people, for example, the villagers, to sing. Sometimes the villagers considered this wish strange because they only sang for specific purposes, to comfort animals, and so on. Anyway, they sang their songs when Gomidas asked. Once, he went to the village where he was born in 1893 in Kütahya. He was received with great interest there. He compiled Turkish folk songs there. As I said, Gomidas compiled songs in many different languages. This encompasses many languages in Anatolia and the Ottoman Empire territory, including Armenian, Kurdish, Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, and the Balkan languages. In fact, around that time, compilations were very common in Europe. Still, Gomidas' research was one of the first examples in Anatolia. In other words, what he did can be called the first scientific music research.

He was also familiar with Kurdish music, and in 1903 he sang songs compiled from the villages around Mount Ararat under the name of "Kurdish Melodies," published in Saint Petersburg. He gave concerts and conferences in many European cities. He performed music, sang and played *kaval*, and trained some music bands. He also translated Armenian hymns into German. He was also interested in the relationship between different musical genres and he wrote articles about music.

During these 10 years, Gomidas was living in Etchmiadzin, visiting various places, and organizing concerts and conferences. At the end of 10 years, he realized that his financial and moral opportunities had atrophied, so he decided to leave Etchmiadzin. There were three options for him. He has received invitations from three places: One was abroad (Europe), one was Tbilisi, and one was Istanbul.

Gomidas decided to go to Istanbul. At that time, the Armenian population in Istanbul exceeded 100 thousand people. One of the reasons for moving to Istanbul was that it was easy to travel from Istanbul to the east and the west. And after the declaration of the constitutional monarchy, there was actually a nice atmosphere in Istanbul.

Therefore, he accepted the invitation of the Galata Surp Krikor Lusavoriç Church and came to Istanbul. Here, he was given a house and a salary. Yet, during the years when Gomidas was living in Istanbul, the Adana massacre happened in 1909.

Gomidas's life in Istanbul continued at the same time.

He was pretty famous in Istanbul and had many fans. Not only Armenians but also Young Turks showed great interest in Gomidas. He established the "Gusan Choir". This choir was a group of students from Armenian schools and singers from neighborhood churches. They gave concerts in Istanbul, Izmir, Alexandria, and Cairo. At the same time, Gomidas was invited to the meetings of the Turkish Hearths (*Türk Ocakları* in Turkish) and asked to give concerts. For example, in 1912, he was invited to attend a concert organized for the benefit of sick Ottoman soldiers. We can say that he established a close relationship with many Turkish intellectuals. He met Talat Pasha, the interior minister of the period. In fact, Gomidas was invited to the event organized for the 1500th anniversary of the Armenian alphabet. He also attended an event held at the American embassy on March 4, 1915. He gave a concert with a small choir, where he sang in Kurdish and played the piano. Enver Pasha and Talat Pasha were also there.

Moreover, he had a close relationship with Istanbul's literary and musical circles. For example, he was invited to the house meetings organized by people such as Halide Edip Adıvar, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, and Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, famous names of that period. He went to their house regularly. In 1911, he

participated in a concert organized for the benefit of the Armenian hospital with the Gusan Choir of 300 people. And at this concert, Prince Abdülmecit Efendi, known as an art lover, met Gomidas and admired him. And he often invited him to the palace. In other words, they had an acquaintance with Abdülmecit.

And then, the night of April 24, 1915, arrived. That night, not only Gomidas but also around 235 Armenian intellectuals from Istanbul, including doctors, traders, artists, journalists, and writers, were taken from their homes, taken under custody, and sent to the central prison of Istanbul. This day is known and commemorated as the starting night of the Armenian genocide. There is even an article by Hrant Dink called “23,5 April” if you want to take a look. In a few days, the number 235 increased to 700-800. These people were put on a train from Haydarpaşa and sent into exile. Most of them never returned. They died and were killed where they were sent. After a few days, the group, including Gomidas, departed by train to arrive in Çankırı. There is a rumor that Gomidas tremendously changed after an incident that he experienced in Akyurt, a district of Ankara, where a gendarme mistreated Gomidas. After that, the people around him observed that Gomidas was in a very nervous and frightened state and behaved strangely. And after departing from Akyurt, the exact number of people is unknown, they arrived at Çankırı. In fact, Gomidas did not stay long in Çankırı.

There are only some speculations on this subject, but a telegram was sent by someone, and eight people were allowed to return. It is unknown who sent these telegrams. One of the people who returned was Gomidas. We do not know who made this return possible. For example, the relationship of Gomidas with the Turkish Hearths, his relationship with Halide Edip Adivar, his acquaintance with Prince Abdülmecit, etc., could have influenced it. Which of his relationships was decisive

and who had enough power to allow Gomidas to return, we do not know, but there are rumors. So, the exile of Gomidas actually lasted for 15 days. A return order came on May 9, and he was in Istanbul on May 15. But when Gomidas returned, he was very much changed.

It is thought that he somewhat recovered at the beginning of 1916, but then it became clear that he did not recover, and his condition worsened. He was admitted to the Şişli Lape Hospital, which is very close to here and stayed there until March 1919. He was then taken to Paris for better treatment. He stayed in Paris. While hospitalized, he usually received no visitors. He did not want to see his friends at all, and there are rumors that he did not talk or talked very little in his last years. After 1915, he never played the piano, composed, or sang for the last 18 years of his life. And he died in Paris on October 22, 1935. Then, in 1936, his body was brought to Soviet Armenia and buried in Yerevan. Today, many places in Armenia bear his name, such as a monument, conservatory, museum, square, etc. You can see his statue in the city center. His archive is also located in Yerevan.

I mentioned that he is not remembered much in Turkey, but we cannot say that he is not remembered at all. In 2014, an album called *Yerkaran*, consisting of the songs of Gomidas, was released by Kalan Music. You can find it on Spotify. In fact, I will open one of his songs now (*The song plays in the background from now on.*). In 2019, a concert called *Aydınlık Sabahın Sesi* was held at the Cemal Reşit Rey Concert Hall for the 150th anniversary of his birth. “Gusan 2010”, a choir founded in 2010 in honor of the Gusan Choir, sang his songs as a cappella, this time on the 140th anniversary of his birth at the Surp Yerrortutyun Armenian Church (*Üç Horan Ermeni Kilisesi* in Turkish) in Beyoğlu. Between 2019-21, the gallery *birzamanlar* in Şişli had an exhibition on Gomidas. It is called *Kalbim O Viran Evlere Benzer*. At

the same time, *Yolcu* Theater released a play about Gomidas in 2021. I recommend you to watch the play while it is still playing. And one of the “In Search of Justice” Seminars by the Karakutu Association was on Gomidas. In other words, we cannot say that Gomidas is not remembered. That is all I will tell you about the life of Gomidas. Is there anything you want to ask? Or any comments? You can also share your feelings. I leave the word to you.

APPENDIX B
LIST OF MEMORY WALKS

Organizer	Place	My role	Date
Karakutu	Beyođlu	Participant	14.11.2020
Karakutu	Beyođlu (Online, via Zoom)	Participant	09.01.2021
Karakutu	Yeldeđirmeni (Online, via Zoom)	Participant	28.01.2021
Karakutu	Kadıköy & Yeldeđirmeni	Storyteller	05.06.2021
Karakutu	Kadıköy	Storyteller	26.06.2021
Karakutu	Beyođlu	Storyteller	24.08.2021
Karakutu	Şişli	Participant	16.10.2021
Karakutu	Şişli	Storyteller	23.10.2021
Karakutu	Kadıköy	Storyteller	06.11.2021
Karakutu	Beyođlu	Storyteller	27.11.2021
SU Gender	Beyođlu	Participant	15.12.2021

APPENDIX C
LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Interview ID	Interviewee	Place	Length
Interview 1	Mina, Karakutu storyteller	Online (via Zoom)	1 hour 18 minutes
Interview 2	Yaprak, Karakutu storyteller	Online (via Zoom)	1 hour
Interview 3	Dilan, Karakutu storyteller	Istanbul	1 hour 15 minutes
Interview 4	Sidar, Karakutu storyteller	Istanbul	1 hour 50 minutes
Interview 5	Utku, Karakutu storyteller	Online (via Zoom)	1 hour 10 minutes
Interview 6	Toprak, Karakutu storyteller	Istanbul	1 hour 10 minutes
Interview 7	Irmak, Karakutu storyteller	Online (via Zoom)	1 hour 15 minutes
Interview 8	Nisan, Karakutu storyteller	Online (via Zoom)	1 hour 30 minutes
Interview 9	Beril, Karakutu storyteller	Istanbul	55 minutes
Interview 10	Mete, Karakutu storyteller	Online (via Zoom)	1 hour
Interview	Ateş, Karakutu storyteller	Istanbul	1 hour 15 minutes

11			minutes
Interview	Ela, Karakutu storyteller	Istanbul	1 hour 10
12			minutes
Interview	Defne, Karakutu storyteller &	Istanbul	1 hour 15
13	employee		minutes
Interview	İpek, memory walk coordinator	Istanbul	1 hour 30
14			minutes
Interview	Ali, Karakutu storyteller & board	Online (via	1 hour
15	member	Zoom)	
Interview	Gizem, Karakutu storyteller &	Istanbul	1 hour 30
16	board member		minutes
Interview	Deniz, Karakutu storyteller &	Online (via	1 hour 10
17	board member	Zoom)	minutes
Interview	Beren, Karakutu memory walk	Online (via	46 minutes
18	participant	Zoom)	
Interview	Çağla, Karakutu memory walk	Istanbul	47 minutes
19	participant		
Interview	Güneş, memory walk coordinator	Online (via	1 hour 20
20		Zoom)	minutes
Interview	Anıl, SEHAK volunteer &	Online (via	1 hour 7
21	employee	Zoom)	minutes
Interview	Cansu, SEHAK memory walk	Online (via	47 minutes
22	participant	Zoom)	
Interview	Ecem, SU Gender employee	Online (via	1 hour 20
23		Zoom)	minutes

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Group 1: Memory walk storytellers

1. Could you introduce yourself?
(Kendini tanıtabilir misin?)
2. Could you tell me how you became interested in memory studies and started volunteering in this field?
(Hafıza çalışmaları ile ilgilenmeye ve bu alanda çalışmaya başlama hikayeni anlatır mısın?)
3. How did you get to know this organization? How did you decide to volunteer here?
(Bu kuruluş ile nasıl tanıştın? Gönüllü olmaya nasıl karar verdin?)
4. What were your motivations and expectations when you first started? Did they change in time? How did they change?
(Bu kuruluş ile ilk tanıştığında motivasyonların ve beklentilerin nelerdi? Süreç içinde bunlar değişti mi, değiştiyse ne şekilde?)
5. What were things you were involved in and contributed to throughout your volunteering until today?
(Bu kuruluşta bugüne kadar hangi çalışmalara katkı sağladın, sağlıyorsun?)
6. Could you tell me about this organization's decision-making mechanisms and processes?
(Bu kuruluşteki karar alma mekanizmaları ve süreçlerinden bahsedebilir misin?)
7. How do you evaluate the memory studies in civil society in Turkey?

