Contents

List of Illustrations

1 Introduction

The vast majority of people in our modern societies leads a routinised every-day life. To this routine belongs, for instance, the practice of commuting to the workplace and coming back home. From 2006 to 2010, "my workplace" was the mountainous and remote areas in Turkey and it regularly took several hours for me to arrive to this "workplace". Covering such distances is common among people who assume a job in the "niche" sector of outdoor tourism. Another ordinary notion of this profession is that one particular region receives the focus and the given person travels there frequently. For me, it was the Mount Ararat and Van region. In the Armenian history, this province was the heart on the ancient high plateau. Prior to the genocidal events of 1915–16, more than 350 villages, towns, and monasteries inhabited by Armenians had been documented in the historical Ottoman Sandjak of Van (Kévorkian and Paboudjian 2012, 511–59).

Van lies on a plateau at an altitude of 1,700 meters, surrounded by goli-ath-like mountains and a lake that stretches to the horizons. A two-hour journey from Van to the north is required to reach the last town, Doğubeyazıt, before the gigantic volcano of Ararat. And this is the most frequently used way for a trip to the mountain. The road to Doğubeyazıt crosses the lakeside. Then the valley floor of Muradiye province follows, or with its old Armenian name Pergri, in Kurdish Bergri. Until the mid of the 2000s, a military checkpoint had fortified the entrance of the valley, signalling as if you were leaving something significant behind or entering an insecure territory, or, as regular, the domain of a certain powerholder. In those four years, I had been on this very road at least fifty times.

Thereafter, only a few minutes of driving, a ruined massive-stone building suddenly rises observing the basin from its rocky left shoulder. For the people who pass by and could see the building standing on a slope approximately two hundred meters higher than the regular road, the "forsaken" Armenian Arkelan Monastery (Kévorkian and Paboudjian 2012, 543) could imply different things. With its at least 700 years of history and maintaining its tower-like shape, this monastery represents, on the one hand, the Armenian past of the region. On the other, with its demolished façade and crumbling walls, the monastery points to the circumstances of the last 100 years. Being ruined by treasure hunters several times and left to vanish from the landscape in the long term are the key elements in describing the relation of this building with this time period.

Every single time I saw this monastery, I thought of stopping the bus, step-ping out, and walking up on the slopes even though such Armenian remnants were widespread in the region. Thus, it could not have been a wonder to see

such an architectural object although back then I had practically no idea about the Armenian history. Every now and then I read a newspaper article about Van or Armenians, but it was not pivotal to my life-world.

My interest in the recent past of this region started to arise parallel to my master's graduation in Germany in 2010–11. Until that period, the monastery had been a forgotten detail for me. Or so I thought. It had been, in fact, more a "passive memory" than a disregarded scene I had been encountering, i.e. a "reservoir for future active memories" (A. Assmann 2010, 140). Even, when I started to read up on the places I have visited in Turkey, for instance, churches whose ruination would be dated to the first half of the 20th century, this passive memory was, so to speak, not activated immediately. I rather focused on the well-known remnants, for instance, the Varak Monastery, and of course the political disputes and violence. Over the course of this retrospective investigation of recollections (cf. Davis 1959),[1] I stumbled on maps about the Armenian districts of Van. However, I could not locate the monastery's image in my mind on any map. So, this remembrance began to trigger further questions.

I did not know whether it was a church or a monastery; whether it was Armenian or Assyrian. Such a piece of information would have eventually led to identifying it. Nevertheless, I did not have it. Furthermore, back then, I carried out no talk, discussion, or any kind of interaction with any other member of the society concerning this particular building. So there was no narrative in my recollections about this monastery (cf. Brockmeier 2015; Halbwachs 1991; 2012), in my memory I "possessed" only a repeatedly captured image behind the windscreen. Nevertheless, the image in my mind was somehow not enough to match with other memories and find the exact location. That was, for instance, not the case for other "forsaken" properties because either I visited these during some hiking tours or I discovered them with my friends when we were opening new paths to hike. However, I never walked on the slopes where the monastery rises.

