R.T.
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES M.A. PROGRAM
M.A. THESIS

GEORG SIMMEL'S CONCEPT OF THE STRANGER AND POST-SIMMELIAN ANALYSES: THE PAKISTANIS AND THE SYRIANS AS THE STRANGERS OF MODERN-DAY ISTANBUL

EMRAH YAĞMURLU
15735013

THESIS SUPERVISOR
ASSOC. PROF. NALAN TURNA

ISTANBUL
2018

R.T.
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES M.A. PROGRAM
M.A. THESIS

GEORG SIMMEL'S CONCEPT OF THE STRANGER AND POST-SIMMELIAN ANALYSES: THE PAKISTANIS AND THE SYRIANS AS THE STRANGERS OF MODERN-DAY ISTANBUL

EMRAH YAĞMURLU
15735013

THESIS SUPERVISOR
ASSOC. PROF. NALAN TURNA

ISTANBUL
2018

R.T.
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES M.A. PROGRAM
M.A. THESIS

GEORG SIMMEL'S CONCEPT OF THE STRANGER AND POST-SIMMELIAN ANALYSES: THE PAKISTANIS AND THE SYRIANS AS THE STRANGERS OF MODERN-DAY ISTANBUL

EMRAH YAĞMURLU
15735013

Thesis Submission Date: 23/07/2018

Thesis Defense Date: 21 / 06 / 2018

Thesis is approved by unanimous / majority vote.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nalan Turna (Thesis Supervisor) _____

Prof. Dr. Özden Zeynep Oktav _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kerem Karaosmanoğlu _____

ISTANBUL
June 2018

ÖZ

GOERG SIMMEL'IN YABANCI KAVRAMI VE SIMMEL SONRASI ANALİZLER: GÜNÜMÜZ İSTANBUL'UNUN YABANCILARI OLARAK PAKİSTANLILAR VE SURİYELİLER

Emrah Yağmurlu
Haziran 2018

Modern iletişim sistemleri ve ulaşım teknolojisindeki gelişmeler sayesinde dünyamız çoğu bilim insanının ifade ettiği gibi "küresel bir köy" oldu. Küreselleşme; artan mal, insan ve fikir akışı ile birlikte, bir yere sabitlenmiş, kökleşmiş ve lokalize edilmiş kültürlere, toplumlara ve devletlere ait varsayımlarımızı tartışmaya açtı. Coğrafi sınırların etkisini yitirmesi, mekân temelli aidiyetleri etkiledi. Genelde, küreselleşme; özelde ise yabancılar, hem kültürler arasındaki hem de biz-onlar/içerisi-dışarısı gibi karşıt ayrımlar arasındaki sınırların yok oluşunun habercisi oldular. Aşırı hareketlilik ve görülmemiş derecede nüfus değişimi ile tanımlanan günümüz dünyasında; "yabancı", hareketliliğin bir figürü olarak, geleneksel alan ve aidiyet sınırlarına bağlı insanlar ile bir çatışma içerisindedir.

Yabancı sosyolojisinde, var olan literatürün teorik tartışmalar ile dolu olduğunu; fakat kavramın, günümüz şehir göçmenleri gibi spesifik gruplara yeterince uygulanmadığını görüyoruz. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma günümüz İstanbul'undaki iki yabancı grubu incelemektedir: kayıt dışı Pakistanlı ve Suriyeli göçmenleri. Bu doğrultuda, çalışma Georg Simmel'in yabancı kavramını ve ilgili literatürü bu iki gruba uygulamaktadır. Literatürde olduğu gibi, yabancının ilişkisel bir figür olduğu ve bu nedenle farklı bağlamlarda farklı form ve roller aldığı kabul edilmektedir. Çalışma, yabancılığın oluşumunu spesifik bir zaman ve mekânda göstermeye çalışmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda yarı yapılandırılmış mülakatlar ve kısmı gözlem kullanılarak; İstanbul yerlilerinin ve yabancılarının birbirlerini nasıl algıladığı gösterilmiştir. Çalışmada; Suriyelilerin ve Pakistanlıların, ev sahibi toplum tarafından farklı muamelelere tabi tutuldukları ortaya konmuştur. Ev sahibi toplumun alt kesimi, Suriyelilere yönelik dışlayıcı bir tutum göstermektedir; çünkü kendi ekonomik çıkarlarını korumak, var olan düzenin devamını sağlamak ve buna bağlı olarak "biz ve onlar" arasındaki sınırları belirginleştirmek istiyorlar. Kısaca, çalışma "yabancı" kavramını günümüz İstanbul'unda yaşayan Pakistanlılar ve Suriyelilere uygulayarak literatürdeki var olan boşluğu doldurmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Georg Simmel, Yabancı, Yabancılar, İstanbul, Suriyeliler, Pakistanlılar, Göçmenler, Küreselleşme, Kültür

