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Contested Territories and the Quest for Ethnology: People and Places in İzmir 1919–22

Georgios Agelopoulos

The Treaty of St Stefano (16 March 1878) and the Congress of Berlin (July 1878) following the Russo-Ottoman war of 1877–78 resulted in a complete reorganization of the Balkan peninsula, with Montenegro, Serbia and Romania gaining recognition as fully independent states. Such developments no doubt strengthened the attempts of Balkan national movements to claim Ottoman territories and, to succeed, they had to organize their military and prepare their paramilitary forces. At the same time, they had to persuade their citizens, the Great Powers and the people living in the territories over which they had jurisdiction of their right to incorporate them into their nation-states. In Balkan academic circles, especially in the humanities and social sciences, this task sparked an interest in the national agenda in which historians, geographers, archaeologists, ethnologists, linguists, folklorists and demographers all played their part.

Ottoman regions with highly diverse populations became the focus of a great number of studies conducted by scholars from the Balkans as well as from western European institutions. The end of the Balkan wars and the annexation of former Ottoman territories into the various nation-states changed the priorities of Balkan scholars. Academics and policy makers turned their attention to the problem of incorporating, socially, culturally, politically and economically, the former Ottoman territories into their nation-state structures. In other words, erstwhile Ottoman subjects had to adapt to a new national identity.

In the case of Greece, during the 1914–22 period (that is from the end of the Balkan wars until the Greek Army’s withdrawal from İzmir), the annexation of the New Lands generated significant challenges and dilemmas for the state administration. The following
analysis indicates that the religious, cultural and linguistic diversity of the populations living in these areas reinforced practices and attitudes that, on the one hand, were linked to the national policy of Hellenization and to the irredentism underpinning it and, on the other hand, refer to a colonial type of administration. The situation in the New Lands demanded the proper scientific study of these populations (a) to ensure their integration into the Greek state, and (b) to allow a more productive use of their resources. Part of this process involved the attempt to develop ethnological studies and the academic discipline of ethnology.

In this chapter I focus on Greek researchers’ ethnographic studies in Asia Minor and on Costantin Caratheodory’s founding of the School of Ethnology at the University of Smyrna in the early 1920s. These projects, combined with other policies that Eleftherios Venizelos’s Greek Liberal Party promoted in the first two decades of the twentieth century, demonstrate a distinctive form of political realism towards the non-Greek speaking and non-Greek Orthodox populations of the New Lands. In the eyes of its promoters, the attempt to incorporate these populations into the Greek state was not based on brutal assimilation but on humanistic endeavour. In this context, Hellenism was seen as a metaphor for Western modernity while any other competing identity was perceived as a premodern Oriental idiom.

On a broader theoretical level, the ethnographic studies that Greek researchers conducted in Asia Minor and the founding of the School of Ethnology at the University of Smyrna highlight the relationship between nation building and the need to develop a scientific study of otherness. It is worth noting that similar attempts to encourage the study of otherness appeared among Turkish national elites at about the same period. The establishment in Istanbul of the Türk Derneği Society in December 1908 encouraged the study of ‘history, languages, literature, ethnography and ethnology … and the present culture of the Turks’. ziya Gökalp, the founding father of modern sociology in Turkey, also stressed the importance of systematically researching folk cultures in his systematic theory of Turkish nationalism.

The establishment in 1882 of the Greek Historical and Ethnological Society influenced the study of otherness among Greek scholars, which generated discussion on the academic discipline of ethnology. In the first volume of the journal Laographía (Folklore) published in 1909, Nikolaos Politis, a founding father of Greek folklore studies, discussed in detail the similarities and differences between ethnology and folklore. He concluded that ethnology studies ‘peoples living in a state of nature’ while folklore studies focus on peoples ‘sharing the
same native land and its culture’. Thus, a division was established with respect to the approach to otherness. Ethnology undertook the study of the most distant others while folklore remained focused on Greeks.10 Greek folklorists’ later writings11 confirmed Politis’s analytical distinction between a discipline studying distant otherness (ethnology) and a discipline of close similarity (folklore). This methodological distinction, as well as the close relationship between folklore studies and ethnology/social anthropology, constitutes a common phenomenon in many European academic traditions of that era.12 In Britain, for example, the development of the Royal Anthropological Institute was initially related to the Folklore Society and the British Association.13 However, as Herzfeld points out,14 the epistemological foundations of anthropological theory partly refer to the reasons that also contributed to the creation of romantic irredentist folklore studies in the nineteenth century. Both disciplines are the product of European Enlightenment and they face fundamental difficulties in defining the other (either inside or outside the nation). The starting point for recognizing otherness is often based on Eurocentric criteria and on the very premises of Western modernity.15