Without any pictures, historical or made in the recent past, I could only narrow down the possibilities to two: the Arkelan Monastery (and most probably its Surp Asdvadzadzin Church, The Church of Our Lady) or Surp Tateos Monastery in Köşg. These buildings had only been a few miles away from each other, according to Raymond H. Kévorkian and Paul B. Paboudjian (2012, 543 f). They were the only identified Armenian monasteries on the western side

---

[1]   This study is not an autoethnographic research, but rather very much inspired by how Fred Davis integrates his earlier professional experiences into the paper *The Cabdriver and His Fare: Facets of a Fleeting Relationship*.

of the road connecting Van to Doğubeyazıt via the provincial town Çaldıran,[2] and between the two Turkish military checkpoints: the first one, as mentioned, before you access the valley, and the other at the pass of Mount Tendürek.

The second outpost on an altitude of 2,644 meters was notorious because of the numerous heavily armed military vehicles and the strict command chain attitude of the soldiers there. This place was guarded in tightened terms because, reportedly, at that particular mountain the Turkish military of republican times had the highest loss rate per km2 in the war against the Kurdish PKK. But what was the reason for such an outpost? Had the army foregrounded the security of its soldiers in that given locus? Or did the institutional memory provide the army with the justification for fortifying a mountainous terrain? In other words, what was the heavily armed checkpoint standing for, its symbolic effect or security policies?

At this outpost, you had to wait in line for an ID-check. And it was prohibited to step out of the vehicle without the authorisation of the military personnel. When someone received such an authorisation, it implied the officers would question that person. That place had an effect that you would start to think about the checkpoint before you arrived. It ruled not just a space in its spatial boundaries, but expanded even to the last checkpoint 60 kilometres before, involving the scene of the monastery.

Returning to the point with this particular Armenian remnant, an initiative based in Paris, *Collectif 2015 : reparation* (www.collectif2015.org), shed light on the dilemma with which I have been struggling. The *Collectif 2015* initiative, demanding monetary reparation and return of the expropriated immobile Armenian wealth from the Turkish government, which was confiscated during or in the aftermath of the extermination campaigns, digitalised a representative list of monumental Armenian properties. In most cases, these properties were left to their fate after the genocide. That transnational draft of the cultural remembrance in digital space helped me to clarify for which monastery I had been looking: it was the Husgan Orti Church of the Surp Istepannos Monastery (Saint Stephen Monastery) at Arkelan.[3]

---

[2]   Kévorkian and Paboudjian's distinguished study provides maps for every Ottoman *vilayet* and *sandjak*, displaying a vast amount of villages, towns, and monasteries where Armenians lived before the extermination campaigns. In their comprehensive study, you can compare the maps of Sandjak of Bayazid (today's Doğubeyazıt) – a part of the Vilayet of Erzurum (p. 461), and Sandjak of Van (p. 512), and come to the conclusion that there was no recorded Armenian monastery or whatsoever in the valley except these two.

[3]   On the following webpage of the initiative, you can find a detailed description of monastery's past and information about its complex. According to this webpage,

In addition to my "unreliable" memory which was "haunted by forgetting" (Huyssen 2000, 38), I did not have the exact lead for finding out the right church, except the right monastery complex. Indeed, my efforts required the organisational quality of "cultural memory" (J. Assmann 2013), which involves scripts and archives. However, except the webpage above and books, there is no such cultural memory with critical organisational quality in Turkey concerning the Armenian past. Furthermore, I believe even that sort of memory work – a (semi-)structured cultural memory in this field – would not have been enough to correspond to my recollections. For I had further experiences from these trips. I have needed to reconstruct my memory and generate a narrative, for instance, concerning the military outpost. Thus, my experience would stay in touch with my biography and the social world and help me in my meaning making efforts concerning those moments (Brockmeier 2015; Bruner 2004; Ochs and Capps 1996). In this regard, my narrative would also remain open for interaction with other personal memories and hence change.

The same mechanism applies to collective memories as well. Remaining in the same spatial area, such an extent from personal to collective memory would subsume various narratives generated in the Kurdish society of Van. There should exist numerous collective memories (Halbwachs 1991) in this particular region concerning the Armenian past, certain properties, and the conflict and war between the Turkish State and PKK, i.e. the political violence. These features locate in an interwoven space of recollections linked to other experienced events, images, and stories with their own temporal organisations. Thanks to the same narrative elements, the Kurdish "social time" emerges reconstructed (Sorokin and Merton 1937; cf. Nassehi 2008; Wallerstein 1988; 1998).