(Türkiye’de sivil toplumdaki hafıza çalışmalarını nasıl değerlendiriyorsun?)

8. How do you position this organization’s works within the memory studies in civil society in Turkey?

(Bu kuruluşun Türkiye’de sivil toplumundaki hafıza çalışmaları içinde nerede konumlandırırsın?)

9. Why is it important to work with and for young people?

(Gençlerle ve gençler için çalışmalar yapmak niye önemli?)

10. What does memory work mean to you?

(Sence hafıza çalışmak ne demek?)

11. What does facing the past mean to you?

(Sence geçmişle yüzleşmek ne demek?)

12. How would you describe the volunteer profile?

(Gönüllü profilini nasıl tanımlarsın?)

13. Which training or workshops caught your attention the most?

(Gönüllü eğitimlerinden en çok ilgini çeken hangisiydi?)

14. Could you tell me about your research and Place Identity Card (MKK)

preparation process? What kind of things did you pay attention to while choosing and writing stories and preparing the MKK?

(Mekan Kimlik Kartı (MKK) hazırlama ve araştırma sürecinden bahsedebilir misin? MKK hazırlarken, hikayeleri seçerken ve yazarken ne gibi şeylere dikkat ettin?)

15. What were the things you enjoyed the most and had the most difficulty with while preparing the MKK?

(MKK hazırlama sürecinde en çok zevk aldığın ve en çok zorlandığın şeyler neydi?)

16. How would you describe a memory walk to someone who does not know about it?
(Bilmeyen birine anlatacak olsan hafıza yürüyüşünü nasıl anlatırdın?)
17. What kinds of places, people, and memories do memory walks involve? What kinds of places, people, and memories do they leave out?
(Hafıza yürüyüşleri hangi mekanları, kişileri, ve hafızaları barındırıyor? Dışarıda bıraktıkları mekanlar, kişiler, ve hafızalar var mı?)
18. What kind of an experience do memory walks offer the listeners and storytellers?
(Hafıza yürüyüşleri dinleyicilere ve hikaye anlatıcılara nasıl bir deneyim sunuyor?)
19. How would you describe the listener profile?
(Hafıza yürüyüşlerine katılan dinleyici profilini nasıl tanımlarsın?)
20. What kind of feedback did you receive from the participants of memory walks so far?
(Bugüne kadar hafıza yürüyüşlerine katılımcılardan ne gibi geri dönüşler geldi?)
21. What were the things you enjoyed the most and had the most difficulty with while storytelling?
(Hikaye anlatıcılığı yaparken en çok zevk aldığın ve en çok zorlandığın şeyler neler?)
22. What is the effect and importance of storytelling in memory studies?
(Hafıza çalışmalarında hikaye anlatıcılığının etkisi ve önemi ne?)
23. What kind of things do you pay attention to when you are storytelling?
(Hikaye anlatıcılığı yaparken ne gibi şeylere dikkat ediyorsun?)

24. What is the effect and importance of the practice of walking in memory studies?
(Hafıza yürüyüşlerinde yürüme pratiğinin etkisi ve önemi ne?)
25. What is the effect and importance of being in the place in memory walks?
(Hafıza yürüyüşlerinde mekanda olmanın etkisi ve önemi ne?)
26. Have you ever participated in an online memory walk? What did you think about it?
(Hiç online hafıza yürüyüşüne katıldın mı? Nasıl buldun?)
27. What would you change if you could change one thing about the memory walks?
(Hafıza yürüyüşleri hakkında bir şeyi değiştirme imkanın olsaydı neyi değiştirdin?)
28. Would you call what you do at this organization memory work? If so, what would you like to say about your experience in memory work?
(Bu kuruluşta yaptığın şeye hafıza çalışmak der misin? Öyleyse, hafıza çalışma deneyimini nasıl değerlendirirsin?)
29. How did the memory walks affect your daily life and practices and your relationships with the city and places?
(Bu deneyim senin gündelik hayatını ve pratiklerini, şehirle ve mekanla kurduğun ilişkileri nasıl etkiledi?)
30. What do you like and dislike about memory work?
(Hafıza çalışmanın sevdiğin ve sevmediğin yanları neler?)
31. Do you have anything to add or ask?
(Ekleme veya sormak istediğin bir şey var mı?)

Group 2: Memory walk coordinators, employees, & board members

1. Could you introduce yourself?
(Kendini tanıtabilir misin?)
2. Could you tell me how you became interested in memory studies and how you started volunteering and working in this field?
(Hafıza çalışmaları ile ilgilenmeye ve bu alanda çalışmaya başlama hikayeni anlatır mısın?)
3. How did you get to know this organization? How did you start to volunteer and work here?
(Bu kuruluş ile nasıl tanıştın? Gönüllü olmaya ve çalışmaya nasıl karar verdin?)
4. What were your motivations and expectations when you first started? Did they change in time? How did they change?
(Bu kuruluş ile ilk tanıştığında motivasyonların ve beklentilerin nelerdi? Süreç içinde bunlar değişti mi, değiştiyse ne şekilde?)
5. What were things you were involved in and contributed to throughout your volunteering until today?
(Bu kuruluşta bugüne kadar hangi çalışmalara katkı sağladın, sağlıyorsun?)
6. Could you tell me about this organization's decision-making mechanisms and processes?
(Bu kuruluşteki karar alma mekanizmaları ve süreçlerinden bahsedebilir misin?)
7. How do you evaluate the memory studies in civil society in Turkey?
(Türkiye'de sivil toplumdaki hafıza çalışmalarını nasıl değerlendiriyorsun?)

8. How do you position this organization's works within the memory studies in civil society in Turkey?

(Bu kuruluşun Türkiye'de sivil toplumundaki hafıza çalışmaları içinde nerede konumlandırırsın?)

9. Why is it important to work with and for young people?

(Gençlerle ve gençler için çalışmalar yapmak niye önemli?)

10. What does memory work mean to you?

(Sence hafıza çalışmak ne demek?)

11. What does facing the past mean to you?

(Sence geçmişle yüzleşmek ne demek?)

12. How would you describe the volunteer profile?

(Gönüllü profilini nasıl tanımlarsın?)

13. Could you tell me how the volunteering process works?

(Gönüllülük sürecinden bahsedebilir misin?)

14. By whom and how are the training and workshops planned? What kinds of training and workshops are provided?

(Gönüllü eğitimleri kimler tarafından ve nasıl planlanıyor? Hangi eğitimler veriliyor?)

15. Could you tell me about the research and Place Identity Card (MKK) preparation processes?

(Mekan Kimlik Kartı hazırlama sürecinden ve araştırma sürecinden bahsedebilir misin?)

16. What are the points to be considered in the process of preparing MKK?

(Mekan Kimlik Kartı hazırlama sürecinde dikkat edilmesi gereken noktalar neler?)

17. Could you describe the memory walk method?
(Hafıza yürüyüşü yöntemini anlatabilir misin?)
18. What kinds of places, people, and memories do memory walks involve? What kinds of places, people, and memories do they leave out?
(Hafıza yürüyüşleri hangi mekanları, kişileri, ve hafızaları barındırıyor? Dışarıda bıraktıkları mekanlar, kişiler, ve hafızalar var mı?)
19. What kind of an experience do memory walks offer the listeners and storytellers?
(Hafıza yürüyüşleri dinleyicilere ve hikaye anlatıcılara nasıl bir deneyim sunuyor?)
20. How would you describe the listener profile?
(Hafıza yürüyüşlerine katılan dinleyici profilini nasıl tanımlarsın?)
21. What kind of feedback did you receive from the participants of memory walks so far?
(Bugüne kadar hafıza yürüyüşlerine katılımcılardan ne gibi geri dönüşler geldi?)
22. What were the things you enjoyed the most and had the most difficulty with while storytelling?
(Hikaye anlatıcılığı yaparken en çok zevk aldığın ve en çok zorlandığın şeyler neler?)
23. What is the effect and importance of storytelling in memory studies?
(Hafıza çalışmalarında hikaye anlatıcılığının etkisi ve önemi ne?)
24. What kind of things do you pay attention to when you are storytelling?
(Hikaye anlatıcılığı yaparken ne gibi şeylere dikkat ediyorsun?)