ABSTRACT

GEORG SIMMEL'S CONCEPT OF THE STRANGER AND POST-SIMMELIAN ANALYSES: THE PAKISTANIS ANS THE SYRIANS AS THE STRANGERS OF MODERN-DAY ISTANBUL

Emrah Yağmurlu
June 2018

Thanks to the modern communications systems and advancement in transportation technology, the world becomes "a global village" as many scholars refer to. With its increased flows of goods, people and ideas, globalization exposes our assumption about cultures, nations and societies as a localized, fixed and rooted into place. The disappearance of the constraints of geography affects placed-based loyalties. Globalization (in general) and strangers (in particular) are together the harbinger of the disappearance of boundaries between cultures, and antagonistic "inside-outside/us-them" mentalities. In today's world, described by hyper mobility and unprecedent population change, the stranger, as a figure of mobility, is in a clash with the local people who adhere to the traditional boundaries of space and belonging.

In sociology of stranger, we see that the existing literature is full of theoretical discussions. However, the concept has not so far sufficiently applied to specific groups, such as immigrants of current day cities. Therefore, this study investigates two stranger groups in modern-day Istanbul: the undocumented Pakistani and Syrian immigrants. The study applies Georg Simmel's concept of the stranger and related literature to these two groups. Like the existing scholarship, I argue that the stranger is a relational figure who takes different idiosyncratic forms and roles in different contexts. The study seeks to show the construction of stranger in a specific time and place. To this end, I collect data through the semi-structured interview method and partial observation. I illustrate how the local people and the strangers of Istanbul perceive one another. I argue that the Pakistanis and the Syrians do not receive the same treatment from the host society. The low-income group of the host society has a discriminatory attitude towards the Syrians since they seek to protect their economic interests, maintain the existing order and thus to solidify the borders between "us and them." Briefly, by applying the concept of the stranger to the Pakistanis and the Syrians who are now living in modern-day Istanbul, the present thesis aims at filling the gap in the existing literature.

Key Words: Georg Simmel, The Stranger, Strangers, Istanbul, Syrians, Pakistanis, Immigrants, Globalization, Culture

FOREWORD

My interest in the concept of stranger goes back to the time that I spent in Sweden as an exchange student. Back then, I studied the Kurdish diaspora in Sweden; there the Kurds were strangers. Here, in Istanbul, the first spark for the present study came when I saw a group of the Pakistani strangers on a foot bridge. At that moment, I felt intimidated by the Pakistanis since I did not know their language, culture and intentions. I asked myself: "Who are those people?" "Why do they always walk together?" Why does the government let them in?" I was overwhelmed with shame when I learned that they were walking together because they were afraid of being attacked by the criminals of the city. It was that "aha moment" which inspired me to study the strangers of modern-day Istanbul.