Collective memories would furthermore include the old city centre of Van which was entirely destroyed during the extermination campaigns targeting the Armenians. Perhaps, the short-term successful Armenian resistance *in situ* would be another event remembered. Moreover, the historiographic reconstruction of these events in the hands of the Turkish State or the Kurdish movement(s) should be counted as indicators for such memories as well since they have provided people with an interpretational template (for a detailed historical portrayal, please see Chapter 4 of the present study).

In addition, the critical examination of the Armenian past and the tendency to face past crimes, by some (socio-)political initiatives in the Turkish and

---

after years of demolishment in the hands of gravediggers and the devastating Van earthquake of 2011 whose epicentre was not far away, there survived only two architectural elements of the church. https://www.collectif2015.org/en/100Monuments/Le-Monastere-d-Arkelan-ou-de-Saint-Etienne-de-Pergri/

Kurdish societies of the country, lived a *belle époque* of liberalisation in the 2000s, following the revocation of state of emergency in Kurdish populated regions in Turkey, or North-Kurdistan, in 2002 and during the cease-fire. For instance, Kurdish municipalities started the renovation of Armenian and Assyrian churches in their area of administration – yet, not reaching the remnants that are away from urbanity. In those years, statements asking Armenians for "forgiveness" or accounts about "ancestors' ill decisions for participating in massacres" have become publicly discussed and widespread in general in Turkey and in particular in the Kurdish society – deriving from the fact that a very high proportion of the Armenians were living prior to the extermination campaigns approximately in today's North-Kurdistan or their historical homeland, West-Armenia.

Progressiveness was ruling the debates. Perhaps, it was clear for most people that a governmental acknowledgement of the genocide was unrealistic in the short term. However, the attempts to reconstruct the past (through memories or renovation campaigns) were now circulating in the social arena. And these were also pointing at the responsibility of the state. Concerning the other side of this coin, the Turkish State was still engaging in improving the denialist repertoire (Göçek 2016; Turan and Öztan 2018). Discovering new forums, reshaping old discourses, and motivating new actors were now the techniques of the negationist (institutional) agents in Turkey. Denying the genocide was not confined to the floors of diplomacy, academy, or official institutions anymore (for a discussion on these points, please see Chapter 5).

In these terms, I drafted two hypotheses about the Kurdish remembrance on the Armenian Genocide. The first has postulated that the recognition of the Armenian Genocide (and demanding such a step from the government) has been *a political tool* to deconstruct the nationalist structures. Additionally, it could be seen as an item for bonding the Kurdish collective identity, illustrating the progressive Kurds vis-à-vis the denialist Turkish State. This hypothesis was based on the very fact that (active) memory involves political motives and, at the same time, considering the present situation (A. Assmann 2010; J. Assmann 2013; Halbwachs 1991; Türkyılmaz 2011).

The second postulate has been a sort of opposite to the first. Deriving from the circulated stories, and for instance anecdotes shared by Kurdish politicians (cf. Dinç 2016), the other hypothesis has assumed a trajectory of facing the past crimes without the political intentions as described above. And indeed, it was, therefore, ignoring the socio-political quality of remembering. In this constellation with defined "extremes", this study has aimed to explore the memory constructions in the Kurdish society concerning the genocide and the Armenian past. In particular, it set the focus on the city and region of Van. In these terms, it looks into biographical narrative interviews (Schütze 1983) and

the ethnographic data – field protocols, photographs, and visual material from exhibitions and denialist memorials. For the analysis of life stories would disclose amorph standings, fluid perspectives, numerous ways of argumentations, and hence deconstruct the face value of various discourses (Schütze 2008a; 2008b). Thus, the study unearths the life-worlds (Schütz and Luckmann 2003) in-between these two hypotheses.

In other words, this book is about the (narrative) zones of memory that emerge under circumstances of political violence in Kurdistan. Based on the ethnographic data, it also carefully investigates denialism in this specific case and, of course, recognition arguments. In doing so, the study seeks to accomplish the task of sketching the contested landscape of collective memories. Hence, this study presumes (collective) memory as reconstruction of (past) experiences and meaning-making efforts for the present.