**Ethnological studies in Asia Minor**

Following the Balkan wars and the First World War, the Greek Army took control of the vilayet of İzmir. The Greek government established the Smyrna High Commission to administer the region while the Greek army engaged in fighting the forces of Kemal Atatürk. Dr Ntinos Malouchos served as director of rural economy in the Smyrna High Commission. He was a well-educated supporter of Venizelos’s Liberal Party and had great respect for premodern rural community institutions. Malouchos, along with the rest of the bureaucrats assigned to work for the Smyrna High Commission, came to İzmir from Athens and it was he who initially proposed the idea of conducting ethnological studies in Asia Minor to the Greek government. The research that Malouchos and his associate Kostantinos Karavidas carried out reflected an anxiety to record the national composition of the populations of Asia Minor—an anxiety that Greeks, Turks and west European politicians, diplomats and military leaders shared at that time. Mapping the national composition of the Asia Minor population was of value both to domestic policy and to the international conferences held to decide on the fate of the Ottoman Empire. In the case of Asia Minor, as Stamatopoulos observed,’any policy of management, even in the event of Greek military victory,
had to address the problem of national and cultural coexistence.\(^{16}\) Managing this problem required access to ethnological maps and demographic censuses.\(^{17}\) However, mapping the populations was by definition fruitless because at that time the rural populations had not yet fully acquired national identities.\(^{18}\) Moreover, geographers and demographers had made comparable attempts to map the national composition of the population two decades earlier in the southern Balkans and their results had been used at international conventions and conferences.\(^{19}\)

It is worth noting that in the late nineteenth century a number of pro-Greek scholars produced ethnological maps presenting the national composition of the population of Asia Minor. Well-known in this group were Kalfoglous, Kontoyiannis and Skalieris, who can be called armchair geographers since none of them actually conducted an extended fieldwork survey in all the areas they describe in their works.\(^{20}\) They relied mainly on secondary resources, information from third parties\(^{21}\) and selective research in specific geographical areas. While their writings served the needs of geography textbooks for Greek schools in the Ottoman Empire and Greece,\(^{22}\) they failed to provide persuasive arguments about the national composition of Asia Minor’s population to a non-Greek audience. This failure obviously affected Malouchos’s and Karavidas’s research methodology. Thus, instead of focusing on the big picture and relying on secondary data and information provided by others, Malouchos and Karavidas conducted fieldwork on specific regions. Their efforts resemble the work of some British anthropologists who helped the colonial administration in India produce ethnological maps and censuses.\(^{23}\)

It is worth noting that both Malouchos’s and Karavidas’s studies were conducted at a time when the process of constructing a Turkish national identity was accelerating. Competing loyalties to Turkism, Ottomanism and Islamism were influencing different elites and different groups in Asia Minor’s population. This was a widespread phenomenon and Karavidas’s specific research priorities highlight his clear understanding of such dynamic processes.

Ntinos Malouchos was a close associate and, to some extent, the mentor of Kostantinos Karavidas, with whom he later cooperated in producing the short-lived (1922–24) journal Koinétis (Community). Malouchos encouraged Karavidas to conduct ethnographic research in western and central Asia Minor. In the autumn and winter of 1922, Malouchos undertook an ethnographic mission, as he called it, to the interior of Asia Minor and submitted a memorandum to the Greek ministry of foreign affairs entitled ‘On the diversity of the Muslim
population of Asia Minor and the economic relations among the various population elements. In this report Malouchos described 'villages with an exclusively Muslim population at a distance of ten hours travel from Ankara', which allows us to conclude that he followed the third Greek Army corps in its advance to Ankara in July–August 1921. He referred in some detail to the languages spoken, relations between races, the role of women, customs, morale, and the sense of national awareness. He identified four different populations – Circassians, Kurds, Tatars and blacks. In conclusion, he advised Karavidas: 'I believe what would greatly interest the Foreign Ministry would be an ethnological study of the non-Turkish Muslims of Asia Minor and a study of the relations between them and the Turks.'

Karavidas was persuaded by Malouchos’s views and, in early May 1922 submitted an application to the foreign ministry seeking assistance to travel to Asia Minor ‘to study the following question: What are the economic relations with the purely Turkish population of the other Muslim communities, which either belong to heretical sects or have different customs, manners and traditions, leading to a lack of uniformity among them’. To persuade the foreign minister of the necessity of the study, Karavidas observed in his application that:

it is likely that these small differences, properly defined and developed, will provide a broad base for the cultivation of a national awareness; it is not impossible that a special policy might be based on this by the state in Asia Minor as it seeks to weaken and fragment the strength of the Turks.

