



Universiteit Leiden

Diasporas and Reconciliation: The Case of the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands

Charlotte de Jong – S1134396

Thesis Master International Relations 2015-2016

Supervisor: dr. A. O'Malley

Second reader: dr. N. Manchanda

Date: 1 August, 2016

Word count: 10 571

ABSTRACT

Because of globalization, it is possible for diaspora to keep in touch with the homeland and to stay connected. They have often resources, such as money, to influence the homeland and homeland politics. If there is a conflict in the homeland, diasporas can therefore influence this, in a negative or positive way. The question is what the role of community activism is in reconciliation and this can contribute to broader international solutions. The Armenian diaspora is very large and has been very active in getting the Armenian genocide from 1915 recognized by Turkey, and other states. The reconciliation process between Turkey and Armenia has not been very successful, apart from some local initiatives. 13 respondents of the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands have been asked about the role the diaspora should play in the reconciliation process. The conclusion is that the diaspora is and should be involved, however there are minimal conditions before reconciliation can truly begin: Turkey must recognize the genocide, apologize and provide financial and material compensation. Besides this, there are some initiatives that work in bridging the gap between two similar cultures, such as the documentary 'Bloedbroeders'.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2. Literature review.....	2
2.1 <i>Literature review diasporas</i>	2
2.2 <i>Literature review diasporas in conflict</i>	5
2.3 <i>Literature review diasporas in reconciliation</i>	6
CHAPTER 3. History of Armenia and Turkey.....	10
3.1 <i>Armenian and Turkish history</i>	10
3.2 <i>Improving Armenian and Turkish relations</i>	12
CHAPTER 4. Theory and methods.....	14
4.1 <i>Theory</i>	14
4.2 <i>Methods</i>	15
4.3 <i>Analyzing the data</i>	17
CHAPTER 5. Results.....	18
5.1 <i>Results from the statements</i>	18
5.2 <i>Results from the interviews</i>	22
5.3 <i>Interview with documentary maker ‘Bloedbroeders’: initiative for reconciliation</i>	24
CHAPTER 6. Conclusion.....	26
6.1 <i>Answering the research question</i>	26
6.2 <i>Recommendation for further research</i>	27
REFERENCES.....	29
Appendix 1. Question list.....	32
Appendix 2. Statements.....	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Characteristics of diasporas according to different scholars.....	4
Table 2.2 Four aspects of reconciliation according to Kriesberg (2007).....	8
Table 5.1 Overview of demographic respondents.....	18
Table 5.2 Identity.....	19
Table 5.3 Turkish-Armenian relation.....	20
Table 5.4 Conditions for reconciliation	21
Table 5.5 Background of respondents.....	22

CHAPTER ONE. Introduction.

It is said that the sun never sets on Armenia, as the Armenia diaspora is scattered over the entire world. There are more Armenians living outside of Armenia than in Armenia itself. The Armenian diaspora is very large and can be found over the entire world. The main reason for this is the Armenian genocide that happened in 1915 by the Ottoman Empire in today's East Turkey. This is a highly contested subject, as the genocide is not recognized by Turkey and many other governments, including the Dutch government. The Armenian diaspora over the entire world has shown to be very organized and is very active in lobbying to get the genocide recognized by more parties.

Scholars agree that diasporas can play an important role in conflicts that happen in the homeland and in homeland politics (Shain 2002; Prikkalainen and Mahdi 2009). However, there has not been many research on the role of diasporas on the period after the conflict: the reconciliation process. Reconciliation is important for preventing repetition of conflict. In this thesis, the role of community activism in reconciliation processes will be researched. The case is the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands. The Armenian diaspora has been striving for recognition of the genocide by Turkey, so far without result. The research question of this thesis is: What is the role of community activism in reconciliation processes and how can this contribute to broader international solutions? The case of the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands.

First a literature review is provided that discusses the main literature on diasporas, their role in conflicts, and reconciliation. Thereafter, the history of Armenia and Turkey will be discussed. This is for a large part a shared history, however, the events of 1915 are told in two different ways. After this, the reconciliation efforts that already have been taking place will be discussed, followed by the methods and theory part. This thesis is qualitative and semi-structured interviews will be used to analyze the perceptions of the Armenian diaspora. This is followed by the results of the statements and the interviews and the interview with Ara Halici, one of the makers of the Dutch documentary 'Bloedbroeders'. This is a good example of an initiative to bridge the gap between Turks and Armenians. This is followed by the conclusion where it will become clear that the diaspora can play an important role, however, there are some difficulties. This is followed by recommendation for further research.

CHAPTER TWO. Literature review

This literature review provides an overview of the important topics of this thesis. It will shape the theoretical framework, which will be discussed in chapter 4. The topic of this thesis touches upon a few different subjects and the aim of this literature review is to make clear why it is important that these subjects or studied together. The first part of the literature review discusses the definition of the term diaspora, followed by the role diasporas can play in conflicts. Thirdly there will be a discussion on the literature on reconciliation. To conclude the literature review, all these topics will be brought together to discuss the literature on the role of diasporas in reconciliation processes.

2.1 Literature review diaspora

The term diaspora was first used to describe Jews living in closed communities outside of Israel (Sheffer 2003, 8; Clifford 1994). Even though the case of the Jews played an important role in the development of the concept, many scholars agree that the Jewish diaspora should be non-normative for the definition of diaspora (Clifford 1994, 303; Cohen 1997, 2-3). Palmer also believes that the concept should not be confined to Jewish communities alone. He presents an argument from a different angle: all of humanity might be considered a part of the African diaspora (2000, 27). This would mean that the Jewish diaspora is not the first diaspora.

Collin's idea stems from a very broad definition of diaspora that has been given by Connor: "the dispersal of a people from its original homeland". However, not every scholar agrees with this broad definition (Butler 2001, 214; Safran 1991). For example, Safran states that by using the definition scholars have applied the term to cases that cannot be considered as a diaspora, such as black people in North America and Flemish speaking Belgians living in Wallonia (1991, 83). He believes that there are six characteristics which define diasporas: a diaspora has been dispersed from a certain region which is called the homeland; there is a collective memory about the original homeland; there is a notion that they cannot be fully accepted by the host country; the homeland is seen as the ideal home; there is a feeling that they should work for the preservation of the homeland; and there is a continuous relation to the homeland and "their ethno communal consciousness and solidarity are importantly defined by the existence of such a relationship" (1991, 83-84).

Safran is not the only scholar who makes an argument for the use of the concept diaspora in a more profound way. Bruneau also comes up with six essential characteristics that defines a diaspora: dispersion under pressure; choice of destination; identity awareness; networked space; and duration of transnational ties (2010, 36-37). Sheffer too suggests a more distinct definition (2003, 10). According to him it has become a traveling concept with which he means that there are many groups that are called a diaspora and by using a broad term it is not possible to distinguish between these different groups (2003, 10). Brubaker calls it a “diaspora” diaspora’ with which he means the scattering of the term diaspora and the different meanings it has been given and different characteristics that have been ascribed to it (2005, 1). He then gives three criteria which he believes are the core elements: dispersion, homeland orientation, and boundary-maintenance (Brubaker 2005, 5-6).