By means of the analysis of life story narratives and further data, the book argues that the Armenian Genocide memories in the Kurdish society in Turkey function in multidirectional terms (Rothberg 2009). The narratives on the genocide, be they acquired from a family member or referring to collectively shared stories, link personal and social experiences of political violence to each other, or in Michael Rothberg's terms they "juxtapose two or more disturbing memories and disrupt everyday settings" (p. 14). Thus, the genocide memory assists the narrator in reconstructing the spacetime of their home region, even expanding it to the whole of Kurdistan. Personal and collective experiences of violence and injustice emerge at this juncture, connected to the Armenian past and remodifying each other in reciprocal terms. Based on the study's sample, I also propose a further possible quality of the Armenian Genocide memory: making the topic of political violence in the Kurdish space describable and discussable (cf. Bar-On 1999). But why do people use stories on Armenians to talk about the state violence and not any other narrative concerning Kurds, for instance, about the Dersim Genocide 1937–38 or Anfal Genocide under the Saddam Regime? What does the Armenian Genocide memory reconfigure in terms of socio-political frameworks in Kurdistan? How does narrating 1915 influence the temporal organisation of social time? The Armenian Genocide memory provides the narrator with a template to locate own biography – and community – in the widened history of the region. It generates a comparability of violent experiences and hence remodifies the victimhood categories (cf. Jeffery and Candea 2006; Türkyılmaz 2011). In this sense, 1915 occurs as a pivotal element to clarify the meaning of violence and injustice.

1.1   Access to the Field and Research Process

As indicated, this study is an empirical qualitative social study. In general, its data set consists of autobiographical narrative interviews that I gathered in two different cities: Van and Istanbul. Altogether, it subsumes 15 face-to-face recorded narrative interviews, five of them from Istanbul and ten from Van. Additionally, at the beginning of my research, I recorded two expert interviews. And after I called off my field research trips another interview via Skype.[4] But for the analytical discussion, I narrowed down the sampling to ten interviews, three of which you can find presented as case studies in this book. Seven further life stories emerge in the comparative discussion.

While I was engaged in my proposal in 2014, the political atmosphere in Kurdish cities in Turkey was bright and peaceful. A peace process between the Turkish government and the PKK was carried out. Scholars and journalists were undertaking their research almost without any obstacles. However, after the June elections 2015, the Turkish government retuned its political trajectory into repression and oppression. Curfews were declared, armed forces took the streets. This time, (provincial) downtowns were the central places of clashes. And non-combatant civilians were targeted as well. There was a difference in comparison to the war in the 1990s. The media landscape had been much more homogenous in those years. However, when the war was reignited in 2015, people living in the centres of curfew started to report what was happening, for instance, through social media. So, clear images of violence were circulating.

This change in the situation forced me to rethink my approach. Although I was deliberately planning to carry out a study in the periphery, I had to reori-entate myself. I did not know if I would ever have a chance to reach my contacts who were living in the villages. Therefore, I aimed to seek interview partners from the city centre of Van instead of the provincial area. I also decided to add the city of Istanbul as a part of my study. The time I spent in Istanbul provided me with the chance to collect further ethnographic materials such as from the exhibitions launched about the Armenian past and set a comparative framework to discuss issues concerning remembrance. While I was elaborating the level of saturation after Grounded Theory (Glaser and Strauss 2009a) based on the interviews I already collected in December 2015 and the following spring in Istanbul and Van, a military coup was attempted in Turkey in July 2016. A new state of emergency was declared to rule under the AKP regime thereafter. The

---

[4]   There had also been further follow-up occasions of some exchange with other inform-ants whom I interviewed during my field trips – some recorded with their permission or written down in notes.

war in the state itself (or perhaps a better formulation, among its structures) became more and more public, for which there had already been some clues since 2013. So, the regime obtained the hand to justify its illegal, unethical, violent, and politically corrupt actions, such as replacing elected mayors of the Kurdish cities with its assigned trustees like governors and arrest local politicians. In her essay published in the edited book "40 Year 12 September", which looks into the societal dynamics and perception of the 12 September 1980 military coup and the post-coup junta regime, the former mayor of Diyarbakır Gülten Kışanak (2020, 139), who has been replaced with a trustee and arrested end of October 2016, points out that "[t]he government has seized the power of ruling with the 'trustee system' and set it further with the decree-law 674 (declared in the official gazette of the Turkish Republic on 1 September 2016) whenever it wants" [translated by E. Y.]. In fact, the government has legalised the trustees system extending its reign beyond the state of emergency. After further deliberation, I called off additional field trips because I could only see an increased proportion of rejections and of course possible risks and harm targeting my informants. In other words, my decision stood for working with 15 interviews in total.