A few days later, on 9 May 1922, Karavidas submitted another memorandum in support of his application entitled a ‘Note on the economic relations among the Muslim communities in Asia Minor’. This four-page, handwritten document was probably the result of correspondence between Karavidas and Malouchos at an earlier date. In this document, Karavidas formulated the basic working hypotheses of the ethnographic research he wished to carry out in Asia Minor. He identified ‘diversity in the manners and customs of the Muslim population’, analysed relationships between Turkish landowners and other Muslims and concluded: ‘the following question remains to be explored: has there been intermarriage between these villages or has each remained pure, inhabited by only one race.’ In further support of his request for assistance for his research in Asia Minor, he observed once again that ‘this new awareness may evolve further, which would, in immediate and practical terms, divide the villages of
those forced to embrace Islam from those which were always Turkish.\textsuperscript{27}

This emphasis on distinguishing between the different crystallized identities of the Muslims of Asia Minor and the possibility of creating a new awareness among populations with non-Turkish roots, on the one hand mirrors a social reality, but on the other it reflects the deepest wishes of the Greek authorities at that time.\textsuperscript{28} There is no doubt that the Muslim population of Asia Minor could be divided into different groups and categories according to descent, language, religious particularities and socio-economic conditions.\textsuperscript{29} A number of these differences had been politicized, which explains the alliance of some Circassian chieftains with the Greek army against Kemal Atatürk.\textsuperscript{30} Skalieris\textsuperscript{31} based his analysis on these linguistic, cultural and socio-economic differences in an attempt to question the existence of a uniform Turkish national identity among the Muslims of Asia Minor. The research Karavidas and Malouchos proposed exploited all these arguments and suggested a pioneering methodological approach to the subject.

On 27 May 1922, Karavidas was granted permission to travel to İzmir as a journalist. He travelled to the interior, sending a few reports to Athenian newspapers and, basically, occupying himself with writing his study. The University of Smyrna did not escape his attention, and, in a letter to Papanastasiou on 1 July 1922, he observed: 'The university needs to rouse itself, using teachers able to turn the students’ minds towards the economic, social and political issues of the Orient.'\textsuperscript{32}

As part of his research, Karavidas conducted a census of the villages in the province of Pergamon in July 1922; these villages belonged to thesandjak of the villayer of İzmir (or Aydin).\textsuperscript{33} This area was, of course, a safe choice in that it was close to İzmir and many Greek-speaking Orthodox Christian populations inhabited it.\textsuperscript{34} In a letter to Malouchos dated 28 July 1922, he divided the district’s populations into Greeks, Armenians, Jews and Muslims. The Muslims were subdivided into Turks, Circassians, Tachtatzides, Bosnians and Turko-Cretans. He finally produced a 63-page paper entitled ‘Observations on the nature and future usefulness of the historical community organizations, and on the future policy of guidance of the Greek communities in Ionia’.\textsuperscript{35} The paper contained a hand-drawn ethnographic map showing the Greek communities of the western and central part of Asia Minor. The structure and arguments of this paper were similar to Karavidas’s work on the Slav-Macedonian rural community and the patriarchal family in the region of Monastir (Bitola), published four years later.\textsuperscript{36}
Karavidas’s theoretical and methodological strengths, as well as gaps in his thinking, were already visible in this early work. His final conclusions are of particular interest:

the form of contemporary civilization, which is advancing ever more rapidly towards the ideals of democratic humanism, must sooner or later be imposed on the peoples of Western Asia Minor; this is what makes the presence here of the Greeks so important, and their responsibilities so much heavier towards themselves and towards the whole country, which deserves a better fate.

These conclusions, of course, present ‘the humanist mask which Greek nationalism was accustomed to wearing in the second half of the nineteenth century’. According to its logic, the duty of Greece was to bring the lights of Western civilization to the Orient.

We should note that Karavidas failed to secure a place on any of the ships that evacuated the Greeks of İzmir. He was left behind in the city, witnessed the great fire and departed on around 29–30 August 1922. He was not to write again anything concerning the populations of Asia Minor.