Butler also argues the scattering of the meaning of diaspora as a negative process and says that this is the result of the way diasporas are studied: through an ethnographic approach (2001, 190). This leads to specifics from a certain group are taken and used as a measure to identify other ‘diasporas’ even though these characteristics might be case specific. She then proceeds with giving the three characteristics Brubaker also gave, and adds a fourth feature which is that diasporas consist of at least two generations (Butler 2001, 192).

Cohen offers a suitable solution to this problem of simplifying the definition of diaspora by typifying diasporas in victim, labor and imperial, trade and cultural diasporas (1997, 178). Following this definition, the Armenian diaspora could be typified as victim diaspora (Cohen 1997, 27). He therefore disagrees with the “generalized inferences” Safran draws from the Jewish case, the “ideal type” of diaspora according to him (Safran 1991, 84). Safran uses the characteristics of the Jewish case to typify minorities as a diaspora (1997, 22; 1991, 83). Cohen also has a list of characteristics but the difference is that not all of these need to be applicable (1997, 29).

Table 2.1 gives an overview of aforementioned scholars and the characteristics they ascribe to a diaspora. Some of the scholars use similar characteristics, or build upon each other. It is clear that one of the main characteristic of the term diaspora is ‘dispersion from the homeland’. Another one is that there is a collective memory about the, sometimes imagined, homeland or that there is a strong orientation towards the homeland. Some scholars also see a relation with the host country as a characteristic of diaspora. This is a characteristic that can

be debated, as this can also depend on the characteristics of the host country. The last characteristic that stand out is a strong inter-group connection.

Table 2.1 Characteristics of diasporas according to different scholars

Safran (1991)	Cohen (1997)	Butler (2001)	Brubaker (2005)	Bruneau (2010)
Dispersed from homeland	Dispersion from homeland due to trauma	Dispersion	Dispersion	Dispersion under pressure
Collective memory about homeland	Dispersion from the homeland due to work or trade	Homeland orientation	Homeland orientation	Choice of destination
Not fully accepted by host country	Collective memory about homeland	Boundary maintenance	Boundary maintenance	Identity awareness
Homeland is seen as ideal home	Homeland is idealized	Two or more generations		Networked space
Work for preservation of homeland	Thinking of returning to homeland			Duration of transnational ties
Continuous relation with homeland	Strong connection to ethnic group			Relatively autonomous social formation
	Unstable relation with host society			
	Connection with members of the diaspora in other countries			
	Possibility for living a distinctive life in host society			

In conclusion, scholars of diaspora studies vary between wide ranging definitions such as that of Connor, definitions drawn from one of the most traditional diasporas the Jews (Safran), or defining diasporas by placing them in different categories (Cohen). This thesis follows the latter definition because it is less broad than other definitions. The Armenian diaspora is a victim diaspora according to this definition. The identity of a large part of the

Armenian diaspora is affected by the Armenian genocide and the passing of trauma from one generation to the next (Cohen 1997, 27). In this case it is the Armenian genocide from the early 20th century, that led to a large part of the diaspora and still plays an important part in the Armenian identity (Cohen 1997, 27). But what is the role diasporas can play in the aftermath of such a tragedy or in conflicts that are happening currently?

2.2 Literature review diasporas in conflict

Many diaspora scholars have written on the subject of diasporas in conflict (Baser and Shain 2009; Koinova 2009; Pirkkalainen and Abdile 2009; Shain 2002). In most studies the focus has often been on the role of the diaspora as ‘peacemaker’ or ‘peace spoiler’ (Baser and Swan 2009, 46-46). Pirkkalainen and Abdile add a third category to the literature on the role of diasporas in conflict: peacemaker and peace spoiler at the same time (2009, 5). They claim that most arguments are focused on negative aspects, such as the idea that diasporas can be responsible for the recurrence of a conflict, and that they can also pose a security threat for the countries in which they live (Pirkkalainen and Abdile 2009, 5).

The idea that diasporas can be a threat for the security in Western countries became more notable after the terrorist attacks of 9/11 (Pirkkalainen and Abdile 2009, 5). One of the few quantitative researches on the role of diasporas in conflict resolution is the research of Collier and Hoeffler called ‘Greed and grievance in civil war’ in which they investigated the causes for civil war (Collier and Hoeffler 2004). They concluded that diasporas are a risk factor in civil wars because they can slow down peace process due to their greater financial capacity in comparison with people in the homeland (Collier and Hoeffler 2004, 589). They can, for example, make financial contributions to rebel groups and therefore prolong the conflict (Collier and Hoeffler 2004, 589).

Not everyone agrees with this conclusion of Collier and Hoeffler. Zunzer argues that diasporas send money on a “family-to-family member level” which actually can be constructive because the financial contribution often goes to poorer members of society (2004, 27). Moreover, Collier and Hoeffler can also be criticized because of the quantitative nature of the research, historical and socio-political contexts of the different cases have not been taken into consideration (Pirkkalainen and Abdile 2009, 13). Also, Collier looked at civil wars globally but only at diaspora members living in the United States (US) (Pirkkalainen and Abdile 2009, 13-14). Diasporas are spread over the entire world and in some cases other

countries inhabit a bigger diaspora, because of historical reasons. It is therefore difficult to draw the conclusion that diasporas are a risk factor in civil wars because this might depend on the case or on the phase of the conflict (Pirkkalainen and Abdile 2009, 14).

However, Collier and Hoeffler are not the only ones stating that diasporas can pose a threat. Smith and Stares state that the study of diasporas in conflict is very important as some diasporas have the capacity to support armed conflicts and that through their network structures arms and money are being sent to state and non-state actors such as terrorist groups (2007, 3). However, they also say that because of their networks, they can support more deserving causes as well, such as humanitarian assistance (Smith and Stares 2007, 3).

Diasporas intervene in conflicts because of power relations within diasporas and between diasporas, the homeland and the host country (Smith and Stares 2007, 5). They argue that diasporas possess agency, which makes them not powerless (Bercovitch in Smith and Stares 2007, 15). Due to globalization, together with an increase of ethnic conflicts, diasporas have become very important political actors that can be very influential, with increased ties with their homeland (Smith and Stares 2007, 21). Because these ties have increased, the ability of diasporas to influence conflicts in their homeland have also increased.

According to Bercovitch, diasporas play a role in politics on four levels: “the domestic level in a host country; the regional level; the trans-state level; and the level of the entire dispersed group in other countries” (2007, 21). On each of these levels, the diaspora can be either maintaining, defending or promoting its interests. This way a diaspora can influence a conflict in the homeland. However, besides their political role, other aspects are also important in the way a diaspora can influence a conflict, whether positive or negative: the position of the host countries society and government on the conflict, the effect of the conflict on the social and economic situation of the diaspora or how it affects their identity or self-image all play a role in diasporas supporting the conflict or supporting the resolution of the conflict (Smith and Stares 2007, 21).