I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Nalan Turna. Apart from being the best supervisor, she is also a genuinely empathic and friendly human being. I greatly appreciate her immediate feedbacks and support during the hard times. Furthermore, I am extremely grateful to A. Tarık Çelenk, Murat Soycengiz, Mustafa Ünal, M. Lütfi Arslan, Osman Bostan, and Evren Balta. I am also grateful to Metin and Sanem Gürcan who together created the best caring atmosphere that made me really feel safe during my hard times. I would like to thank Ergün Yıldırım and İrfan Özet for their kind support. I would like to express my gratitude to Özden Zeynep Oktav who become my great mentor since my BA years. I am also indebted to Kerem Karaosmanoğlu who has contributed to my works with his idiosyncratic approach. Furthermore, I would like to thank to Aysegül Baykan since during her graduate level course, she introduced us "Simmel". Of course, I owe my deepest gratitude to my friends, who I name as nameless heroes and heroines. They tolerated my being "Mr. Pessimist" and opened space for me in their lives. Last but not the least, I want to thank to my family. No word can explain my feelings; without them, I would not have completed anything. I owe them a lot, indeed my existence.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to all strangers, more specifically to those who have contributed to the present study. Of course, I am alone responsible for any errors and inadequacies of this study.

Istanbul, June 2018 Emrah Yağmurlu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, we are experiencing a process called globalization in which we see an unprecedented volume of population change and emigration; a process of liberation from space. In this global world, by the help of advancement in transportation and information technologies, cities have been increasingly experiencing population movements, emigration, mobilities, and so on. They are becoming more diverse and linked to the transnational migration, hyper mobilities and life styles and thus they are losing their homogeneities. Istanbul is one of those cities with 14.8 million people, except the non-Istanbul residents who visit the city on occasion, undocumented immigrants, refugees, and tourists.

From a sociological perspective, globalization is a social process in which the constraints of geography on people's sociocultural life have been decreasing. This is what we are increasingly aware of (Waters, 1995, 3, quoted in Peieterse, 2015, 17). In the contemporary world, as many scholars have indicated, people now have more complex and interdependent lives. They live in cities of millions of strangers. Without the constraints of geography, we see that the traditional institutions such as family, community and state are not enough for today's people to make meaningful sociocultural and political decisions. They need more than these "conventional boundaries of space and belonging" (Morrell, 2008, 5). The clash between the adherents of these traditional boundaries and the strangers (outsiders, refugees, cosmopolitans, immigrants) is the main problem of the contemporary world as Stuart Hall puts: "the capacity to live with difference is … the coming question of the twenty first century" (Hall, 1993, 361 quoted in Jackson et al., 2017, 2). By considering all these, the present thesis uses German sociologist Georg Simmel's the concept of the stranger in order to portray a specific part of urban life in Istanbul.

Georg Simmel's seminal article "The Stranger" inspires many to study sociology of stranger. Simmel use "the stranger" as a tool to reveal "the social insecurities of modernity" (Oakes and Price, 2008, 311). The stranger, by his presence, shows us that there is another social reality out there and our social reality is not the only legitimate

way to see the world, and reminds us that the world is not a stable place, instead it is in a constant motion. Thus, he upsets "our previously unproblematic existence" (Dessewffy, 1996, 600). He is a disruption to the assumption that there is an organic relationship between place and identity which is the underlaying presupposition of nation state. He is a symbolic figure who makes us question "our assumptions about culture as spatially localized or fixed with clear boundaries and territory" (Oakes and Price, 2008, 60). "He is a challenger to insiders' social organization, to their way of life, to their assumptions about social reality" (Tiryakian, 1973, 48). Strangers also have a special status due to their knowledge of the unknown. Since what we think as strange is unexperienced, they are also exciting. In conclusion, the stranger is not usually welcomed by the host groups and received a combination of treatments between annihilation and an elevation to a distinguished position.