On a broader theoretical level, Malouchos’s and Karavidas’s work encountered and reproduced the dilemmas that nationalist ideology imposed on premodern cultures. Nationalism demands the existence of exclusive and unique identities and both the Greek and Turkish nations developed on the basis of what Anthony D. Smith called ethnic nationalisms. According to this model of national ideology, cultures are nationalized and culture becomes a criterion of national identification and mobilization. In the case at hand, politicians, policy makers and state officials embracing national ideologies attempted to use sociocultural, linguistic and historical criteria to divide the local population into distinctive national groups (like Greeks and Turks). However, by using these criteria they failed to understand that, at the local level, the decision to adopt a nationality during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a political choice very often irrelevant to the sociocultural identity and linguistic practices of those who took this decision. Karavidas’s research can be understood as an attempt at social engineering in which certain customs and morale (that is sociocultural, linguistic and historical characteristics) were to be used for creating a different national awareness.
**The school of ethnology of the peoples of the Orient**

The work of Karavidas and Malouchos was a concrete attempt to establish a scholarly discourse on the subject of otherness. In terms of planning, the most important attempt to set up the structures for a scholarly study of otherness was associated with the founding of the University of Smyrna. Its establishment in December 1920 was the idea of Costantin Caratheodory, an internationally renowned mathematician and close friend of Albert Einstein. Caratheodory, the child of a Greek Phanariot family, was well travelled and able to communicate in seven languages. He had a celebrated academic career at several major German universities, at the University of Athens and at the Athens National Technical University. In his analysis of Caratheodory’s career, Pyrgiotakis made a persuasive case for presenting him as a product of the encounter between the West and the Orient. Caratheodory convinced Venizelos of the importance of establishing the nation’s second university in İzmir rather than Thessaloniki, and granted him full freedom and support in planning the various faculties, curricula and organization of the new institution. Caratheodory and his colleagues were distinguished by their political realism. We should note that Nikolaos Politis, too, was involved in staffing the School of Ethnology. He recommended that Caratheodory hire Evgenios Somaridis, who at the time was lecturing at the University of Vienna, to teach in the new school. For reasons that remain unclear, Caratheodory eventually opted for an orientalist who had also studied the social sciences, I. Kallitsounakis. Kallitsounakis, who had been teaching oriental languages at the University of Berlin, assumed responsibility for overseeing the ordering of books for the new school.

The proposal for the new university envisaged four schools – engineering, agriculture, commerce and the ethnology of peoples of the Orient. To these were added later an institute of health, a school for civil servants and a senior Muslim seminary, which was rather similar to a school for Muslim studies. Caratheodory’s relations with Stergiadis, the head of the Greek high commission in Smyrna, were excellent, as evidenced from his personal letters to the latter.

For Caratheodory, one of the main reasons for selecting İzmir as the site for the new university was the composition of the Asia Minor population and the need ‘for active participation of the minorities in public life and in the development of the country’, as he put it in his memorandum to Venizelos. One has to remember that İzmir was the second most important port of the Ottoman Empire, a cosmopolitan city with large numbers of Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Levantines and...
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Turks. Nor was it by chance that Caratheodory’s choice of the university’s motto was EX ORIENTE LUX. The special importance Caratheodory attached to the issue of the non-Greek populations of the ‘Greece of the Five Seas’ can also be seen in the view he formed of the School of Ethnology, which ‘must above all serve a practical purpose’. This practical purpose, which the school of ethnology and senior Muslim seminary shared, was different from a crude nationalist agenda. It served a programme of social modernization and aimed to consolidate relations between Greeks and their neighbours. Caratheodory was particularly explicit in his memorandum: ‘the true driving force behind the rapprochement of different peoples lies in a community of interests, and in the capacity of education to play the part of the catalyst in a chemical compound.’ The development of the University of Smyrna was oriented ‘to the creation of centres of education and study suitable for developing the natural relations which Greece is called on to restore with all its neighbours’.

The ethnology school curriculum initially focused on history and the ethnographic present (languages, ‘customs, religion and legislation of the peoples in question’). Some courses were specified in the Caratheodory memorandum – comparative linguistics of the Semitic languages, Slavic languages, Turkish, Persian and Armenian, history of art and archaeology, and Islamic law. Additional courses were not mentioned by name, only a general description of their framework was provided. We should note that the proposed curriculum did not include any courses in Greek language or literature. It is also important to keep in mind that the term Orient (Anatoli) was at the time used in Greece to refer to the whole of the former Ottoman Empire, including the Balkans. This explains why Slavs, Turks, Armenians and others are categorized as belonging to the Orient.