2.3 Literature review diaspora in reconciliation

For this thesis it is important to realize that diasporas can influence a conflict. If diasporas can influence a conflict, can they also do this after the conflict during the reconciliation period? Conflicts and reconciliation go together, as scholars on peacebuilding and conflict transformation agree that reconciliation is necessary for long lasting peace

(Fischer 2011, 415). Before understanding the role diasporas can play in the reconciliation process, it is important that it is clear what reconciliation means.

Reconciliation is seen as an important factor for lasting peace (Fischer 2011, 415). It entails bottom-up and top-down processes, but it does not matter where the process starts (Fischer 2011, 415). However, it is important that the process happens on the grassroots level and the political level (Bar-Tal and Bennink 2004, 27). Reconciliation is not just an end station of a conflict, but it is a process aimed at building a relationship between individuals and societies (Fischer 2011, 415). In the case of the Armenian state and Armenian societies the aim is to build a relationship with the Turkish state and with Turkish societies. Fischer writes the following:

“The need for reconciliation is emphasized in particular for societies that have gone through a process of ethno-political conflict, as these are marked by a loss of trust, intergenerational transmission of trauma and grievances, negative interdependence (as the assertion of each group’s identity is seen as requiring the negation of the other group’s identity) and polarization” (2011, 415).

Fischer continues with saying that the parties involved often live in close proximity to each other which makes it almost necessary to address the differences between them to prevent violence from happening again. This illustrates the case of Armenia and Turkey very well: “Reconciliation is regarded being necessary to prevent desire for revenge” (2011, 415).

The outcome of reconciliation processes are not always the same. Fischer discusses the different approaches to the reconciliation process, for example forgiveness, coexisting or trust-building in a society (2011, 416). Kriesberg also states that reconciliation is not permanent, but that the relation between the groups that are reconciling keeps changing (2007, 1). He gives the example of the relationship between the Native Americans and the dominant ethnic groups in the United States (Kriesberg 2007, 1).

Kriesberg is surprised by how reconciliation often is explained as a static term, whilst he sees that reconciliation can mean different things to different people (2007, 2). He therefore discusses four aspects of reconciliation: the units, the dimensions, the degree and the symmetry of each of the aspects (see table 2.2). Firstly, with units Kriesberg means the many different parties that are involved with reconciliation (2007, 2). It could be nations or individual persons, on a personal and grassroots level, or on an elite level. Secondly,

reconciliation has four dimensions that are essential for conflict transformation: truth, justice, respect and security. Reconciliation does not mean that all these dimensions are addressed in the same way. They also do not have the same meaning for everyone. For example, for a member of a community the truth can be more important than justice whilst for a politician this might be different (Kriesberg 2007, 6). Some dimensions can even contradict each other. However, achieving high levels of reconciliation among all the dimensions is important (Kriesberg 2007, 6). The third aspect is that of the degree of reconciliation, which can vary in extent and intensity (Kriesberg 2007, 6). If there is a high degree of reconciliation this means that there are many members of society contributing to the process. Fourthly, reconciliation is often not symmetrical which means that reconciliation is not an equal process (Kriesberg 2007, 7). One side may have had more losses than the other side or one side may need to forgive more than the other side. Gaining more symmetry means that the two groups involved are moving towards greater equity (Kriesberg 2007, 7).

Table 2.2 Four aspects of reconciliation according to Kriesberg (2007)

Units	Different parties involved with reconciliation
Dimensions	Truth
	Justice
	Respect
	Security
Degree	Measurement of contribution to reconciliation process
Symmetry	Equality of process

Some of these aspects are essential for this thesis and the case of reconciliation between Armenia and Turkey. The units involved at the moment are mainly at the grassroots level, as on a political level they are at a standstill. The degree and symmetry are also of great importance. As Fischer says: “If members of one side asserts truths that are ignored or denigrated by the other, their assertion is hardly a mark of reconciliation, as the truths need to be shared or at least acknowledged to indicate some degree of reconciliation on that dimension” (2011, 417). This is important to keep in mind with the case of Armenia and Turkey, where both countries have a different truth over a shared part of their history.

There are a few articles about engaging diasporas in different types of reconciliation, such as the involvement of diasporas in truth commissions, however none of them research the case of Armenia. Young and Park researched the case of the Liberian diaspora and their role in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Diaspora Project (2009). This was the first of its kind that included a diaspora population (Young and Park 2009, 341). Young and Park even argue in their article that there might be possible legal obligations in involving the diaspora in the reconciliation process, because, as Cohen said, some diasporas are victim diasporas (2009, 356). Meeting international legal obligations is an important motivator for states in transitional justice processes. They do this by investigating human rights violations, to convict the perpetrators and take care of reparations for the victims (Young and Park 2009, 349). It is important that the emphasis lays on the victims, as in transitional justice processes the victims are being addressed and not the perpetrators (Young and Park 2009, 349). Following the definition of Cohen, some diasporas can be categorized as victim diasporas, which could mean that they might have some rights in transitional justice.

Reconciliation is a process, whereas transitional justice often means different judicial mechanisms, such as tribunals, truth commissions, settlement on reparations, but also “political and social initiatives devoted to fact-finding, reconciliation and cultures of remembrance” (Fischer 2011, 407). Transitional justice originally comes from the human rights movements, but over the past two decades in which there have been many conflicts and wars for example in the former Yugoslavia, the meaning of transitional justice has extended (Fischer 2011, 407). Transitional justice mechanisms can contribute to reconciliation.

CHAPTER THREE. History of Armenia and Turkey

Before discussing the methods of this thesis, it is important to have a better understanding of the case of this thesis: the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands and their role in the reconciliation process between Turkey and Armenia. To understand this, there is need for a little bit of background information on their shared history and how their history goes in a different direction. The Armenian and Turkish history of the beginning of the 20th century depends on who is telling it. Both sides explain the events of 1915 in a different way. The Turkish state talks about a war with insurmountable victims, whereas Armenia talks about a genocide. Today, most scholars do agree that the atrocities that started in 1915 can be called a genocide, including some Turkish scholars such as Taner Akçam (Dadrian and Akçam 2011; Cooper and Akçam 2005; Bloxham 2005). Besides that, there is an increasing number of states and organizations that are recognizing the Armenian genocide, such as the European Parliament¹ and the Council of Europe², and most recently Germany³. In this thesis the events of 1915 will be called a genocide, based on the research of the above mentioned scholars. However, the purpose of this thesis is not to provide a discussion about the terminology, but to discuss the role of community activism in the reconciliation processes, whether this is after a genocide, civil war or other conflict. The first part of this chapter will discuss the events of 1915, followed by an account of the current relation between Armenia and Turkey. In conclusion, past reconciliation efforts between both countries will be discussed.