As Catherine Harris et al. indicates, the existing literature on the concept of stranger is full of theoretical discussions but there is a lack of application of the concept to the specific groups (Harris et all., 2017, 18). Unlike the existing literature, my study here concerns two stranger groups in the contemporary Istanbul, the undocumented Pakistani and Syrian immigrants. In this study, I use Simmel's concept of the stranger to analyze my participants' life in Istanbul. I argue that the stranger is a mobile person who traverses space. He/she leaves his/her native countries, cities, towns, and even their small groups and enters a new one. I categorize the Pakistanis and the Syrians as "undocumented emigrants" since they crossed the Turkish borders in an illegal way. Although it affects my participants' strangeness, my aim is not to study their legal situation. I focus on their situation as strangers; my purpose is to show how their strangeness has been constructed and increased when they interacted and confronted with host society. Therefore, the present study seeks to shed an interdisciplinary light on the underrepresented two groups of Istanbul. In this way, it will give a voice to both "the strangers and the host society" and will reveal what is going wrong between them.

I will also strive for answering the following questions: "what are the different attitudes of the local people towards these two groups?", "what are the underlying reasons behind the different treatment of the strangers?", "how city life is possible?", "do we really experience the same city?", "why are the Pakistanis are being overlooked and a xenophobia shown towards the Syrians?" Studying these specific stranger groups will

show us what kind of justifications that the host group can use to legitimate their attempts to clean the "national space" from non-nationals.

The paper is organized around six chapters. The first chapter simply introduces the study and its purpose. The second chapter covers the considerations about the method used in the study, the semi-structured interview, the role of researcher/myself, limitations and delimitations. The third chapter, dealing with the theoretical background, provides the necessary information about Georg Simmel's sociology to situate his concept of the stranger in a proper place. This chapter also refers to the post-Simmel literature on the stranger and seeks to shed a light on why strangers are seen as dangerous. It also examines the relationship between the stranger and city. The fourth chapter discusses the connections between culture, space and place in relation to the stranger. It shows us how the stranger, as a figure of mobility, exposes our assumptions about culture as localized, fixed, and rooted into place. The fifth chapter analyses the main findings of the data gathered and provides the strangers' perceptions of the host group and vice versa.

2. METHODOLOGY

> "If a tree falls in the woods and there is no one there to hear it, did it really make a sound?" (Tracy, 2013, 39).

In this chapter, I will overview my method and the ways I collected the data. I will first compare the positivist and the interpretive paradigms. Then, I will try to situate myself; what kind of role I acquired during my interviews. The next section explains why I chose the semi-structured interview method. Then, I will provide my personal background to allow the potential readers to make a better judgment of this study because I am also part of a society and thus my personality and experiences can affect the research. At the final section of this chapter, I will cover the selection process, give both descriptions of the interview procedure and limitation of the study.

2.1. Construction of the Reality: The Positivist and the Interpretivist Paradigms

For the present study, I will use the qualitative research method that helps to provide insights on illegal Syrian and Pakistan immigrants and their experiences in Istanbul. As Victor Jupp states, qualitative research is mostly based on interpretivism, inductivism, and constructivism (Jupp, 2006, 249). Shank describes qualitative research as "a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning." In this context, systematic means "planned, ordered, and public" (Shank, 2002, 5, quoted in Royan 2012, 28) and "by 'empirical,' he means that this type of inquiry is grounded in the world of experience, and in general he says that the empirical researcher tries to understand how the informants make sense of their experiences" (G. Goethals, G. Sorenson, J. Mac Gregor, 2004 quoted in Royan, 2012, 28). This challenges the positivist paradigm which claims "there is a single true reality already exists 'out there' in the world and is waiting to be discovered" (Tracy, 2013, 39).

The aim of the positivist paradigm is to measure and predict social phenomena and create a tangible knowledge. In other words, the goal is to mirror reality. In this respect, a response to the famous puzzle "If a tree falls in the woods and there is no one there to hear it, did it really make a sound?" from the positivist paradigm may be "'Yes, if

we can prove it' and would go on to measure the vibrations made when the tree falls. … given the right tools and research methods, the vibrations suggest there was a 'sound,' whether or not anyone was there to hear it" (Ibid., 39).