25. What is the effect and importance of the practice of walking in memory studies?
(Hafıza yürüyüşlerinde yürüme pratiğinin etkisi ve önemi ne?)
26. What is the effect and importance of being in the place in memory walks?
(Hafıza yürüyüşlerinde mekanda olmanın etkisi ve önemi ne?)
27. How did the idea of making a short film come about? How did it contribute to the memory walk? (SEHAK memory walks)
(Kısa film çekilmesi fikri nasıl ortaya çıktı? Sürece katkısı neler oldu?)
28. Have you ever participated in an online memory walk? What did you think about it?
(Hiç online hafıza yürüyüşüne katıldın mı? Nasıl buldun?)
29. What would you change if you could change one thing about the memory walks?
(Hafıza yürüyüşleri hakkında bir şeyi değiştirme imkanın olsaydı neyi değiştirirdin?)
30. What would you like to say about your experience in memory work?
(Hafıza çalışma deneyimini genel olarak nasıl değerlendirirsin?)
31. How did the memory walks affect your daily life and practices and your relationships with the city and places?
(Bu deneyim senin gündelik hayatını ve pratiklerini, şehirle ve mekanla kurduğun ilişkileri nasıl etkiledi?)
32. What do you like and dislike about memory work?
(Hafıza çalışmanın sevdiğin ve sevmediğin yanları neler?)
33. Do you have anything to add or ask?
(Eklemek veya sormak istediğin bir şey var mı?)

Group 3: Memory walk participants

1. Could you introduce yourself?
(Kendini tanıtabilir misin?)
2. How did you get to know this organization and the memory walks? How did you decide to participate in a memory walk?
(Bu kuruluş ile nasıl tanıştın? Hafıza yürüyüşünden nasıl haberdar oldun ve katılmaya karar verdin?)
3. How do you evaluate the memory studies in civil society in Turkey?
(Türkiye’de sivil toplumdaki hafıza çalışmalarını nasıl değerlendiriyorsun?)
4. How do you position this organization’s works within the memory studies in civil society in Turkey?
5. *(Bu kuruluşun Türkiye’de sivil toplumundaki hafıza çalışmaları içinde nerede konumlandırırsın?)*
6. Why is it important to work with and for young people?
(Gençlerle ve gençler için çalışmalar yapmak niye önemli?)
7. What does memory work mean to you?
(Sence hafıza çalışmak ne demek?)
8. What does facing the past mean to you?
(Sence geçmişle yüzleşmek ne demek?)
9. What were your motivations and expectations from the memory walk?
(Yürüyüşe katılırken motivasyonların ve beklentilerin nelerdi?)
10. How would you describe a memory walk to someone who does not know about it?
(Bilmeyen birine anlatacak olsan hafıza yürüyüşünü nasıl anlattırydın?)
11. Could you tell me about the memory walk you participated?

(Katıldığın hafıza yürüyüşünü anlatır mısın?)

12. What impressed you the most in the memory walk?

(Yürüyüşte seni en çok etkileyen şey neydi?)

13. What do you remember from the memory walk when you look at it today?

(Bugünden baktığında hafıza yürüyüşünden aklında kalanlar neler oldu?)

14. What did you feel before, during, and after the memory walk?

(Yürüyüş başlamadan, sırasında ve sonrasında neler hissettin?)

15. What is the effect and importance of the practice of walking in memory studies?

(Hafıza yürüyüşlerinde yürüme pratiğinin etkisi ve önemi ne?)

16. What is the effect and importance of being in the place in the memory walks?

(Hafıza yürüyüşlerinde mekanda olmanın etkisi ve önemi ne?)

17. How do you evaluate the storytelling of memories during the memory walks?

(Yürüyüşlerde hafızaların hikayeleştirilerek anlatılmasını nasıl değerlendiriyorsun?)

18. How were the street interviews? What do you remember about the interviews? (SEHAK memory walks)

(Sokak röportajları nasıl geçti? Neler hatırlıyorsun?)

19. How was the film shooting and editing process? (SEHAK memory walks)

(Film çekme ve editleme süreci nasıl geçti?)

20. What happened in the discussion session after the memory walk? What was discussed?

(Yürüyüş sonrasında yaptığınız oturumda neler oldu? Neler konuşuldu?)

21. What kind of an experience do memory walks offer the participants?

(Sence hafıza yürüyüşü katılımcılara nasıl bir deneyim sunuyor?)

22. What kinds of places, people, and memories do memory walks involve? What kinds of places, people, and memories do they leave out?

(Hafıza yürüyüşleri hangi mekanları, kişileri, ve hafızaları barındırıyor?

Dışarıda bıraktıkları mekanlar, kişiler, ve hafızalar var mı?)

23. Before participating in the memory walk, were there any issues on your mind that you thought were important to be remembered? If so, what were they?

(Yürüyüşe katılmadan önce kafanda toplumsal olarak hatırlanmasını önemli bulduğun meseleler var mıydı? Varsa nelerdi?)

24. What would you change if you could change one thing about the memory walks?

(Hafıza yürüyüşleri hakkında bir şeyi değiştirme imkanın olsaydı neyi değiştirdin?)

25. Have you ever participated in an online memory walk? What did you think about it?

(Hiç online hafıza yürüyüşüne katıldın mı? Nasıl buldun?)

26. Do you have anything to add or ask?

(Ekleme veya sormak istediğin bir şey var mı?)

APPENDIX E

LONG QUOTES IN TURKISH

1. Failliğin mirasını ve hafızasını taşıyan kuşaklar olarak neyi yapmakta başarısız olduğumuz üzerine düşünebilir miyiz? Neleri işitmiyoruz? Neleri görmüyoruz? Şimdiye dair bir soruya, konuşmanın imkânlarına ve imkâansızlıklarına, eşitsizliğin toprağını eşelemeye doğru da gidebiliriz.
2. O anlatırken bir yandan tam orada, tam o fotoğraflara bakıyorduk. Bir de dediğim gibi haberlerden falan hatırladığım görüntülerdi onlar. Sanki evet hani arkamda bir topluluk var. Sesler canlandı kulağında. Haberlerde dinliyorduk, o sırada çocuktum X'da yaşıyordum. Hepimiz Hrant'ız hepimiz Dink'iz posterleri onları falan canlandı o an kafamda bir anda onu dinlerken.
3. 15 dk 20 dk yürütürler iki rota arasında. Olabildiğince bunu gözetirler. Bu biraz da şey için, insanlar bir anlatıyı aldıktan sonra, genelde de anlatılar bizde maalesef ağır olduğu için onlara ya hareket halindeyken hem hazmetmeleri, hazmetmeye çalışmaları hem düşünmeleri için bu anlatılar üzerine hem zaman açmak ama tam bunu yapamadan ikinci tokadı yemelerini sağlamak gibi bir şey geliyor bana.
4. Bir yerden bir yere yürürken gerçekten böyle bir şeyin bir madde etkisindeymiş gibi artık her yere aaa acaba buranın tarihi ne, bunun tarihi neymiş, buraları nereler falan diye hatta o sokaklar eskiden nasıldı gibi düşünmeye gidene kadar bir hülya içine dalıyorsun. Dolayısıyla o yürümek aradaki mesafe hem düşünme için hem hayal kurma fırsatı için güzel bir imkan sağlıyor.
5. O mekanı, o kişiyi ya da o olayı, bir olay da olabilir bu, birbiriyle özdeşleştirerek. Aslında mekana da biraz anlam yükleyerek. O anlamı oraya bir elbise gibi

giydirecek bence. Çünkü hani işte X bir yazar burada yaşamıştır demek yerine aslında o X yazarın yaşamış olduğu o adaletsizliği, varsa öyle bir geçmişinde adaletsizlik, onu aslında o mekana giydirmek gibi görüyorum ben. O mekana bir daha zaten başka bir gözle bakamıyorsun. O oluyor senin için. Bu da tabii zihninde çok güzel kapılar açıyor bence. Çünkü şehir birazcık dekor gibi gelir bana. Şimdi şu sokaktan biri yürürken aslında o evlerin içini bilmezsin, ama hepsinin içinde başka bir şey yaşam sürüyordur ya, ama aslında senin için bir dekor orası. İçine girmedikçe var olmayan bir şey, bir yer. Bence Karakutu'nun da yaptığı şey o dekoru aslında senin hayatına sokmak. O senin günlük yaşamına onu dekor olmaktan çıkarıp anlamlı bir şey halinde o mekanı sokmak gibi söyleyebilirim.

6. Bu hikayeleri her anlatan kişi kendisi o hikayeyi neden anlatmak istedi. Çünkü hikayeler gönüllü olarak seçiliyor. Kendisi neden anlatmak istedi ve kendi hayatına nasıl bir bağlantı kurdu gibi bir kısım da anlatıyor ve orada tamamen şey serbest yani . . . Dolayısıyla insanlar kendileriyle hikayelerin bağlantısını kurarken günümüzdeki tartışmalara veya kişisel hayatlarından anekdotlara da değinebiliyor.
7. Bir gün merdivenlerin orada bekliyorum, grubumu bekliyorum. Yukarıdan yokuştan bir adam indi ve şey diye bağırdı Güngör abla bak sana kiracı getirdim dedi. Ve apartmanın içinden de bir kadın “aa gelin gelin” diye bağırdı, kadını görmedim ama Güngör Abla'ydı o yani apartmanın içindeydi ve ben şey oldum. Aa benim yıllardır anlattığım Güngör Abla buradaymış oldum mesela. Böyle bir şeyi mekana gitmeden deneyimlememin imkanı yok yani imkanı yok burada anlatsam olmaz kesinlikle.