3.1 Armenian and Turkish history

For centuries long, the Armenians had been living, in what is now called eastern Anatolia, side by side with the Muslim majority (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). All non-Muslims, and also the Christian Armenians, were seen as second-class citizens, but the Armenians did hold cultural, civil and financial autonomy (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). However, this started to change in the nineteenth century. This was the time where the powers of the Ottoman Empire started to decline and they started to feel the threats of Western powers coming nearer (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 81). Besides that, the national and religious

¹ European Parliament 2015. *European Parliament resolution of 15 April 2015 on the centenary of the Armenian Genocide*. 2015/2590/RSP.

² Council of Europe. 2001. *Recognition of the Armenian genocide*. Declaration No. 320.

³ Smale, Allison and Melissa Eddy. 2016. "German Parliament Recognizes Armenian Genocide, Angering Turkey". *NY Times*. 2nd June, 2016.

minorities within the Ottoman Empire started to make claims for more autonomy. They got support from outside the Empire, as the Western powers preferred to deal with Christians, including the Armenians, in trade agreements (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). This meant that the economic and social power of the Armenians increased which led to resentment from the Muslims Turks towards the Armenians (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). Besides this, the Armenian population in Russia were also pushing for reforms in the Ottoman Empire to benefit the Ottoman Armenians. As a result, the Ottoman Armenians were seen as being disloyal to the Empire. This led to massacres of Armenians between 1894 and 1896 encouraged by Sultan Abdul Hamid (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82).

After the Balkan war of 1912, the Ottoman Empire lost large part of its territories where much of its Christian population was living (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). The Ottomans were fearing international intervention, which was fed by threats from Russia and the idea that the Armenians were pro-Russian and anti-Ottoman (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). This is a point in history where the stories of the Turks and Armenians differ. In 1915 the Ottoman government called for deporting the Armenian population towards the deserts of Iraq and Syria. They believed that the Armenians were a threat for the Empire, as they were non-Muslims and possibly collaborating with the Russians. Nowadays Turkey states that they had to defend themselves because the Armenians wanted to attack them. The Armenians however say that they were not necessarily pro-Russian but remained loyal to the Empire. This is the crucial point in their history where Turkey and Armenia do not agree over. Besides that, defining this event as a genocide has been the number one requirement for beginning reconciliation efforts.

However, as said before most scholars nowadays agree that the deportations of the Armenians were seen by the Ottomans as a way to eliminate the Armenian population (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). Based on first-hand accounts and photographs of diplomats and politicians from Europe and the United States, missionaries and military officers that were present in the region, it is known that the deportations also included the demolishing of Armenian churches and buildings, mass drownings, beatings and rapes (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82). The perpetrators were “government forces (...) and the local population, especially the Kurds” (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82).

Between the years 1919 and 1922, the killings of Armenians continued (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 83). In 1923 the Turkish Republic was founded by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and

it was tried to establish a new national identity to eliminate the tensions that existed between the different ethnic groups. A result of this was replacing the Arabic alphabet with a Latin alphabet, which had the consequence that the following generations were not able to read accounts of Turkish history, such as the historical records in the archives (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 83).

The genocide has not always been denied. In 1919, due to Western pressure, there had been investigations and trials of those responsible of the genocide (Dadrian and Akçam 2011). However, when the Turkish Republic came into existence, the denial of the genocide started (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 83). The result of the genocide is the death of 800,000 to 1.5 million Armenians and a widespread Armenian diaspora (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 82-83). Nowadays, Armenians can be found over the entire world, with large communities in the United States, France and Russia. There are also approximately 80,000 Armenians living in Turkey, mainly in Istanbul (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 83). As Cooper and Akçam write: “the trauma of the genocide became a defining element in diaspora identity, hardened by continued Turkish denial” (2005, 83). Even after more than 100 years, the genocide is still of major importance to the Armenians.

3.2 Improving Armenian and Turkish relations

Since the genocide, there have been clashes between Turkey and Armenia. In the 1980s, Armenian extremists killed 31 Turkish diplomats (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 83). In 2007, Turkish-Armenian journalist Hrant Dink was killed by a Turkish nationalist for calling the killings of the Armenians a genocide⁴. Besides this, in the 1980s Armenians started to organize lobby groups and participate in diplomacy to get recognition for the genocide (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 83). Turkey responded to this with sanctions. When Armenia became an independent country in 1991, the relations between Armenia and Turkey got even worse. In the year of independence, Armenia won a war with Azerbaijan to annex an enclave, Nagorno-Karabakh (Cooper and Akçam 2005, 83). Turkey is ally of the Islamic Azerbaijan and therefore decided to close its border with Armenia. This has had negative consequences for the economy of both countries.

⁴ BBC. 2012. “Hrant Dink murder: Turkish court jails man for life.” <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-16600746> (accessed 1 June 2016).

However, the Turkish-Armenian relations is not without any attempts to be normalized. At the Turkish academic level, there have been open discussions about the genocide (Goksel 2010, 195). There have been several conferences where it was possible to talk about, and use the word genocide (Goksel 2010, 195). There also have been many NGO projects. An example of this is the Turkish Armenian Reconciliation Commission (TARC), consisting of Armenian and Turkish ex-diplomats, academics and activists (Mandaci 2014, 247; Görgülü 2008, 25). The initial aim of the TARC was improving Turkish-Armenian relations and by achieving this opening up the Turkish-Armenian border. However, the TARC worked mostly on creating a shared history, as both countries have different versions of it (Görgülü 2008, 25). This proved to be very difficult, as the Turkish side wanted a joint study about the events of 1915, and the Armenians demanded recognition of the genocide without the study. The TARC therefore only existed between 2001 and 2004.

Besides the TARC, there have been more local civil society initiatives to promote reconciliation. On a local level, these have turned out to be successful. On a more political level there have not been many results in normalizing the relationship. Especially with the recent fighting in Nagorno-Karabakh, the tensions between Turkey and Armenia have increased again⁵.

⁵ Babayan, Nelli. 2016. "Here's what the research reveals about the violence in Nagorno Karabakh – and how 'freezing' conflicts can backfire." *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/04/07/here-what-the-research-reveals-about-the-violence-in-nagorno-karabakh/?tid=a_inl (accessed: 1 June 2016).

CHAPTER FOUR. Theory and methods

4.1 Theory

This thesis is not applying one particular theory to the case of the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands. Instead, this research is placed in the theoretical framework of reconciliation and the role of community activism. As stated in the literature review on reconciliation, reconciliation is very broad and it can engage with many levels, such as the grassroots level or more on the political level. This means that also communities (such as diaspora communities) can play a role in the reconciliation process. This thesis will investigate this role of community activism and how this can be connected to broader international solutions to major problems. The case and community that is taking as research case, is the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands.

As shown before, diasporas can have a lot of influence and therefore they might play a role in reconciliation as well. Through quantitative semi-structured interviews with members of the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands, their role with and their wishes for reconciliation will be measured. These findings will be connected to how community activism can play a role in reconciliation. Community activism, or grassroots activism, entails actions carried out by a group of people to change something (Collins 2013, 403). In this case it means the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands and how they are organizing to gain recognition for the genocide, and to reconcile with Turkey.