Unlike the positivist paradigm, the interpretive paradigm tells a different story. To understand this approach, we should refer to Max Weber's concept "verstehen". Simply, the concept refers to an interpretive process which aims to study people on their own terms and from their point of views (Tracy, 2013, 41). Weber believes that sociologists have advantages over natural scientists. For example, social scientists can understand (verstehen) social phenomena; but it is not the case for a natural scientist to gain "a similar understanding of the behavior of an atom" (Ritzer, 2011, 116).

The interpretive paradigm opposes to the positivist notion that there is a single reality out there and we can mirror reality. For it, knowledge and reality are situated. They are constructed and reconstructed by people through various reactions. The role of researcher has a critical space since it plays a mediated role in knowledge creation (Ibid., 40). Again, if we look at the same question "If a tree falls in the woods and there is no one there to hear it, did it really make a sound?",

> "Interpretive scholars might say that the issue depends on the meaning of the word "sound." Given that sound requires a listener, perhaps the tree did not have sound if no one was listening; or maybe it had a different sound, depending on who or what was present at the scene (a baby, a chipmunk, a researcher, a digital tape-recorder, or a journalist). Also, interpretive researchers might argue that what is classified as having a sound differs from person to person. Does the air conditioner in the background create "sound"? What about the sound of your own breath or heart beat? … Interpretivists would ask and gain insight from multiple points of view, from multiple participants, and from themselves, to answer the question" (Ibid., 40-41).

Before Weber; scholars from the tradition of hermeneutics, such as German philosopher Wilhem Dilthey, argue that the difference between social sciences and natural sciences comes from their subject matter due to human actions which are meaningful and purposive. Therefore, social phenomena are subject to a subjective interpretation, choices and motivation (Jupp, 2006, 317-318). Weber's verstehen is not immune from criticism regarding the validity of knowledge produced in this way; but as George Ritzer points out, it is due to the misconception about the concept which claims that verstehen is simply based on intuition of the researcher (Ritzer, 2011, 117). However, Weber claims that subjective meaning can be studied objectively through ideal types and human rationality. He also says that there is a need to comprehend the values which shape people's perception and action in a "non-judgmental way" (Jupp, 2006, 318).

As a qualitative approach, interpretivism discovers subjective meanings in which people conceive the world and use different ways to construct social realities through languages, images and cultural artifacts. Although interpretive researchers do not claim that it is possible to see how their participants conceive worlds, verstehen refers to "the practice of striving toward empathic understanding" (Tracy, 2013, 41).

Ritzer indicates that verstehen (and interpretive tradition) draws on hermeneutics which is a special approach to understand and interpret published writings. The goal is to understand both the basic structure of the text and its author's thinking. Weber and Dilthey try to extend it to the understanding of the social life (Ritzer, 2011, 117). Therefore, human actions are not seen as something tangible material reality which can be discovered; as opposed to this, they are seen as "text" that can be "read, interpreted, deconstructed, and analyzed" (Tracy, 2013, 41). As Sarah Tracy puts it clearly, "Likewise, to understand their own ethnographic texts, researchers must consider their own subjectivity and life worlds" (Tracy, 2013, 42).

> "Man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning" (Geertz, 1973, 5, quoted in Tracy, 2013, 3).

I argue that knowledge is socially constructed and situated. As Sarah Tracy (2013, 41) clearly explains, apart from seeing the world from their participants' eyes, interpretive scholars consider their choice of selecting qualitative approach as a moral decision which is full of ethical and political consequences. Truth is not context-free and it is fraught with power relations.

In conclusion, apart from the above reasons, I chose qualitative research method since it is more suitable for the topic of the present study. It gave me an opportunity to gain an insight into my participants' world. During the interview, I tried to establish trust-based relationships with my participants so that they can share their opinions and experiences as what they are.

2.2. Where Do I Stand: An Ethnographer or a Stranger?

Ethnography is a qualitative research method emerging from anthropology. It has been used by sociologists who have studied cultures, social interactions and behaviors of small groups (Naidoo, 2012, 1).