8. Şifreleri çözüp bir mekandan başka bir mekana gidiyorlar, hazine avı gibi. Şey olur ya, bir müzeye gidersiniz belli bir çizgi olur, sana çok lineer akışlı bir şey anlatırlar, belki senin de müdahil olamayacağın o anlatıya, sonra da evine gidersin. Ama Karakutu'da öyle olmuyor. O kurulan anlatı çok öyle değil. Sen şifreyi çözüp bir mekana gidiyorsun, sonra başka şifreyi çözüp diğer mekana gidiyorsun. Daha böyle aktif katılımcısı oluyorsun.
9. Yanlış yollara sapmak, yanlış yerlere gitmek, doğru yerde yürürken bile farklı mekanları görmek, orayı gözünle kaydetmek, ya da o yola dair, o mekana dair algının yürüyerek değişmesi, yürürken değişiyor olması... Çünkü belki daha önce yürüdüğün bir yol ya da bir sonraki hafta yürüyeceğin bir yol. O anlamda görmek ve yürümek bence o mekana dair algının ve hafızanın dönüşümünü sağlayan en önemli şey bence aslında.
10. Oradaki yaşanmışlıkların beni etkilemesini bekliyordum ama duraklar arasında yürürken o duraklar arasında bir farkındalığımız arttı bizim ekip arkadaşım. Hani bir bilgimiz de yok ama daha fazla bakmaya başladık. Daha fazla böyle etrafımızda ipuçları yakalamaya başladığımızı fark ettik ve bu çok beklediğimiz bir şey değildi açıkçası.
11. . . . mekanda bir hikaye dinledikten sonra bir sonraki mekana giderken bile hemen etrafına böyle bir bakıyorsun. O farkındalığı katıyor sana. Hemen şey gözünüyle bakıyorsun acaba bu evde ne olmuştur, acaba bu bina neyin nesidir, burada kim oturmuştur gibi bakıyorsun.
12. Kafada bir hikaye olarak kaldığında birinci sınıfta hoca anlatırken üzülüyorsun belki böyle ne bileyim sonuçlarını konuşuyorsun, bir şeyler yapıyorsun ama kitaptaki teorik kısım gibi kalıyor. Gerçeğini görünce farklı sorular geliyor insanın aklına. Benim dedem o gün neredeydi mesela? Gerçeği koyunca iş

değişiyor. O yüzden bu yaklaşım ile bu sokaklara Karakutu'yla birlikte bakacak olursam, burada yaşandı diye düşününce, şey sorusu bence çıkıyor insanın karşısına: . . . o zaman burada mı yaşanmıştı? O merak duygusunu dürtüyor. Normalde yanından yürüyüp geçeceğin, aracı olarak kullandığın sokakla iletişimini biraz değiştiriyor.

13. Grup olarak yürümek bile eylem gibi olabiliyor çünkü sivil polisler gelip siz niye toplandınız diyor mesela . . . Niye toplandınız? Çünkü toplanmak istedik yani. Ama gelip soruyorlar. Onun için toplu halde yürümek bile bir şeye dönüşebiliyor, politik bir eyleme dönüşebiliyor veya yürüyememek.
14. Taksim'de İHD'nin önünde bir hikaye anlatıyoruz normalde, çok uzun zamandır gidemiyoruz oranın önüne kapalı olduğu için. Oraya gitmeye çalışmak, sonra o yürüyüşe katılan insanların belki de hiç haberi olmayan şekilde İHD'nin kapalı olduğunu görmeleri, ondan bizim bununla ilgili onlara ya işte biz böyle bir hikaye anlatıyoruz normalde ama şu an oraya giremiyoruz dememiz. Çünkü yürüyüşe katılan herkes aşırı politik ve aşırı her şeyi sığağı sığağına takip eden insanlar olmayabiliyor. Ya da çoğu insan mesela Beyoğlu'na gitmiyor yıllardır ve böyle bir şey için gidiyor ve sonra oranın halini görüyor. Mesela Cumartesi Anneleri'nin oturduğu yerin etrafını çevirmişler. İHD'nin önü kapalı. Gezi Parkı'na gittiğimizde sivil polisler etrafımızı sarıyor falan. Bütün bunlar oraları, oralarda yürümek ve hikaye anlatmak için bile oralarda var olamamak bile insanlara biz politik bir şey yapıyoruz herhalde şeyi veriyor.
15. Bizim yaptığımız şey de dolaylı olarak bir geçmişle yüzleşme pratiği. Önce kişisel ufak hayatlarımızda bir araştırmayı yaparken o zorlu geçmişte unutturulan, çarpıtılan, saptırılan geçmişe dair farklı bir anlatıyı bulmaya çalışıyoruz. Bunun için bize sunulan hali hazırda verilen ana akım tarihte verilen

kaynakların ötesine geçmeye çalışıyoruz. Bu öncelikle kendi küçük hayatlarımızda bir geçmişle yüzleşme pratiği. Sonrasında bunu anlatıyoruz başka insanlara. Dolayısıyla geçmişle yüzleşmeye dair bir iddiamız var.

16. Nasıl etkileyici olmasın ki? Doğrudan geçmişle yüzleşme sunuyor, hem fiziksel bir şey de var ya. Mekandasın varlığıyla oradasın bir de oranın hikayesini dinliyorsun. Geçmişle yüzleşme meselesi biraz tabii çok büyük de bir laf yani. Tam karşılığı bu mudur? Değildir ama bir kapı açıyor. İnsanların kafasında bir soru işareti, bir duygu bırakıyor. Burada yaşanmış bir şey var geçmişle yüzleşmek bence çok daha kapsamlı bir şey hani hemen bir hafıza yürüyüşüyle bunu yapabilir miyiz, hayır ama bir adım bu. Ve çok etkileyici bir adımmış gibi geliyor diyebilirim.

17. . . . kendini farklı siyasi söylemler içinde sürekli yineleyen, öznelere üreten, öznelere konuşurken kendi özerkliklerine inançları itibarıyla da görünmezleşen, sırta kadem basmayı başaran, kısacası öznelere tekrar tekrar kendine döndürmeyi başaran bir toplumsal iktidar biçimidir.

18. Dedim ya Cumhuriyet'in makbul kıldığı bir insan tipi var laik, Hanefi, Sünni, Müslüman, Türk. Ben aslında hepsine uyan bir şeyim. Benim hiçbir azınlık şeyim yok..Benim oralarda oluyor olmam aslında çok garip geliyordu başta insanlara. Bir dönem ben de bunu sorguladım. Acaba ben niye buradayım? . . . Acaba benim burada olmam gerekiyor mu? Belli bir süre bunları düşünüyordum.

19. Tırnak içerisinde belli başlı hedef gösterilen grupların hiçbirinde değilim ben. Kendim ve ailem. Yani etnik olarak. Orada böyle bir şey oldum. Ben şu an içinde var olduğum dünya görüşünü savunuyorum ama böyle bir zorbalığa maruz kalmadan savunuyorum. O insanlar bunun için çok daha büyük bedeller ödemişler. Kendimi kötü de hissettim birkaç gün onun etkisinden çıkamadığımı

hatırlıyorum. Ben kendi dünya görüşüm için böyle bir ortamın içerisinde kalsaydım acaba aynı görüşü aynı kuvvetle devam ettiriyor olabilir miydim? Bu birkaç gün böyle hem mutluydum bunları öğrendiğime hem de kendimi sorguladığım bir süreç geçirdim açıkçası.

20. İlk anlatışımında ağlasaydım bu duygu yüküne dayanamadım ve ağladım derdim ama bir değil iki değil üç değil belki onuncu anlatışımında ben Gomidas'ın hikayesini gözyaşlarımı tutamadım çünkü çok ağır geldi . . . Zorlu konular çalışıyoruz yani işkenceler hapishaneler göçler soykırımlar insanların hayatlarını darmaduman altüst eden konuları biz gün yüzüne çıkarıyoruz ve didik didik araştırıyoruz bir de üstüne bunları anlatıyoruz. Şimdi bunun altından kalkmak çok kolay bir şey değil . . . Burada biz araştırmacıyı çoğu zaman yok sayıyoruz.
21. Ya ben o ara Ermeni Soykırımına çok kafayı takmıştım. Sürekli olarak onunla ilgili okuyup yazıyordum . . . Ben uzun süre baş edemedim bu meseleyle. Sonrasında ben mesafe aldım. Bir süre bıraktım bütün bunları. Çalışmak istemiyorum dedim, görmek istemiyorum, bilmek istemiyorum tamam. Yani bu bir koruma mekanizmasıydı. Çok bilinçli olarak yaptığım bir şey de değildi. Ama bir süre mesela uzaklaştım. Şimdi mesela nasıl diye sordun? Şu an mesafe almış hissediyorum mesela. Şu an çok daha rahat anlatabilirim gibi.
22. Anlatıcılık mevzusu bir yerden sonra . . . tekdüze, günlük bir aktivite haline gelebiliyor. Oradan da biraz meseleye dair bir böyle . . . soğuk bir yerden bakmak gibi bir sonucu var bence. Yani soğuk bir yerden kastım, meselenin kendisinden uzaklaşmak. Yani çünkü orada bir tekdüze, o anlatıcılar için çok kez yapılmış, artık ezberlenmiş metinlerden gelen, ezberlenmiş bir aktivite gibi aslında.
23. O dönemde yapan kişileri soy olarak düşünürsem, o zaman onlar benim soyummuş gibi algılayarak kendi yaptığım şeyden yani kendi soyundan utanma

duymam gerekiyor. Ama ben bunu hiçbir şekilde kişiselleştirmedim . . . Çünkü bu her yerde yaşanıyor ve bu bir politikaydı.