The case of Armenia and Turkey is interesting. Firstly, Turkey and Armenia are now two different states, whilst at the moment of the genocide it was the Ottoman Empire. Secondly, the genocide happened more than 100 years ago and therefore there are very few survivors and perpetrators still alive. Adjudicating someone in a court for the events of 1915 is therefore also very difficult. The Armenian diaspora is a widespread and highly organized diaspora. It is unknown how many Armenians are living in the Netherlands. Many of the Dutch Armenians live in Almelo, where there is also an Armenian church and a genocide memorial. In Amsterdam there is also an Armenian church. There are many Armenian organizations spread throughout the Netherlands. Some of them are cultural organizations that provide Armenian language and dance lessons to children and have the goal to bring Armenians together and keep the culture existing. Others have a more political goal and are

organizing lectures and protests, whilst others take the shape of a business network supporting Armenian entrepreneurs and businesses in the Netherlands.

4.2 Methods

This part of the thesis will discuss the methods of this research, how the participants have been selected and how data is gathered. This is a qualitative research which means that it is interpretivist. By examining the interpretation of the participants on a certain topic, one will get a better understanding. This research will have a small number of participants, which means that there is small *n*. By conducting semi-structured interviews, the views of the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands on reconciliation between Armenia and Turkey will be measured. A semi-structured way of interviewing means that there is precomposed set of questions, however the respondent is not structured in the way of replying (Bryman 2008, 438). This allows for the interviewee to tell and explain more instead of only answering the question. Besides that, for the interviewer it is also possible to ask questions that are not on the question list but that come up in that particular interview (Bryman 2008, 438). The advantage of conducting semi-structured interviews is that the data is descriptive and help in getting specific insights on certain topics (Bryman 2008, 438).

Because the format of the interviews is semi-structured, there is a list with prepared questions (see appendix 1). Besides that, the respondents will fill in their date of birth, if they are born in the Netherlands or how long they have been living in the Netherlands, and occupation. Before each interview, the respondents will fill in a list with statements according to the Likert scale. This means that they can respond to a statement in five different ways: completely disagree, partly disagree, neutral, partly agree, completely agree. The reason for choosing this format besides only open questions is that the Likert scale is helpful in measuring attitudes (Bryman 2008, 146). Besides this, it also helps in comparing different responses.

Before the official interviews started, a set of try-out interviews were conducted to test some of the questions. The question about one's family history proved to be very helpful in starting the interviews because it provides the interviewer with a lot of background information of the interviewee and it leads to possible other questions that are not on the list. Besides that, the interviewees are asked about their participation in Armenian organizations, activities and protests. Also their opinion on the Turkish-Armenian relation is asked, together

with the question if it is possible that this relation improves and if there are conditions for this. The interview ends with talking about the role of the diaspora in reconciliation.

The initial idea was to use the indicator 'generation', but this was too vague and for many people difficult to assess to which generation after the genocide they belong to. In the case of the Armenians, many Armenians did not flee to The Netherlands right after the genocide. There are cases where people first fled to a country in the area, before they fled to the west. Besides that, there has also been a wave of Armenian immigration after the collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s. After contacting an Armenian organization in The Hague, it proved too difficult to find people that belong to the 3rd and 4th generation of Armenians after the genocide. Therefore, it is decided that the interviews will not be held with only the third and fourth but with any age. The age is still an important indicator in the research and the answers of the respondents will therefore be analyzed with the age taken in consideration. This way, the differences in answers between younger or older members of the diaspora become visible.

The number of respondents is 13. They have been contacted through Armenian cultural organizations, and a few through a Facebook page for Dutch Armenians. Asking people if they knew someone else who wanted to be interviewed also proved successful. However, finding the respondents also immediately points out a bias in the research. Because the research reached out to Armenians that are already organizing themselves and emphasizing their Armenian identity, there is the risk of interviewing people that already have a strong opinion on the Turkish-Armenian relation. Respondents that wanted to be interviewed were often part of the board of another commission that is active in organizing the yearly protest on the 24th of April or in organizing commemoration activities. However, none of the organizations is political or affiliated with an Armenian political organization.

Conducting semi-structured interviews is appropriate for the research question because the aim is to find out if and how the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands is involved in reconciliation and what their point of view is on reconciling Armenia and Turkey in general. This research wants to know opinions on a certain topic and through interviews these opinions can be asked. A qualitative research is also a good fit for this research question because the questions are more in depth than simply asking if they agree with it or not. A qualitative research focuses more on the words than on the numbers (Bryman 2008, 366).

4.3 Analyzing the data

The interviews were conducted on several dates and occasions. Some interviews have been conducted over the phone or via Skype but most interviews were conducted in person. By consent of the interviewees, all the interviews have been taped. After conducting the interviews all the interviews were transcribed. By reading the interviews multiple times, different recurring topics have been identified. Some questions led to calculating how many respondents gave a certain answer to see how many of the total respondents believe the same thing. Besides the answers to the questions, the respondents have filled in to what extent they agree or disagree with a list of statements. This can be translated into a form of visualization, such as a graph and table. By analyzing the data, the age of the respondents will be noted, as well as how they arrived in the Netherlands. There are multiple waves of immigration of Armenians to the Netherlands, that represent three different reasons for moving, that will also be a part of the analysis.

CHAPTER FIVE. Results

This part of the thesis discusses the results that are obtained through the interviews. The respondents are all part of the Armenian diaspora in The Netherlands, however they do not have the same sex or age or are born in the Netherlands. Therefore, it is important to first look at the demographic of the respondents. The number of respondents is 13, nine women and four men. There are three categories of age: 20-29 years, 30-49 years and above 50. Most people fit in the first age group, namely six. The second group consists of 4 people, and there were three people above 50. See table 5.1 for an overview. Even though it is not known how large the diaspora in the Netherlands is, it is clear that this is not a representative sample of the entire diaspora. It is very small and for a large part the group is made up of women. There are few reasons for this. At the visited events, there were more women than men. This was often the case because there were a lot of children at the events and the mothers all came together to meet each other. Besides that, the men present were often busy with arranging the event and had less time.

Table 5.1 Overview of demographic respondents

	20-29	30-49	50+
Men	2	0	2
Women	4	4	1
Total: 13	6	4	3

5.1 Results from the statements

Every respondent also agreed to fill in the list of statements (see appendix 2). This was done before the interviews were held. The results are analyzed by using Excel and making different tables of the data. To get a better overview, most statements fall within three categories: identity, Armenian Turkish relations, and conditions for reconciliation. The two first statements are about identity. The first statement is if one feels more Armenian than Dutch and the second statement is if one feels more Dutch than Armenian. As the table shows, 6 people feel completely Armenian, whilst one person feels completely Dutch. However, people do also feel Dutch at the same time. The interviews also revealed this. This

is typical for a diaspora, being strongly connected with the homeland, but also with the host country and feeling that you do not belong to either country completely.