In terms of analytical relevance, I sought my interview partners from a widely defined spectrum of politically active people. It includes, for instance, (active) members of the Kurdish left-wing parties, country wide the HDP and the BDP in Kurdistan, and people who are engaged in non-governmental and non-party organisations. It was crucial for the research that none of them would be an expert in the field of the Armenian Genocide studies. For such an expert position would then deteriorate the conditions of a possible life story narration, as Daniel Bertaux suggests (2018, 61). Furthermore, I wanted to concentrate on the biographies in the secondary zone with regard to the contemporary debates, so to speak. Due to its focus on a single region, the limited number of interviews, and most importantly the gender imbalance in the sample, perhaps a theoretical saturation of the theory extrapolating to the region and similar issues has not been achieved (cf. Corbin and Strauss 1990; Glaser and Strauss 2009a). However, the analysis of narrative interviews showcases another perspective on the public debates (cf. Bertaux 2018, 63). In these terms, I considered additional (empirical) material like special exhibitions, their catalogues, memorial places captured visually, and some archival materials like oral history accounts and witness reports, literary accounts, and, of course, other secondary literature.

In most cases, I reached the interview partners through gatekeepers – individuals and friends instead of institutional door openers or distributors which could have ignited a hierarchical framing (cf. Schütze 2008b, 3 f). The interviews were carried out in a place that the narrator chose and acknowledged as safe, either the personal office, home, or in a third party place such as a café.

Without a doubt and as it is always the case, this project developed further during field research and most importantly during the analyses. What I had expected concerning the regimes of collective and personal memory in Kurdistan and what was in store for me turned out to be totally different. Of course, I had some ideas. But these did not match people's realities.

1.2 Research Ethics

The question of research ethics subsumes several points such as the protection of informant's rights, prevention of possible risks and harm targeting informant privileges and even their health, voluntariness to participate, confidentiality, and of course anonymisation of data. In the process of preparing my PhD proposal, carrying out my field trips, and analysing the gathered data – including writing this manuscript, these issues have occurred continuously because the ethics question was not to be answered in generalised terms since I have been conducting a qualitative social research project – moreover, with a particular focus on autobiographies (cf. von Unger 2018; Siouti 2018). While preparing my field trips, for the orientation I have used the ethics codex of the German Society of Sociologists and Union of German Sociologists (DGS & BDS 2017).

As mentioned before, the reignited war in Kurdistan following the June election of 2015 has changed the circumstances tremendously. And the effects of this change have echoed in my project, not just concerning the narratives I collected but in my approach. Before the war erupted again, I had the chance to conduct interviews with two experts from the field. During this period, the atmosphere was entirely different, and I was thinking about including the analysis of these recordings into my research – and perhaps to gather further expert interviews. However, after the violence *in situ* and the repression of critical voices became the "norm" again, I cancelled the part with the experts because anonymising relevant sections was impossible. Even though I would have tried to work with such interviews in masked versions, having such a small community (working on the Armenian Genocide and Kurdish–Turkish conflict) that has been perhaps under the surveillance of state institutions posed equally high risks. The question was now how to deal with information from those interviewees who are not known publicly.

My field trip in Istanbul at the end of 2015 clarified the contours of my approach. During this trip, I could collect three biographical interviews. Before the interviews I gave a detailed explanation of my research, information regarding my position as researcher (being a PhD student, how I finance my research, my background, how come I do have an interest in this very topic, et cetera), and described the interview context: that I have only one preformed question

to ask and further questions would find shape while they tell me their life story. With most of my informants, I spent some time prior to the interview situation so that we develop a mutual understanding and trust. For instance, in the case of Delal – in Istanbul, we met several times before we recorded an interview. Some other pre-interview-periods were shorter of course, for instance with the interview partners that I met in Van via gatekeepers. Several people rejected to participate in this study, some also after I described my research interest or my approach.

When I was in Turkey after I recorded the interviews, I sent them immediately to another encrypted email of mine, which I created only for this purpose and erased them from the recorder as well as my computer. First, after I finished my field research in Turkey, I downloaded these data and saved them in my desktop computer because I was going to revisit the field. When I thought that I had enough interviews to write my study, I started to use my laptop for my research project and erased that encrypted email. And of course, I never brought my laptop to Turkey when I visited the country for personal reasons. While planning this procedure, it became clear to me that I could not use any printed document which would deteriorate and risk my informant's conditions if something happens to me before I cross the border. This is why I did not use any informative research and confidential disclosure agreements that were to be signed by my interview partners and sealed with a name. I also explained why I do not have any printed agreements and offered my informants to send the anonymised interview transcription whenever they would want it.