24. Yani aslında bence hem var hem yok çünkü bir noktada diyorsun ki bunu ben yapmadım, buna ben vesile olmadım, benden öncekilerin yaptığı bir şeyin sorumluluğunu ben alamam. Ama bundan sonra böyle bir şey olmaması için ben çaba gösterebilirim.
25. Ve ben her yürüyüşe katıldığımda . . . insanların böyle yarısından çoğunun tüylerinin diken diken olduğunu ve herkesin de çok etkilendiğini, bağ kurduğunu, yeni hikayeler öğrendiğini ve aslında o ortamı sevmelerinin sebebinin de bir şekilde orayla da empati kurmalarının olduğunu düşünüyorum.
26. Bazen konular çok ağır oluyor hakikaten ama aslında konuyu çok ağır bir şekilde anlatmamak gibi bir hedefi var. Yani çok dramatikleştirmeden anlatmaya çalışmak ve sonunda da bir umut veren bir yere bağlamak, bir mücadeleye, veya diyelim o hikayenin kahramanı mücadele edememişse bile sonrasında onun hatırlatılması için verilen mücadeleden bahsetmek de olabilir bu . . . Biraz onu yapmaya çalışıyoruz yani umutsuz bir sonla bitirmemeye çalışmayı hedefliyoruz.
27. Hikayeyi oradaki hak ihlaliyle bitirirsek bence bu biraz umutsuzluk yayıyor benim gözlemim bu yönde. Orada bir şey yaşandı, olayı anlatıyoruz ve sanki tüm acıklı haliyle orada o insanı, o geçmişte bırakmak gibi oluyor. Bence öyle yapmamak lazım. Oraya götürüp oradan “hadi gel, burada da bak bugün bu tarz şeylere benzer şeyler yaşanıyor”, bu bir direniş olabilir, bir hak ihlali olabilir. İnsanlar çok etkilenmiş oluyor, kendi başlarına gelen şeyle bağ kuruyorlar. Hep bunun altını çiziyorum kendi olduğum şeylerde: Bugün buradayız, bir aradayız ve birbirimize bunları anlattık, demek ki hala umut var.

28. Geen iřte bir Őey okumuřtum, insanlar hüzünlü müzikler dinlediklerinde mutlu oluyorlarmıř. Bunun sebebi de iřte kendilerini anlayan onlara hak veren, onlar gibi hisseden birilerinin olduđunu bilmekmiř . . . Yaptıđımız Őey belki bizi üzüyor, düşündürüyor, dalıp gidiyorsun. Ne bileyim belki diyorsun ki, bir Őey olmaz biz bořa uğrařıyoruz . . . Ama bir yandan da diyorsun ki “bugün birisi sana bunu anlattı, birisi senin yařadıđın gibi bir Őey yařamıř” . . . Ortaklık umut da veriyor aslında.
29. *O gün gelecek ve biz huzura kavuřacađız*” diye bir Őey yok. O güne biraz daha yaklařmıř olacađız sadece. Gelecekte bambařka bir güzelliđin tarifi ıkabilir. O yüzden, “*biz göremeyeceđiz, ocuklarımız görsün*” de deđil gereklik, ünkü onlar da görmeyecek. Görmek istediđimiz, barıř dediđimiz Őey bir nehir gibi. Ona su tedarik etmekten bařka bir Őey yapamayız. Her getiđi yerde yeni bir anlam kazanacak, yenilenmesi, yeniden düşünülmesi, formüle edilmesi gerekecek.
30. Evet, o öfkeyle ne yapıyorsun iyi bir soru. Genelde tırnaklarımı yiyorum. ok fazla somut bir yere kanalize olmuyor. Daha ok farkındalık gibi yani aresizliđe de gömüldüđüm oluyor. ünkü en fazla 19 Ocak'a gidiyorsun, en fazla mahkemeleri takip ediyorsun. Hadi gittin ađlayan'a gittin. ađlayan'da bir iki duruřmaya da katılmıřtım. Bunları yapıyorsun ama elimden gelen bařka Őeyler belki onu [Hrant Dink] tanıtmak gibi durumlar oluyor.
31. Gündelik olarak her günümü geirdiđim her gün önünden yürüdüđüm parkın bahenin evin binanın caminin kilisenin hikayesini hem tarihsel bađlama oturttarak hem de oradaki yařamıř insanların hikayeleriyle bađdařtırarak dinlemek bende inanılmaz bir merak uyandırmıřtı. Sadece dinlediđim yere dair deđil. Ya bu kentte neler var, ben daha neler öğrenebilirim aslında, acaba řurada

ne var, burada ne var, hadi şuna da bakayım buna da bakayım. Hadi biraz daha interneti kurcalayayım, ne yazılmış ne çizilmiş.

32. Oradan senin için de farklı bir merak kapısı doğuyor yani “a bunu hemen araştırmalıyım, size gerekli bilgiyi sağlayacağım” diyorsun ve kendin yeni bir araştırmanın peşine düşüyorsun, o anlatıyı zenginleştiriyorsun belki ya da sadece kişisel olarak kendine bir şey katmış oluyorsun. Öyle bir kapı açmasını seviyorum açıkçası ben.
33. Onun sorumluluğunu ben alamam. O zaman ben kolektif bir şeyin bir parçasıymışım gibi kendimi düşünüp kendime bir kimlik atfetmem gerekir. Ama neden yapayım bunu? Çünkü ben yapmadım bunu. O travmatik şeylerin yaşanmasına ben sebep olmadım. Tabii öyle bir toplumun da aynı şeyleri tekrar etmemesi için, dönüşmesi ve değişmesi gerekiyorsa bunun için de işte çalışmam gerekiyor, çalışırım.

APPENDIX F

APPROVAL OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 27.05.2022-67788

T.C.
BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER YÜKSEK LİSANS VE DOKTORA TEZLERİ ETİK İNCELEME
KOMİSYONU
TOPLANTI KARAR TUTANAĞI

Toplantı Sayısı : 32
Toplantı Tarihi : 26.05.2022
Toplantı Saati : 10:00
Toplantı Yeri : Zoom Sanal Toplantı
Bulunanlar : Prof. Dr. Ebru Kaya, Prof. Dr. Feyza Çorapçı, Doç. Dr. Arhan S. Ertan, Doç. Dr. Senem Yıldız,
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen
Bulunmayanlar :

Damla Barın
Sosyoloji

Sayın Araştırmacı,

Daha önce SBB-EAK 2021/26 sayılı ve "Hafıza Yürüyüşleri: İstanbul'da Hafıza Yürüyüşlerine Katılan Gençlerin Geçmişle Yüzleşme Deneyimleri" başlığı ile onay almış, içerik değişmeden başlığı "Hafızalar Arasında Yürümek: Hafıza Yürüyüşlerinde Gündelik ve Duygulanımsal Karşılaşmalar ve Geçmişle Yüzleşme" olan araştırma projeniz 26 Mayıs 2022 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve SBB-EAK 2022/47 sayılı ile kabul edilmiştir.

Bu karar tüm üyelerin toplantıya çevrimiçi olarak katılımı ve oybirliği ile alınmıştır. COVID-19 önlemleri kapsamında kurul üyelerinden ıslak imza alınmadığı için bu onay mektubu üye ve raporör olarak Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen tarafından bütün üyeler adına e-imzalanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla, bilgilerinizi rica ederiz.

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin
SOHTORİK İLKMEN
ÜYE

e-İmzalıdır
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik
İlkmen
Öğretim Üyesi
Raporör

SOBETİK 32 26.05.2022

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

REFERENCES

- Abiral, B., Altınay, A. G., Altınay, G., Çalışkan, D., & Yıldız, A. (2019). Curious steps. In *Women mobilizing memory* (pp. 84-104). Columbia University Press.
- Abu-Lughod, L., & Lutz, C. (1990). Introduction: Emotion, discourse, and the politics of everyday life. In L. Abu-Lughod & C. Lutz (Eds.), *Language and the politics of emotion* (pp. 1-23). Cambridge University Press.
- Adanalı, Y. (June 15, 2017). Yürümek: Adalet & diğer şeyler için. Retrieved May 15, 2022, from <https://beyond.istanbul/y%C3%BCr%C3%BCmek-adalet-di%C4%9Fer-%C5%9Feyler-i%CC%87%C3%A7in-d496e8f65018>
- Adorno, T. W. (1998). The meaning of working through the past. In *Critical models: Interventions and catchwords*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Agamben, G. (1999). *Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the archive*. New York: Zone Books.
- Ahıska, M. (2006). Occidentalism and registers of truth: The politics of archives in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 34, 9-29.
doi:10.1017/S0896634600004350
- Ahıska, M. (2011). Monster that remember: Tracing the story of the Workers' Monument in Tophane, İstanbul. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 45, 9-47.
- Ahıska, M. (2014). The imperial complex, resistance, and remembering: Thinking through the eruptions and thresholds of memory in Turkey. *Haus der Kulturen der Welt*. Retrieved from <https://journeyofideasacross.hkw.de/between-times-shifts-in-imperialism-orientalism-and-occidentalism/meltem-ahıska.html>
- Ahıska, M. (2019). Memory as encounter: The Saturday Mothers in Turkey. In A. G. Altınay, M. J. Contreras, M. Hirsch, J. Howard, B. Karaca, & A. Solomon (Eds.), *Women mobilizing memory* (pp. 133–151).
<https://doi.org/10.7312/bach94616-013>
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2005). The politics of bad feeling. *Australian Critical Race and Whiteness Studies Association Journal*, 1.
- Akçura, B. (2020). “Kaldırın şu heykeli buradan”. İletişim Yayınları.
- Akdemir, E. (2021). *Listening to possible worlds: The 2019 İstanbul feminist night march and its acoustic conflicts*. Master thesis. Boğaziçi University.
- Akkent, M. & Kovar, S. N. (2019). *Feminist pedagogy: Museums, memory sites and practices of remembrance*. İstos.