Table 5.2 Identity

	More Armenian than Dutch	More Dutch than Armenian
1. completely disagree	1	1
2. partly disagree	1	1
3. neutral	3	6
4. partly agree	2	4
5. completely agree	6	1

Interesting is that there seems to be no relation with the length of living in The Netherlands and feeling more Armenian than Dutch. Two of the respondents are born in The Netherlands. One of them completely agreed with the statement *feeling more Armenian than Dutch*. The other one responded neutral. Besides that, most persons that answered that they completely agree with feeling more Armenian than Dutch have been living for more than 20 years in the Netherlands. Only one person that agreed with this statement has been living in The Netherlands for only four years.

The next group of statements are about the possibility of improving the relation between Armenia and Turkey. The two statements are: *it is possible that the relation improves* and *it is necessary that the relation improves*. The latter statement should be reflecting the opinion and the wishes of the respondent, whilst the first one is more based on if they believe that it is even possible that the current relation changes. As table 5.3 shows, almost half of the people do believe that there is a possibility that the relation between Turkey and Armenia improves. This was also the result from the interviews. During the interviews, people were able to elaborate more on the reasons why the relationship can improve. A recurring thought in the interviews was the current political situation in Turkey and Erdogan as the President. The interviews were conducted in the months April, May and June, so before the Turkish coup that took place on the 15th of July, 2016, which has changed the Turkish political situation at the moment. The general thought was that it is very unlikely that the relation will

improve. Most respondents believe that with a more democratic government there is a possibility for improving Turkish-Armenian relations. The respondents do believe that it is necessary to improve the relation; nine people agree or partly agree. The main reason for an improved relation is the economy, but also that improving the relation might lead to recognizing the genocide by Turkey.

Table 5.3 Turkish-Armenian relation

	It is possible that the relation between Turkey and Armenia improves	It is necessary that the relation between Turkey and Armenia improves
1. completely disagree	1	1
2. partly disagree	1	1
3. neutral	2	2
4. partly agree	5	3
5. completely agree	4	6

The next questions went into more detail of the conditions for reconciliation between Turkey and Armenia. Conditions that are mentioned in the statements are: recognizing the genocide, apologizing, offering financial compensation, and giving land back to Armenia where many Armenians used to live, including the land of the mountain Ararat which is a holy mountain for the Armenians. The format is in a way that each following statement builds upon the next statement. This means that the final statement is that Turkey recognizes the genocide, apologizes, offers financial compensation and gives land back to Armenia.

Table 5.4 show the different conditions how the interviewees responded to it. Notable is that 11 of the 13 respondents believe that recognizing the genocide is not enough. For recognizing and apologizing, this is 10 of the 13 people. If financial compensation is also offered to the victims and the families of victims, no one of the respondents disagrees completely, whilst 11 of the 13 agree or partly agree. The respondents are more divided on the topic of returning land. Some of the interviewees do believe that if Turkey recognizes the genocide they should also give back land. However, two of the respondents believe that this will never happen and that this claim is the reason why Turkey will not recognize the

genocide. They believe that there are consequences attached to Turkey recognizing the genocide, such as financial compensation.

Table 5.4 Conditions for reconciliation

	Recognizing the genocide	Recognizing the genocide and apologizing	Recognizing the genocide, apologizing and offering financial compensation	Recognizing the genocide, apologizing, offering financial compensation and returning land to Armenia.
1. completely disagree	7	5	0	2
2. partly disagree	4	5	2	1
3. neutral	0	2	0	2
4. partly agree	1	0	4	1
5. completely agree	1	1	7	7

According to this sample, only recognition of and apology for the genocide from Turkey is not enough for the reconciliation process. They want financial compensation or evening returning of land. However, the role of the international community is also important. The next statement is about the role of the international community in pressuring and imposing sanctions on Turkey for the denial of the genocide. 10 respondents answered this question with completely agree, one respondent said partly agree. This statement made very clear that this sample of the diaspora wants the international community to take action in recognizing the genocide. This also became clear during the interviews. People did add that also other countries that are currently not recognizing the genocide, should also be pressured in doing so. All the interviewees said that the Dutch government should make a bigger statement in recognizing the genocide and make it their job to pressure other countries in recognizing the genocide as well.

An important question during the interviews was if the diaspora should be involved in the reconciliation process with Turkey. All of the respondents answered that the diaspora should be involved because a large part of the diaspora is the result of the genocide. The answers on the question in which way the diaspora should be involved proved a lot harder to

be answered. Many respondents believed that the way the diaspora is involved at the moment is enough. With this they mean the way the diaspora is organized in the host states, via cultural Armenian organizations, organizing protest, and in general supporting the Armenian cause.

5.2 Results from the interviews

For some part the results of the statements also incorporated some questions of the interviews. However, it is necessary to look more in-depth into the interview questions and responses. The first question of the interview is about the family history which led to extensive answers with a lot of information at once. Most respondents also shared how they came to the Netherlands and for what reason. Table 5.5 provides an overview of the different ways and reasons why the respondents came to the Netherlands. Most respondents are refugee, but not all from Armenia. Because of the Armenian genocide, many families fled to safer regions in the area, such as Iraq and Iran. However, in these countries the Christian Armenian population is a minority and due to wars and conflicts, many of the Armenians fled again, this time to a region further away, such as the Netherlands. The refugees from Armenia all came to the Netherlands in the 90ies, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Table 5.5 Background of respondents

Born in the Netherlands	2	
Refugee	10	From Armenia: 3 From Greece: 1 From Iran: 2 From Iraq: 4
Moved for marriage	1	From Armenia

All the respondents are member of an Armenian cultural organization. None of them are active in more political organizations, however, 11 out of the 13 respondents will always join protests. Every year there is a protests on the 24th of April, which is the day the genocide is remembered. This year there were also additional protests at the beginning of April due to

the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh⁶. The two respondents who answered that they do not join protests hold the belief that protesting does not work and is not to the aid of the reconciliation process.

The genocide is an important subject for all the respondents as 12 out of 13 respondents talk about the genocide with people who do not have an Armenian background. Only one respondent answered not to talk about the genocide with other people because of lack of interest from non-Armenians. Nine out of 13 people also talk about the genocide with people with a Turkish background, however of these nine respondents three are trying to avoid it. Four people absolutely avoid talking about it with people with a Turkish background because they work with Turkish colleagues or have a Turkish friend and they do not want to jeopardize their relationship.

The next question was about if the relation between Armenia and Turkey could ever improve. Six out of the 13 said yes, this is possible. Seven people believe this relation will not improve. Five people gave as a reason the current political situation (before the coup) and President Erdogan. They believe that he is not willing to make amends with Armenia or fulfill the minimal condition for reconciliation: recognizing the genocide. However, some initiatives were mentioned as positive for improving the Turkish-Armenian relation, but most of them are on a more local level. The answers people gave to the question what kind of activities need to be organized to improve the Turkish-Armenian relation were mainly focused on local activities. The Turkish-Armenian Reconciliation Commission (TARC) is seen as a good way to create more understanding, but three people said about this that recognition is the minimum criteria to participate in such a commission.