Due to my research topic, encountering narratives on personal or family experiences of violence was not avoidable (von Unger 2018, 687). It even was essential to understand the life stories because when my interview partners had started to talk about the violent events that they lived through, it implied I was a confidant to them. Indeed, being a confidant and having the power of "possessing" these data has brought along challenges for the whole length of the research. How I could clarify that I would not abuse this power in analysing the interviews was the crucial question. Because I do focus on the attempts of meaning-making by my interview partners, I could have crossed the thin red line between the reconstruction of narratives and ascription of some (alleged) implicit constructions (pp. 685 f). To minimise this risk, I took part in interview analysis meetings, asked for different perspectives of people who are not active in the Kurdish and Armenian Genocide studies. On such occasions, I only provided excerpts of transcribed and anonymised interviews.

The study includes no (audio-)visual evidence such as photographs or links to videos and recordings of persons whom I interviewed in order to ensure the participants' anonymity. To guard the issues of anonymisation and confidentiality, I have changed and masked personal names, family names, places, towns,

working places, and institutions. In the interviews, I let only a few town names uncloaked since they are metropolitan and highly populated cities, like Istanbul and Van, or since they are crucial to understanding the biographical project of the person. The original recordings were then encrypted and kept in an – again encrypted – USB disk. Except for two interviews that were transcribed by a confidant of mine under full confidentiality agreements, the data sets, recordings as well as transcriptions, have not been given to any third party.

1.3 Outline of the Study

This book contains eight chapters, including this introduction. Every single chapter, except the introduction, includes a part to conclude the points underscored on the previous pages. It occurs in Chapter 2 fused with research questions and in further parts as concluding remarks. Additionally, every subchapter of the comparative discussion, Chapter 7 Violence and Genocide in Memory, has a short summary so that the reader can easily follow the line of argument. A glossary on terminologies, for instance from Turkish, and notes on citations are to be found on the first pages following the table of contents.

Following these introductory words, I portray the research design where you can find a detailed description of the methodologies I used – ethnographical fieldwork and biographical narrative interviews. The theoretical chapter on memory issues follows this part on methodologies. In Chapter 3, you can find an analytical discussion concerning this trans- and interdisciplinary field. In the next chapter on historical research, I first sketch what the historiographical concepts concerning 1915 were, for instance, in the early republican era or during the junta regime in the early 1980s. Then I depict the situation in Van in 1915–16. Furthermore, this chapter involves ethnographic and sociological perspectives paving the way to the issues of remembering.

Chapter 5, The Conflict of Recognition and Denial, aims to shed light on discourses of different parties through reconstructing the "old" as well as current frames of denialism and recognition debates. It also tackles with theoretical concepts of denialism, developed by Stanley Cohen (2001), or discussions in this regard, for example, by Marc Nichanian (1998; 2011). In doing so, this chapter includes visual data such as photographs taken at exhibitions, urban space, and memory places in Istanbul and Van. Publications of Kurdish intellectuals on this very issue, the Armenian Genocide and Kurdish complicity, are further materials that are considered in this part.

The following chapter contains three case studies – the in-depth analysis of the biographical narrative interviews from Van and Istanbul. In their analysis, I have faced the significance of violent experiences and their place in biographical reconstruction. In order to capture the violence in a picture – that

is repeatedly accentuated by all my informants, I have worked on these life stories splitting their analytical portrayal into two main parts: the biographical synopsis and the violence in narration.

In Chapter 7, this book takes the turn of a comparative discussion and looks into the memory (re-)constructions of violent events, the concepts of repression, and state political violence from the perspective of people affected. In these terms, the study takes narratives from the three case studies and further seven biographical interviews into consideration. This core chapter involves a discussion that synchronises theoretical compounds and narrative structures in developing theories of (collective) memory. Hence, this discussion chapter yields and renders several elements from the whole manuscript. It consists of three main layers that I view crucial to understand the Kurdish memory: the issue of being able to describe and discuss own experiences; the questions of narrative temporal organisations; and the contestation of memories.

Then the conclusion of this book follows, crystallising my key findings and arguments. Instead of portraying a complete summary of every chapter and their arguments, I intentionally kept this part as compact as possible to provide the readers with a simple orientation.