> "ethnography usually involves the ethnographer participating, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions through informal and formal interviews, collecting documents and artefacts - in fact, gathering whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the emerging focus of inquiry" (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, 3, quoted in O'reilly, 2012, 2).

In the literature, the defining feature of ethnography is its emphasis on the fieldwork. As Thomas Hylland Eriksen states, although it is impossible due to their cultural background; anthropologists have to stay in the field to be capable of seeing the world from their participants' eyes (Eriksen, 2015, 36). Victor Jupp defines ethnography as "a cocktail of methodologies that share the assumption that personal engagement with the subject is the key to understand a particular culture or social setting" (Jupp, 2006, 101). Sarah Tracy also sees "long-term immersion into a culture" as key aspect of ethnography. She adds that some researcher tries to escape from criticism by reserving "the term *ethnography* for long-term, side-by-side, immersed, and holistic studies of a culture" and using the designation of "ethnographic methods" instead. Those researcher, by using ethnographic methods, are more likely not to take a holistic perspective of a culture but one or two concepts related to their studies (Tracy, 2013, 29).

I did not have to travel to a far-away country and study an undiscovered tribe or society; thanks to globalization, my participants came to my city and town. I did not use participant observation as the main data collection method or immerse myself into my participants' daily life as an ethnographer usually does. Yet, I have established close friendships with some of them, visited them in their workplaces and shared the same public spaces. I used any opportunity to gather information about their experiences from different sources including their Turkish coworkers and bosses, immigrant groups, and people in the city when the opportunities arise. I used the semi-structured interview method to collect my main data.

Today, the main challenge to the traditional definitions of some social sciences comes from globalization. The dichotomies such as rural vs urban and other conventional forms of boundaries are of no importance in a globalized world. It became impossible to draw clear cut distinction between us as modern and them as primitive due to the effect of globalization on spatial distances which has led to the disappearance of boundaries between countries and cultures. Therefore, as Eriksen explains, today's anthropologists can study any social system anthropologically ranging from witchcraft in Africa and the other side of one's own town, or adaptation of immigrants etc.

(Eriksen, 2015, 3). In this vein, I studied two strangers group who mostly work and live in my neighborhood and surrounding towns.

Dannison Nash is right in asking "How may the most general role which the anthropologist plays in the field be described?" (1963, 150). He describes ethnologists as stranger. While making their fieldwork, researchers take on some roles in the field. For example, as Eriksen says, they can assume the role of clown as they may speak strangely with an unnatural language, they may ask improper questions and go beyond cultural limits since they do not know how things are done in their participants' world (Eriksen, 2015, 32). The other role can be taken is the expert but this runs the risk of not seeing the aspects of the group which participants who are ashamed of showing to "high-ranking strangers" (Ibid., 33).

While I was doing interviews, I felt like a stranger in a Simmelian sense. Interestingly, although my participants do not know me very well, they open their inner feelings to me. They ask me if I can give them advices about life and culture in Istanbul, and others even ask how to socialize with girls. Therefore, I find Nash's saying, "the picture of the ideal field worker is very to Simmel's stranger (1950:405) in whom the qualities of nearness and remoteness give the character of objectivity" very convincing. He also adds that such objectivity requires extraordinary personal qualities (1963, 158), which I hope I lived up to them.

2.3. Semi-Structured Interview

There are three types of interview methods: structured, unstructured and semi-structured. Each provides advantages according to researchers' goal and projects. Structured interview method is preferred if a researcher has a list of certain questions and solid ideas about the case he wants to uncover (Berg, 2007, 69). This type of interviews is designed to "elicit information using a set of predetermined questions that are expected to elicit the subjects' thoughts, opinions, and attitudes about study-related issues" (Ibid., 69). This kind of interview are advisable when one seeks to obtain and compare data from a wide range sample. But the downside of this approach is its lack of flexibility and depth. Also, it assumes that participants will respond to questions truthfully in the first time when asked (Tracy, 2013, 139). As Fontana & Frey say,

structured interview "often elicits rational responses, but it overlooks or inadequately assesses the emotional dimension" (Fontana & Frey, 2005, 703, quoted in ibid.).