The interviews also made clear that people have less confidence in political reconciliation initiatives because politics make reconciliation more complicated, as said by two respondents. However, four people did say that only politics can make real steps in reconciliation because they can officially recognize the genocide. But there is a role for the diaspora. All the respondents said that it is the duty of the diaspora to aim for recognition and to be involved in the reconciliation process. The main reason that was given for this is that the diaspora is a direct consequence of the genocide. Almost all the respondents say that the diaspora is already involved by participating in protests, telling the story and by supporting

⁶ News.am. 2016. "Armenians gather in Amsterdam to protests against Azerbaijan's aggression." Via <http://news.am/eng/news/321349.html> (accessed: 10 June 2016).

Armenians. An example is commemorating the Armenian genocide together with Turks or Turkish organizations. Four out of the 13 respondents named the Dutch television program 'Bloedbroeders', made by a Dutch-Armenian actor Ara Halici and Dutch-Turkish journalist Sinan Can, as a very good initiative. This documentary is a good example of a non-political initiative that is made by an Armenian from the diaspora. It was possible to interview Ara Halici about the example he and Can have become for the Armenian society in the Netherlands.

5.3 Interview with documentary maker 'Bloedbroeders': initiative for reconciliation

In 2015 Armenian-Dutch actor Ara Halici and Turkish-Dutch journalist Sinan Can made 'Bloedbroeders', a TV-documentary in which they look for the truth about the Armenian genocide. From his Turkish surroundings, Can heard stories that there was never a genocide, whilst Halici heard that Turks cannot be trusted. During the interviews for this thesis, many respondents talked about the TV-documentary because they see it as an example of bringing Turks and Armenians closer together. It even led to Can apologizing for the genocide on Armenian television. It was possible to interview Ara Halici and to ask him about this initiative, if it contributed to reconciliation between Armenians and Turks in the Netherlands and what more can be achieved.

Halici explains that the idea to make this documentary came from Can. He did not want to produce it by himself, but preferably with someone from Armenian descent to give the documentary more impact. This has definitely made the documentary successful because it speaks to both the Armenian and Turkish communities in the Netherlands. Halici further explains that from both communities there is a lot of distrust towards each other. Both Halici and Can have experienced the consequences of the documentary: for Halici it has mainly been very positive, but for Can it has been very negative and he has been called a traitor for making the documentary.

Halici explained that the main goal of the documentary was to become an example for Turks and Armenians to get closer to each other. The documentary showed that a Turk and an Armenian can become friends and discuss topics such as the genocide. Halici is therefore hopeful for future reconciliation between the two countries, however the current political situation does not contribute to this. On a local level reconciliation seems to be more successful. For the documentary Halici talked to many Turks and discovered that there is a

large group is not sure what happened and wants to find out for themselves. This has given him hope that reconciliation is possible.

Halici also discovered that there is a difference in perception between the Armenians in Armenia and in the diaspora. The diaspora has often a harsher opinion, which can be harmful for the reconciliation process. However, he understands that the reason for this is that the diaspora has grown up with the stories about the genocide as their families are usually the victims. For reconciliation however, it is necessary that there is willingness for discussion to create a better understanding for each other. 'Bloedbroeders' functions as an example for Armenians and Turks in the Netherlands to talk to each other and learn more about each other. This can lead to a contribution to the reconciliation process and 'bloedbroeders' therefore is a good example of a non-political reconciliation initiative.

CHAPTER SIX. Conclusion

6.1 Answering the research question

This thesis researched the role of community activism in reconciliation processes. By conducting interviews with members of the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands, an attempt was made to answer this question. This part will discuss the findings.

The interviews and statements revealed that most respondents believe that reconciliation is possible. However, the minimal condition for this is recognition of the genocide by the Turkish government. This is not seen as enough: apologies and financial and material compensation are also seen as very important which makes it very difficult for reconciliation as the Turkish government is not able to meet the latter condition. Previous more political attempts, such as TARC, have shown that both parties have different conditions which make starting the reconciliation process very difficult. The current Turkish political situation (before the coup) is seen as problematic for the reconciliation process. Therefore, many respondents mentioned more local and non-political initiatives to improve the relation between the Turks and Armenians, such as the documentary 'Bloedbroeders'.

The role of community activism in a reconciliation process in this case seems to be formed around one issue: striving for recognition of the genocide. By telling the story of the genocide to non-Armenians and even discussing it with Turks, the Armenian community in the Netherlands is trying to get more support for this issue. Also joining yearly protests is a way the diaspora is showing their support. Some Armenian organizations also participate in lobby activities, for example at the Dutch government as they have not recognized the genocide officially.

The next step is to look at how community activism can contribute to broader international solutions. In the case of the Armenian diaspora, it is clear that the diaspora wants to be involved in any attempts of improving the relation between Turkey and Armenia. Whilst the Armenian diaspora in the Netherlands is not the direct result of the genocide, in other countries this can be the case. Therefore, they see it as their right to be involved in the reconciliation process. Many respondents did say that they were not sure how the reconciliation process should be shaped because they are not politicians. In the case of

Armenia and Turkey it seems like the Armenian diaspora wants their wishes to be heard by politicians who should initiate the reconciliation process.

The support from the diaspora for certain international solutions can be very helpful as the diaspora still has contacts with the homeland and might be able to influence the homeland to support certain reconciliation measures. The diaspora might also function as an example: many respondents said that since live in the Netherlands they feel less negative over Turks as when they were living in Armenia or in other countries with a very small Turkish population. Because of the large Turkish population in the Netherlands, one will have more contact with Dutch Turks, for example as a colleague or neighbor. This has the consequence that Armenians and Turks communicate with each other, whereas in Armenia this is not necessary because of the demographic situation. The respondents said that they have realized that many Turks cannot be blamed for denying the genocide as they have heard only the Turkish side of the story. The interviews also made clear that an initiative such as ‘bloedbroeders’ have contributed to more contact between Turks and Armenians as it functions as an example that Armenians and Turks can be friends.

In the case Armenia and Turkey, the way the history is told is very important. Reconciliation will not be possible if both sides stick to their own history without making any compensations. This applies to both the Turks and Armenians. Therefore, communication between both cultures is very important. Even if reconciliation on a political level seems very difficult at the moment, the diaspora can have a role in increasing the dialogue between Armenians and Turks. In some ways this is already been done, for example inviting Turkish organizations to Armenian organizations. To answer the question ‘What is the role of community activism in reconciliation processes and how can this contribute to broader international solutions?’ the diaspora at the moment has the role of participating and broadening the dialogue between Turks and Armenians in the Netherlands. This can function as an example for a dialogue on a more political level and in the end to solve the conflict between the Turks and Armenians.