- Akşit, E. E. (2005). *Kızların sessizliği*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Alpkaya, G., Altıntaş, I., Sevdiren, Ö. & Sevimli, E. A. (2013). *Enforced disappearances and the conduct of the judiciary*. Truth Justice Memory Center.
- Altınay, A. G. & Çetin, F. (2009). *Torunlar*. Metis Yayınları.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso books.
- Anderson, J. (2004). Talking whilst walking: A geographical archaeology of knowledge. *Area*, Vol. 36, pp. 254–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0004-0894.2004.00222.x>
- Arendt, H. (2006). What is freedom. In *Between past and future*. Penguin Books.
- Arslan, U. T. (2010). *Mazi kabrinin hortlakları*. Metis Yayıncılık.
- Arslan, U. T. (2015). Türklük ethosu ve suçluluk sorunu: Mesele Dergisi'nde 1915. Retrieved from <https://azadalik.com/2015/10/02/turkluk-ethosu-ve-sucluluk-sorunu-mesele-dergisinde-1915/>
- Arslan, U. T. (2016). Kesik'in açtığı yerden: Kat kat notlar. Retrieved from <https://azadalik.com/2016/05/10/kesikin-actigi-yerden-kat-kat-notlar/>
- Arslan, U. T. (2021). Çocukluğun zamanı: Yurt, kazı ve hafıza. In E. Ertürk & S. Sancaktar (Eds.), *Hafıza ve sanat konuşmaları 2020*. Hafıza Merkezi.
- Arslan, U. T. (2022). Zamansal yolculuklar: Umut Tümay Arslan ile faile bakmak. [Video]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RP3y01ZEA4w>
- Artuç, S. (2021). *Marc Nichanian's dead witness revisited through 'mourning and melancholy': From historical loss to structural lack*. Master thesis. Boğaziçi University.
- Assmann, A. (2014). "The whole country is a monument": Framing places of terror in post-war Germany. In E. Schindel & P. Colombo (Eds.), *Space and the memories of violence* (pp. 135–149). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How do to things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Aybak, T. (2016). Geopolitics of denial: Turkish state's 'Armenian problem.' *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 18(2), 125–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2016.1141582>
- Balancar, M. F. (2012). *The sounds of silence: Turkey's Armenians speak*. Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları.
- Barsalou, J., & Baxter, V. (2007). *The urge to remember*.

- Bassett, K. (2004). Walking as an aesthetic practice and a critical tool: Some psychogeographic experiments. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 28(3), 397–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309826042000286965>
- Bayer, G. (2019). Confronting the past on screens. *Holocaust Studies*.
- Benjamin, W. (1968). *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Benjamin, W. (1999). *Selected writings: Volume 2, Part 2, 1931-1934* (M. W. Jennings, H. Eiland, & G. Smith, Eds.).
- Benjamin, W. (2002). *The arcades project*. Harvard University Press.
- Benjamin, W. (2007). *Illuminations*. Schocken Books.
- Berlant, L. (2011). *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press.
- Berlant, L., & Stewart, K. (2019). *The hundreds*. Duke University Press.
- Beykoz Kundura. (n.d.). Retrieved April 13, 2022 from <https://www.beykozkundura.com/remotestanbul>
- Bilal, M. (2004). *The lost lullaby and other stories about being an Armenian in Turkey*. Boğaziçi University. Master thesis.
- Bora, T. (2009) Geçmişle hesaplaşma: Müşküller ve yordamlar “Söyledim ve vicdanımı kurtardım” dan ötesi? *Birikim* (248), 7–17.
- Bozkurt, H. & Kaya, Ö. (2014). “Fotoğrafi kaldırmak”: Eşi zorla kaybedilen kadınların deneyimleri. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Bozoğlu, G. (2019). *Museums, emotion, and memory culture: The politics of the past in Turkey*. Routledge.
- Bull, A. C., & Hansen, H. L. (2020). Agonistic memory and the UNREST project. *Modern Languages Open*, 1(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3828/mlo.v0i0.319>
- Burton, N. (2021). A study of wonder. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/hide-and-peek/201412/study-wonder>
- Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519–531.
- Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Stanford University Press.
- Cantek, F. & Zırh, B. C. (2014). Bir semt monografisine doğru: Cebeci’ye bakmak. *İdealKent*, 11, 138-170.
- Cardiff, J. & Miller, G. B. (2012). *Alter bahnhof video walk* [Video]. Retrieved May 12, 2022 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sOkQE7m31Pw>

- Cardiff, J. & Miller, G. B. (2022). Alter bahnhof video walk. Retrieved May 12, 2022 from <https://cardiffmiller.com/walks/alter-bahnhof-video-walk/>
- Casey, E. S. (1996). How to get from space to place in a fairly short stretch of time: Phenomenological prolegomena. In S. Feld & K. H. Basso (Eds.), *Senses of place* (pp. 13–52). School of American Research Press.
- Casey, E. S. (2001). Between geography and philosophy: What does it mean to be in the place-world? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 91(4), 683–693.
- Center for Spatial Justice. (2018). *Beyoğlu “Yıkılmadım ayaktayım” haritası*.
- Cercel, C. (2020). Whither politics, whither Memory? *Modern Languages Open*, 1(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3828/mlo.v0i0.334>
- Certeau, M. de. (1984). Walking in the city. In *The practice of everyday life*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ahg.12135>
- Cherry, M. (2021). *The case for rage: Why anger is essential to anti-racist struggle*. Oxford University Press.
- Clough, P. T. (2008). The affective turn. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(1), 1–22. doi:10.1177/0263276407085156
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge University Press.
- Connerton, P. (2008). Seven types of forgetting. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698007083889>
- Connerton, P. (2009). *How modernity forgets*. Cambridge University Press.
- Çavdar, O. (2020). *Sivas katliamı: Yas ve bellek*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Çelik, A. & Dinç, N. M. (2015). *Yüz yıllık ah! Toplumsal hafızanın izinde 1915 Diyarbekir*. İsmail Beşikçi Vakfı Yayınları.
- Çelik, A. (2020). The Armenian Genocide in Kurdish collective memory. *Middle East Report*, 295.
- Çetinkaya, C. (2020). Rising Ottoman nostalgia in Turkish popular culture: An analysis of Turkey’s europeanization process and Ottoman-themed soap operas. *Politikon: The IAPSS Journal of Political Science*, 46, 8–28. <https://doi.org/10.22151/politikon.46.1>
- Çevik, S. B. (2019). Turkish historical television series: Public broadcasting of neo-Ottoman illusions. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 19(2), 227–242.
- Çınar, R. Ü. (2020). *Ecdadın icadı: AKP iktidarında bellek mücadelesi*. İletişim Yayınları.

- Çiçek, C. (2021). *Kürt meselesi ve siyasi barış bağlamında güç paylaşımı ve ademi merkezîyet*. Truth, Justice and Memory Center.
- D'Souza, A. & McDonough, T. (Eds.). (2006). *The invisible flâneuse?: Gender, public space, and visual culture in nineteenth-century Paris*. Manchester University Press.
- Damasio, A. (2003). The feeling of what happens. In R. Solomon, *What is an emotion* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- David, L. (2020a). The emergence of the 'dealing with the past' agenda: Sociological thoughts on its negative impact on the ground. *Modern Languages Open*, 1(December 1948), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3828/mlo.v0i0.321>
- David, L. (2020b). *The past can't heal us: The dangers of mandating memory in the name of human rights*. Cambridge University Press.
- Debord, G. (1956). Theory of the derive (K. Knabb, Trans.). *Les Lèvres Nues*, (9). Retrieved from <https://www.cddc.vt.edu/sionline/si/theory.html>
- Demirel, I. & Dönmez, Ö. (n.d.). *Memory walk handbook*. Retrieved from <https://en.calameo.com/read/00697082951e9f9c38cad> (Accessed: May 2022)
- Descartes, R. (1649). *The passions of the soul*. Paris: H. Legras. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2021666986>
- Descartes, R. (1985). The passions of the soul. In *The philosophical writings of Descartes, vol. 1* (J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff & D. Murdoch, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dinç, P. (2016). *Collective memory and competition over identity in a conflict zone: the case of Dersim*. PhD thesis. London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Doğru, O. & Dinçer, H. (2017). *Amicus Curiae görüşü: Anayasa Mahkemesi'ne bireysel başvuru ve zorla kaybetmeler*. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Duthie, R. (2017). *Justice mosaics: How context shapes transitional justice in fractured societies*. International Center for Transitional Justice.
- Edensor, T. (2000). Walking in the British countryside: Reflexivity, embodied practices and ways to escape. *Body & Society*, 6(3–4), 81–106.
- Edensor, T. (2010). Walking in rhythms: Place, regulation, style and the flow of experience. *Visual Studies*, 25(1).
- Eken, B. (2014). The politics of the Gezi Park resistance: Against memory and identity. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 113(2), 427–436. doi:10.1215/00382876-2644212
- Elçi, T., Keskin, E., Perinçek, M., Pişkin, L., Tanrıkulu, N. & Uçum, M. (2012). *Confronting the past: Impunity and high profile cases*. TESEV.

- Elkin, L. (2017). *Flâneuse: Women walk the city in Paris, New York, Tokyo, Venice, and London*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Erdoğan, R. T. (2014). The unofficial translation of the message of H.E. President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the then prime minister of the Republic of Turkey, on the events of 1915. Retrieved from https://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkish-prime-minister-mr_-recep-tayyip-erdo%C4%9Fan-published-a-message-on-the-events-of-1915_-23-april-2014.en.mfa
- Ergin, M. & Karakaya, Y. (2017). Between neo-Ottomanism and Ottomania: Navigating state-led and popular cultural representations of the past. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 56, 33-59. doi:10.1017/npt.2017.4
- Ertürk, E., & Sancaktar, S. (2020). *Hafıza ve sanat konuşmaları 2020*. Hafıza Merkezi.
- Felman, S., & Laub, D. (1992). *Testimony: Crises of witnessing in literature, psychoanalysis, and history*. Routledge.
- Firat, D. (2016). Sites of memory of the 1980 military coup in Turkey. In M. T. Starzmann & J. R. Roby (Eds.), *Excavating memory: Sites of remembering and forgetting*. University Press of Florida.
- Fletcher, L. & Weinstein, H. (2015). Writing transitional justice: An empirical evaluation of transitional justice scholarship in academic journals. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 7(2), 177-198. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huv006>
- Forsdick, C., Mark, J., & Spišiaková, E. (2020). Introduction from populism to decolonisation: How we remember in the twenty-first century. *Modern Languages Open*, 1(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.3828/mlo.v0i0.342>
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Freud, S. (1901). *The psychopathology of everyday life*. London: Penguin Books.
- Future Architecture. (n.d.) Istanbul walkabouts: Critical walking in transforming landscapes. Retrieved May 12, 2022, from <https://futurearchitectureplatform.org/projects/4cf0b4af-eb98-495d-85bc-f95edca76202/>
- Garber, M. (2004). Compassion. In L. Berlant (Ed.), *Compassion: the culture and politics of an emotion* (pp. 15-28). New York: Routledge.
- Gedeş, M., Kılıç, E., Sevimli, E. A., Zeren, G., & Zingil, Ö. (2021). *1990'lı yıllardaki ağır insan hakları ihlallerinde cezasızlık sorunu: kovuşturma süreci*. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday-Anchor.