Knowledge of the current ethnographic situation of the Orient was deemed important in the curriculum because ‘alongside the scientific teaching of languages, it will be necessary to organize, in particular, courses designed to give the student a vivid perception of the Slavic and Muslim worlds, not only from a historical perspective but also from the standpoint of the current situation’. The final plans for the curriculum were slightly different from the initial proposal put forward by Caratheodory, with more emphasis being laid on the teaching of languages.

Courses at the University of Smyrna were scheduled to commence in September 1922, but by the end of August that year, Kemal Atatürk and his forces had gained control of the city and the Greek administration withdrew. Caratheodory made his escape from İzmir at
literally the very last moment.56 The Greek, Levantine and Armenian
eighbourhoods of the city were burnt. There was no continuity to
Caratheodory’s vision and the compulsory exchange of Greek and
Turkish populations removed any chance of the Greeks returning to
Asia Minor. Since then the university buildings have been used as a
girls’ college.

National politics and the quest for ethnology
The activities of Malouchos, Karavidas and Caratheodory can best be
understood in the context of Venizelist liberals framing national
policies on otherness during the 1910–30 period.57 As already
explained, perceptions of Hellenism and Hellenization dominated
these policies. At the same time, however, through invocation of the
cultural superiority of the West and its civilizing role, they also evoke
broader notions of colonial power structures. As Sigalas observed, ‘in
the context of the conceptual notion of “Hellenism”, assimilation
represented the other side of the coin of expansion.’58 The negotiation
of otherness of the ‘Orthodox populations of different national
backgrounds’ in the New Lands aimed at integrating these
populations, at Hellenizing them. From the studies by Karavidas and
Malouchos, and from the ethnology school’s founding objectives, it is
clear that any attempt to integrate the non-Orthodox populations of
Asia Minor into the main body of society had first to involve
distancing them from the process of Turkification that was taking
place during that period.59 What I am suggesting is that certain
intellectuals involved in the Venizelist movement, like Karavidas,
Malouchos and Caratheodory,60 were persuaded that there was an
unfolding process of Turkification and that it could be countered, in
part, by systematic study and implementation of appropriate policies
on the Greek side.61 We shall never know to what extent such plans
corresponded with reality or to what extent they were just the wishes
of certain Greek intellectuals, politicians and leaders.

It is worth noticing that these views were by no means acceptable
to the Greek royalists who took a much more cautious stance towards
the populations of other races and towards attempts to study and
understand their otherness. It is interesting that certain pro-royalist
circles within the University of Athens greeted with some disdain the
founding of the University of Smyrna. In a discussion held in the
senate of the University of Athens on 4 June 1922, concerning recog-
nition of foreign schools, the dean of the school of physics and
mathematics, Professor N. Hatzidakis, described the University of
Smyrna as ‘the practical university founded in Smyrna under the
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supervision of Caratheodory’, classifying it with the various foreign missions active inside the Greek state.62

During the final months of the Smyrna high commission, when it was clear that the Greek military presence in Asia Minor was in deep trouble, the Venizelists made desperate efforts to stress the need to maintain a Greek military force in the region to avert the impending catastrophe. It is in this context that we should see the efforts of the Venizelist officers active through the Asia Minor Defence movement in Istanbul and İzmir.63 Material available in the Karavidas archive contains no reference or information that might indicate that he was in touch with the Venizelists of the Asia Minor Defence movement.64 At the same time, there is no evidence to indicate any involvement by Karavidas, Malouchos or Caratheodory in the discussions on the creation of an Asia Minor state – a proposal put forward by High Commissioner K. Stergiadis a few months before the final withdrawal of the Greek army. The ethnological research of Malouchos and Karavidas, conducted in the very last days of the Greek presence in İzmir, as well as the concluding lines from Karavidas’s study, cited above, must of course be seen in this context as part of the general efforts of the Venizelists to preserve the Greek presence in Asia Minor. But history took a different course, and the next three decades (1930–50) saw the dominance of a narrower concept of Hellenism that gradually led to the construction of ever more others (Bulgarians and communist conspirators).65

In any case, the efforts to build up a scholarly study of otherness in the early 1920s contained elements of the ideology of the Greek nation-state, as well as a colonial Orientalist framework similar to the one that led to the development of anthropology among the colonial powers of that time.66 The futility of such an endeavour had been foreseen – albeit with some partiality – by the English historian Toynbee, who observed that ‘the new Greek University will be a castle built on sand, with no roots in the country where it is located’.67 In that crumbling imperial world, the meeting of the West and the East in Asia Minor shifted from the hands of Greek nationalists to the control of Turkish nationalists.
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