6.2 Recommendations for further research

Because of the small scale of this research, more research on the same topic is necessary. It is also necessary to hear the side of the Turkish diaspora and to get an understanding of their ideas and contribution to reconciliation. In this case only the diaspora

in the Netherlands has been researched, but research is also necessary for other countries with a large Armenian diaspora, such as the United States or France. More research can be conducted on the role of diasporas in reconciliation in general. What kind of role can they play? Research on the role of diasporas on transitional justice has been studied, but reconciliation is still an undiscovered topic. Therefore, further research should also investigate the effectiveness of a diaspora participating in a reconciliation process as this is not clear.

This research is not without limitations which also need to be addressed in future research. The main bias of this research is the sample of the Armenian diaspora. It is very small and most people were contacted through Armenian organizations, which can mean that the sample of respondents is already very organized. Future research should try to get a more representative sample of the Armenian diaspora. Besides that, a bigger variety of the different age groups and backgrounds perhaps present bigger differences in answers. Because of the small n it was impossible to draw any conclusions from different answers given by respondents with different ages and backgrounds. In general, it is not possible to make any generalizations because of this small number of participants.

It is necessary to carry out more research on the role of diasporas on reconciliation as diasporas can play an important role, positive and negative. Especially in a globalized world where it is simple for a diaspora to exchange ideas, opinions and money with the homeland it is important that the possible value of the influence of diasporas is understood. Diasporas can help in bridging the gap between two cultures, as could happen in the case of Armenia and Turkey, because they can function as an example. The difficulty is that the Armenian diaspora is hold back because of preconditions for reconciliation which are unlikely to be met in the near future. The hope is therefore that diasporas are inspired by initiatives such as 'bloedbroeders' to bridge the gap between two cultures that are very similar with a shared history.

REFERENCES

- Anderlini, Sanam Naraghi, Camille Pampell Conaway and Lisa Kays. 2004. "Transitional Justice and Reconciliation." In: *Inclusive Security, Sustainable Peace: A Toolkit for Advocacy and Action: Justice, Governance and Civil Society*.
- Bar-Tal, Daniel and Gemma H. Bennink. 2004. "The Nature of Reconciliation as an Outcome and as a Process." In *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. Eds. Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 11-38.
- Baser, Bahar and Ashok Swain. 2009. "Diaspora Design versus Homeland Realities: Case Study of the Armenian Diaspora." *Caucasian Review of International Affairs*: 3(1). 45-62.
- Bloxham, Donald. 2005. *The Great Game of Genocide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2005. "The 'diaspora' diaspora." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*: 28(1). 1-19.
- Bruneau, Michel. 2010. "Diasporas, transnational spaces and communities." In *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concept, Theories and Methods*, eds. Rainer Bauböck and Thomas Faist. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 35-49.
- Butler, Kim D. 2001. "Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse." *Diaspora*: 10(2). 189-219.
- Clifford, James. 1994. "Diasporas." *Cultural Anthropology*: 9(3). 302-338.
- Cohen, Robin. 1997. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London: UCL Press.
- Collier, Paul and Anke Hoeffler. 2004. "Greed and grievance in civil war." *Oxford Economic Papers*: 56. 563-595.
- Collins, Pauline. 2013. "Community Activism." In *Encyclopedia of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Eds. Idowu, Samuel O., Nicholas Capaldi, Liangrong Zu and Ananda

Das Gupta. Berlin: Springer Publications. 403-406.

Cooper, Belinda and Taner Akçam. 2005. "Turks and Armenians and the 'G-Word'." *World Policy Journal*: 22(3). 81-93.

Dadrian, Vahakn N. and Taner Akçam. 2011. *Judgement at Istanbul*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Goksel, Diba Nigar. 2010. "The Rubik's Cube of Turkey-Armenian Relations." *UNISCI Discussion Papers*: no. 23. 193-206.

Görgülü, Aybars. 2008. *Turkey-Armenia Relations: A Vicious Circle*. Istanbul: Tesev Publications.

Fischer, Martina. 2011. "Transitional Justice and Reconciliation: Theory and Practice", in *Advancing Conflict Transformation: The Berghof Handbook II*. Eds. B. Austin, M. Fischer, H.J. Giessmann. 406-430.

Koinova, Maria. 2009. "Diasporas and democratization in the post-communist world." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*: 42. 41-64.

Kriesberg, Louis. 2007. "Reconciliation: Aspects, Growth and Sequences." *International Journal of Peace Studies*: 12(1). 1- 21.

Mandaci, Nazif. 2014. "Reconciliation under the shadow of diaspora politics: some lessons from the Turkish-Armenian Reconciliation Commission (TARC)." *DEU Journal of GSSS*: 16(2). 235-257.

Palmer, Colin. 2000. "Defining and Studying the Modern African Diaspora." *The Journal of Negro History*: 36(1). 27-32.

Pirkkalainen, Päivi and Mahdi Abdile. 2009. "The Diaspora-Conflict-Peace-Nexus: A Literature Review." *Diaspeace*.

Safran, William. 1991. "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return." *Diaspora: A journal of Transnational Studies*: 1(1). 83-99.

Shain, Yossi. 2002. "The Role of Diasporas in Conflict Perpetuation or Resolution." *SAIS Review*: 22(2). 115-144.

Shain, Yossi. 2008. *Kinship and Diasporas in International Affairs*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Sheffer, Gabriel. 2003. *Diaspora politics: at home abroad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Hazel and Paul Stares, eds. 2007. *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?* New York: United Nations University Press.

Young, Laura A. and Rosalyn Park. 2009. "Engaging Diasporas in Truth Commissions: Lessons from the Liberia Truth and Reconciliation Commission Diaspora Project." *The International Journal of Transitional Justice*: 3. 341-361.

Zunzer, Wolfram. 2004. "Diaspora Communities and Civil Conflict Transformation." *Berghof Occasional Paper Nr. 26*.

APPENDIX ONE. Question list

1. Would you mind telling me something about your family history?
2. Would you mind telling me something about how the genocide affected your family?
3. When and why did you or your family come to The Netherlands?
4. Are you part of an Armenian organization in The Netherlands? Which one?
5. In what kind of activities do you take part?
6. Do you also take part in more political activities?
7. Do you join protests?
8. What is your role in the activities organized?
9. Do you support all the activities organized?
10. Are there also types of activities that you would not join?
11. Do you share the story of the Armenian genocide, for example with your kids or with friends from other cultures?
12. Do you talk to Turks about the genocide?
13. Is it possible to create a better relation between Turkey and Armenia?
14. What would be necessary for this?
15. If Turkey recognizes the genocide, is that enough to move forward?
16. What kind of activities should be undertaken to be able to create a better relation between Turkey and Armenia?
17. What do you think of past initiatives to create a better relation between Turkey and Armenia, such as the Turkish-Armenian reconciliation commission (TARC)?
18. Should the diaspora be involved in reconciliation?
19. How should the diaspora be involved in reconciliation?

<i>The international community should impose sanctions on Turkey for not recognizing the genocide</i>					
<i>Additional remarks</i>					