- Gökarıksel, S. (2019). Facing history: Sovereignty and the spectacles of justice and violence in Poland's capitalist democracy. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 61(1), 111-144. doi:10.1017/S0010417518000518
- Göral, Ö. S. & Kaya, Ö. (2018). *Barişı aramak hukuku dönüştürmek: Kadın mahkemeleri örneği*. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Göral, Ö. S. (2019). *Hakikat için umut var mı? Kafkaslar, Ortadoğu ve kuzey Afrika'da zorla kaybetmeler ve kayıp kişilere ilişkin karşılaştırmalı bir analiz*. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Göral, Ö. S. (2021). Memory as experience in times of perpetual violence: The challenge of Saturday Mothers vis-à-vis cultural aphasia. *Kurdish Studies*, 9(1), 77-95. <https://doi.org/10.33182/ks.v9i1.569>
- Göral, Ö. S., Işık, A., & Kaya, Ö. (2013). *The unspoken truth: enforced disappearances*. Istanbul: Truth Justice Memory Center.
- Gready, P. & Robins, S. (2020). Transitional justice and theories of change: Towards evaluation as understanding. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 14(2), 280-299. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijaa008>
- Guidance note of the secretary-general: United Nations approach to transitional justice*. (2010).
- Günel, A. & Çelikkan, M. (2019). *A city that remembers: Space and memory from Taksim to Sultanahmet*. Truth Justice Memory Center.
- Gür, A. (2007). Stories in three dimensions: Narratives of nation and the Anatolian Civilizations Museum. In Özyürek, E. (Ed.), *The politics of public memory in Turkey*. Syracuse University Press (pp. 40-69).
- Gür, B. F. (2002). Spatialisation of power/knowledge/discourse: Transformation of urban space through discursive representations in Sultanahmet, Istanbul. *Space and Culture*, 5(3), 237-252.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective memory* (L. A. Coser, Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2016.08.010>
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Harmanşah, Ö. (2014). Urban utopias and how they fell apart: The political ecology of Gezi Parkı. In U. Özkırımlı (Ed.), *The making of a protest movement in Turkey: #occupygezi*. Palgrave Pivot, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137413789_9
- Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53, 23-40.

- Heddon, D., & Turner, C. (2012). Walking women: Shifting the tales and scales of mobility. *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 22(2), 224–236.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2012.666741>
- Hemmings, C. (2012). Affective solidarity: Feminist reflexivity and political transformation. *Feminist Theory*, 13(2), 147-161.
- Henderson, L. (1987). Legality and empathy. *Michigan Law Review*, 85, 1574-1655.
- Hirsch, M. (2012). *The generation of postmemory: Writing and visual culture after the Holocaust*. Columbia University Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). The sociology of emotion as a way of seeing. In G. Bendelow & S. Williams, *Emotions in social life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Hooks, B. (1996). *Killing rage*. Henry Holt and Company.
- Houston, C. (2020). *Istanbul, city of the fearless: Urban activism, coup d'etat, and memory in Turkey*. University of California Press.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century* (Vol. 4). University of Oklahoma Press.
- Huysen, A. (2003). *Present pasts*. Stanford University Press.
- Impunity Watch policy brief: Guiding principles of memorialisation*. (2013).
- Ingold, T. & Lee, J (Eds.) (2008). *Ways of walking: Ethnography and practice on foot*. (2008). University of Aberdeen.
- Jenks, C., & Neves, T. (2000). A walk on the wild side: Urban ethnography meets the flâneur. *Cultural Values*, 4(1), 1–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14797580009367183>
- Joinet, L. (1997). *Revised final report: Question of the impunity of perpetrators of human rights violations (civil and political)*.
- Karakutu. (2019). About us. Retrieved April 13, 2022, from
<https://www.karakutu.org.tr/en/about-us/>
- Karaosmanoğlu, D. (2010). Nostalgia spaces of consumption and heterotopia: Ramadan festivities in Istanbul. *Culture Unbound*, 2(2), 283-302.
- Kent, L. & Demian, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Transitional justice in law, history and anthropology*. Routledge.
- Kesselring, R. (2016). *Bodies of truth: Law, memory, and emancipation in post-apartheid South Africa*. Stanford University Press.
- Kovanlıkaya, Ç., Fırat, D., Yılığür, E., Aslan, Ş. & Özarslan, A. D. (2021). *Bomonti: Kentsel dönüşüm ve mekanın belleği*. İtişim Yayınları.

- Köksal, Ö. (2016). *Aesthetics of displacement: Turkey and its minorities on screen*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kramer, K., & Short, J. R. (2011). Flânerie and the globalizing city. *City*, 15(3–4), 322–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2011.595100>
- Kuhn, A. (2002). *Family secrets: Acts of memory and imagination*. Verso.
- Kuhn, A. (2010). Memory texts and memory work: Performances of memory in and with visual media. *Memory Studies*, 3(4), 298–313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698010370034>
- Kundera, M. (1980). *The book of laughter and forgetting* (M. H. Helm, Trans.). New York: Penguin.
- Kurt, G. (2014). *Cezasızlık sorunu: Soruşturma süreci*. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Lee, J., & Ingold, T. (2006). Fieldwork on foot: Perceiving, routing, socializing. In S. Coleman & P. Collins (Eds.), *Locating the field: Space, place and context in anthropology* (pp. 67–86). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). *The right to the city*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Lefebvre, H. (2004). *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time, and everyday life*. Continuum.
- Lepecki, A. (2013). Choreopolice and choreopolitics: Or, the task of the dancer. *The Drama Review*, 57(4), 13–27. https://doi.org/10.1162/DRAM_a_00300
- Lessa, F. (2013). *Memory politics and transitional justice* (J. G. Allen & M. G. Arenillas, Eds.).
- Levi, P. (1959). *If this is a man*. The Orion Press.
- Levy, D., & Sznajder, N. (2002). Memory unbound: The Holocaust and the formation of cosmopolitan memory. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(1), 87–106.
- Lindholm, C. An anthropology of emotion. In Casey, C., & Edgerton, R. B. (Eds.). (2007). *A companion to psychological anthropology: Modernity and psychocultural change* (pp. 30–47). Blackwell Publishing.
- Lorde, A. (1981). The uses of anger. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 9(3).
- Lorimer, H., & Lund, K. (2003). Performing facts: Finding a way over Scotland's mountains. *The Sociological Review*, 51(2), 130–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00455.x>
- Lund, K. (2005). Seeing in motion and the touching eye: Walking over Scotland's mountains. *Etnofoor*, 27–42.

- Lutz, C., & White, G. M. (1986). The anthropology of emotions. *Annual review of anthropology*, 15(1), 405-436.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. SAGE.
- Massey, D. B. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual*. Duke University Press.
- McCracken, S. (2002). The completion of old work: Walter Benjamin and the everyday. *Cultural Critique*, 52, 145–166.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/cul.2003.0013>
- McDonough, T. (Ed.). (2009). *The situationists and the city*. Verso.
- Mills, A. (2010). *Streets of memory: Landscape, tolerance, and national identity in Istanbul*. University of Georgia Press.
- Mills, B., & Walker, W. (2008). Introduction: Memory, materiality, and depositional practice. In B. Mills & W. Walker, *Memory work: Archaeologies of material practices*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Morvan, Y., & Logie, S. (2014). *Istanbul 2023*. Paris: Editions B2.
- Moyn, S. (2010). The last utopia: Human rights in history. *Canadian Journal of History*. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjh.46.3.769>
- Navaro-Yashin, Y. (2009). Affective spaces, melancholic objects: Ruination and the production of anthropological knowledge. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 15(1), 1–18. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20527631>
- Neyzi, L. & Darıcı, H. (2013). “Özgürüm ama mecburiyet var”: Diyarbakırlı ve Muğlalı gençler anlatıyor. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Neyzi, L. & Kharatyan-Araqelyan, H. (2010). *Speaking to one another: Personal memories of the past in Armenia and Turkey*. Bonn: dvv international.
- Neyzi, L. (1999a). *İstanbul’da hatırlamak ve unutmak: Birey, bellek ve aidiyet*. İstanbul: Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Neyzi, L. (1999b). Gülümser’s story: Life history narratives, memory and belonging in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 20, 1-26.
- Neyzi, L. (2002). Remembering to forget: Sabbateanism, national identity, and subjectivity in Turkey. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 44(1), 137-158.
- Neyzi, L. (2004a). ‘Ben Kimim?’ Türkiye’de sözlü tarih, kimlik ve öznelik. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Neyzi, L. (2004b). Fragmented in space: the oral history narrative of an Arab Christian from Antioch, Turkey. *Global Networks*, 4(3), 285-297.
- Neyzi, L. (2008). Remembering Smyrna/Izmir: Shared history, shared trauma. *History and Memory*, 20(2), 106-127.
- Neyzi, L. (2011). *Nasıl hatırlıyoruz? Türkiye'de bellek çalışmaları*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de memoire. *Representations*, (26), 7-24.
- Oliver, K. (2001). The look of love. *Hypatia*, 16(3), 56-78.
- Orentlicher, D. (2005). *Report of the independent expert to update the set of principles to combat impunity*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199560103.003.0007>
- Orhon, G. (2015). *The weight of the past: Memory and Turkey's 12 September coup*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ökten, N. (2007). An endless death and eternal mourning: November 10 in Turkey. In Özyürek, E. (Ed.), *The politics of public memory in Turkey*. Syracuse University Press (pp. 95-113)
- Öncü, A. (2007). The politics of Istanbul's Ottoman heritage in the era of gloablism. In H. Wimmen, F. Mermier & B. Drieskens (Eds.), *Cities of the south: Poverty, citizenship and social excludon in the 21st century*. London: Saqi Books.
- Öztürkmen, A. (2001). Sözlü tarih: Yeni bir disiplinin cazibesi. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 91, 115-121.
- Öztürkmen, A. (2003). Remembering through material culture: Local knowledge of past communities in a Turkish Black Sea town. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 39(2), 179-193.
- Öztürkmen, A. (2006). Remembering conflicts in a Black Sea town: A multi-sited ethnography of memory. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 34, 93-115.
[doi:10.1017/S0896634600004398](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600004398)
- Özyürek, E. (2006). *Nostalgia for the modern: State secularism and everyday politics in Turkey*. Duke University Press.
- Özyürek, E. (2007). *The politics of public memory in Turkey*. Syracuse University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315225197-2>
- Phillips, A. (2005). Cultural geographies in practice: Walking and looking. *Cultural Geographies*, 12(4), 507-513. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1474474005eu342xx>
- Pinder, D. (2005). Arts of urban exploration. *Cultural Geographies*, 12(4), 383-411.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1474474005eu347oa>

- Pink, S. (2008). An urban tour: The sensory sociality of ethnographic place-making. *Ethnography*, 9(2), 175–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138108089467>
- Pink, S. (2009). *Doing sensory ethnography*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvw04d9k.22>
- Polletta, F., Chen, P. C. B., Gardner, B. G., & Motes, A. (2011). The sociology of storytelling. *Annual review of sociology*, 37, 109-130.
- Potamianou, A. (1997). *Hope: A shield in the economy of borderline states*. Routledge.
- Radstone, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Memory and methodology*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Rancière, J. (2006). *The politics of aesthetics: The distribution of the sensible*. Continuum.
- Ranciere, J. (2010). *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics* (S. Corcoran, Trans.). Continuum.
- Rendell, J. (2008). Space, place, and site in critical spatial arts practice. In C. Cartiere & S. Willis (Eds.), *The practice of public art* (pp. 33–55). Routledge.
- Report of the secretary-general: The rule of law and transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict societies*. (2004).
- Report of the special rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence: Memorialization processes in the context of serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law*. (2020).
- Rogowska-Stangret, M. (22 March 2018). Situated knowledges. *New Materialism*. Retrieved from <https://newmaterialism.eu/almanac/s/situated-knowledges.html>
- Rothberg, M. (2009). *Multidirectional memory*. Stanford University Press.
- Rothberg, M. (2019). *The implicated subject*. Stanford University Press.
- Salt Galata. (2018). Yararlı sanat ofisi konuşmaları: Nazlı Tümerdem İstanbul walkabouts: ‘Yakın’a seferler. Retrieved May 12, 2022 from <https://saltonline.org/tr/1825/yararli-sanat-ofisi-konusmalari-nazli-tumerdem>
- Samancı, Ö. (2019). Images, perceptions and authenticity in Ottoman–Turkish cuisine. In *Food Heritage and Nationalism in Europe* (pp. 155-170). Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sancar, M. (2007). *Geçmişle hesaplaşma: Unutma kültüründen hatırlama kültürüne*. İletişim Yayınları.

- Sandıkçı, Ö. & Ger, G. (2002). In-between modernities and postmodernities: Theorizing Turkish consumptionscape. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 29, 465-470.
- Schechner, R. (2006). *Performance studies: An introduction*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Seremetakis, C. N. (Ed.). (1994). *The senses still*. Routledge.
- Sevdiren, Ö. (2015). *Türkiye’de cezasızlık mevzuatı*. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Shehadeh, R. (2008). *Palestinian walks: forays into a vanishing landscape*. Scribner.
- Shouse, E. (2005). Feeling, emotion, affect. *M/c journal*, 8(6).
- Simmel, G. (1950). The metropolis and mental Life. In *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* (pp. 409–424).
- Solnit, R. (2001). *Wanderlust: A history of walking*. Penguin.
- Solnit, R. (2016). *Hope in the dark: Untold histories, wild possibilities*. Haymarket Books.
- Sontag, S. (2003). *Regarding the pain of others*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Stewart, K. (2007). *Ordinary affects*. Duke University Press.
- Stockholm Declaration (2000). International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. Retrieved from <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/about-us/stockholm-declaration>
- Stokes, M. (2000). ‘Beloved Istanbul’: Realism and the transnational imaginary in Turkish popular culture. In *Mass mediations: New approaches to popular culture in the Middle East and beyond* (pp. 224-242).
- Stoler, A. L. (2002). Colonial archives and the arts of governance. *Archival Science*, 2, 87-109.
- Stoler, A. L. (2011). Colonial aphasia: Race and disabled histories in France. *Public culture*, 23(1), 121-156.
- Subotić, J. (2020). The appropriation of Holocaust memory in post-communist Eastern Europe. *Modern Languages Open*, (1), 1–8.
- Suciyani, T. (2016). *The Armenians in modern Turkey: Post-genocide society, politics and history*. I.B. Tauris.
- Suner, A. (2006). *Hayalet ev: Yeni Türk sinemasında aidiyet, kimlik ve bellek*. Metis Yayınları.
- Suner, Asuman. (2009). Silenced memories: Notes on remembering in new Turkish cinema. *New Cinemas: Journal of Contemporary Film*, 7, 71-81.

- Suni, A. T. (2019). *Palimpsests of violence: Ruination and the politics of memory in Anatolia*. PhD Thesis. University of California.
- Tahinciođlu, G. (2021). *Kayıp adalet: Cezasızlık ve korunan failler*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Taylor, D. (2006). Trauma and performance: Lessons from Latin America. *PMLA*, 121(5), 1674–1677.
- Teitel, R. G. (2003). Transitional justice genealogy. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315086859>
- Tekiner, A. (2021). *Atatürk heykelleri: Kült, estetik, siyaset*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Trouillot, M. (1995). *Silencing the past: Power and the production of history*. Beacon Press.
- Turgut, H. (2021). Istanbul: The city as an urban palimpsest. *Cities*, 112, 103-131. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2021.103131
- Türkiye’de geçiş dönemi adaleti: Dönüşen özneler, yöntemler ve araçlar*. (2021). Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Uçarlar, N. (2021). *Türkiye’de barışçıl bir hakikat arayışı ve ırkçılıkla yüzleşme*. Hakikat Adalet Hafıza Merkezi.
- Uçarlar, N. (2022, January 22). Geçmişle yüzleşme, ırkçılıkla mücadele/Interviewer: Bekir Avcı. Retrieved from <https://birartibir.org/gecmisle-yuzlesme-irkcilikle-mucadele/>
- Uğur Çınar, M., & Altınok, B. U. (2021). Collective memory and the populist cause: The Ulucanlar Prison Museum in Turkey. *Memory Studies*, 14(5), 1106–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17506980211033334>
- Ünlü, B. (2016). The Kurdish struggle and the crisis of the Turkishness contract. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 42(4-5), 397-405.
- Ünlü, B. (2018). *Türklük sözleşmesi: Oluşumu, işleyişi ve krizi*. Dipnot Yayınları.
- Vartanyan, A. (2019). Encounters in the liminal space. In M. Akkent & S. N. Kovar (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy: Museums, memory sites and practices of remembrance* (pp.20-31). İstos.
- Walker, M. U. (2018). Capturing transitional justice: Exploring Colleen Murphy’s The conceptual foundations of transitional justice. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 14(2), 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2018.1506997>
- Walton, J. F. (2010). Practices of neo-Ottomanism: Making space and place virtuous in Istanbul. In *Orienting Istanbul* (pp. 104-119). Routledge.

- Walton, J. F. (2016). Geographies of revival and erasure: Neo-Ottoman sites of memory in Istanbul, Thessaloniki, and Budapest. *Die Welt des Islams*, 56(3-4), 511-533. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700607-05634p11>
- What is transitional justice?* (2008). International Center for Transitional Justice.
- White, D. (2017). Affect: an introduction. *Cultural Anthropology*, 32(2), 175-180.
- Whitehead, C. & Bozođlu, G. (2016). Protest, bodies, and the grounds of memory: Taksim Square as 'heritage site' and the 2013 Gezi protests. *Heritage & Society*, 9(2), 111-136.
- Wieviorka, A. (1998). *The era of the witness*. <https://doi.org/10.1353/bio.2007.0040>
- Winter, J. (2012). The generation of memory: Reflections on the "memory boom" in contemporary historical studies. *Canadian Military History*, 10(3), 57-66.
- Woodward, K. (2004). Calculating compassion. In L. Berlant (Ed.), *Compassion: The culture and politics of an emotion* (pp. 59-86). New York: Routledge.
- Woolf, V. (1948). Street haunting: A London adventure. In *A selection of essays by Virginia Woolf*.
- Wüstenberg, J. (2017). *Civil society and memory in postwar Germany*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yavuz, M. (2020). *Nostalgia for the empire: The politics of neo-Ottomanism*. Oxford University Press.
- Yıldırım, Y. (2020). *Charting spatial practices of feminisms in Turkey: Sensitivities, tools, and tactics*. Master thesis. Kadir Has University.
- Yıldırım, Y. (Presenter). (2019, December). Ümit Hamlacıbaşı ile duygusal yürüyüşler ve bir duyumsama mekanı olarak Kapalıçarşı üzerine [Audio Podcast]. In Açık Radyo (Producer), *Açık Mimarlık*. Retrieved from <https://open.spotify.com/episode/6K6k2OJVUBQckHfawLiZ2r?si=8a59962626bb4905>
- Yıldız, P. (2021). *Kayıp hafızanın izinde*. Metis Yayınları.