Unlike the above interview method, the unstructured interview method provides an atmosphere in which respondents speak freely around a topic. Thus, this method produces plenty of data (Jupp, 2006, 157). In this vein, this becomes a most time-consuming method if compared to the other two. On the positive side, the rationale behind this approach is to stimulate rather than dictating the interview. This approach makes the interview to be more creative and adoptive to the changing circumstances arising during the process and it leaves the control of the discussion to the respondents (Douglas, 1985 in Tracy, 2013, 139).

When it comes to the semi-structured interview method, by its definition it plays a mediated role between two approaches above. It is not strictly defined as the structured one and not as loose as the unstructured one. Simply, one has some general ideas and relevant subtopics in mind that direct participants and prevent them from straying into the irrelevant areas. It is a flexible approach for a small-scale research (Drever, 1995 in Pathak, A., & Intratat, 2012, 4). In the semi-structured interview, it is expected that specific questions arise during interview. This gives more freedom to researchers/interviewers. It enables them to discover things along the interview process (Pathak, A., & Intratat, 2012, 4). If the interviewee finds a topic difficult to speak or gives a brief response, the interviewer can give some background information or clues related the topic in order to encourage him/her to see the matter further (Mathers, Fox, Hunn, 1998, 2).

Generally, in the qualitative interviews, knowledge is created through the interactions between a researcher and a participant who get together to have a conversation on a topic that both are interested (Alinia, 2004, 127). Although my participants accept to make interviews, I cannot say that this was based on equal interest of both sides. Clearly, I was the person who needed their experiences. I would like to learn my participants' personal experiences and their understanding of their social realities.

The main goal of my study is to find out what kind of strangeness my participants are experiencing. Do they face different treatment by the host society? What kind of interactions they have with the host society or do they have? I investigated certain themes such as their emigration stories and future plans, employment problems, social life,

interactions with the host society and the city, transnational aspect of their movements and transactions etc. By referring to each side of the involved parties and their opinions about each other, I find an opportunity to see the same issue from each side.

Since their experience is crucial for the present study, a few words should be said on experiences: according to Philemona Essed, there are four types of experiences:

> "(a)Personal experiences (experiences that one personally has had, or can have witnessed, or has heard about); (b) vicarious experiences (things that happen to others in the same situation/group that one has witnessed or heard about); (c) mediated experiences (something that one learns of through mass media); (d) cognitive experiences (the person's knowledge and perception of reality)" (Essed, 1991, 58 quoted in Alinia,2004, 131).

In this study, the empirical data comes from the participants' experiences. As Minoo Alinia indicates, we have access only to the participants' representations of realities (2004, 130). Their realities and knowledge are context-bounded and located because they are also, like everyone, situated in "categories of gender, class, nationality, sexuality, age, etc." (Ibid., 130). Related to this point, Karin Widerberg makes a distinction between the lived and articulated experiences. She points to the discursive dimension in articulated experiences (Widerberg, 1996, 130 in Alinia, 2004, 131-132). Alinia continues her analysis:

> "This discursive dimension refers to the way in which people interpret, describe, and present their lived experiences. They do it via different discourses and from their positions in categories of class, gender, nationality, age, etc. Hence, articulated experience must be analysed also in relation to the social and political discourses through which people construct their perceptions of reality" (Alinia, 2004, 132).

As indicated by Eriksen, urban fieldwork requires more formal methods. According to him, in urban settings where people are engaged in various activities in hectic life of cities and where their time and attentions are drawn by TV, social media etc.; time is a scarce resource. Under these conditions, urban fieldwork is likely to depend on more formal methods such as the semi-structured interview (Eriksen, 2015, 33). For the present thesis, I decided to use the semi-structured interview method with the aim of grabbing my participant's lived experiences.

In the next section, I will give a brief background of myself. As Paul Saukko says, the only way to understand others is to reflect on similarities and differences between self and others through critical self-reflexivity. She also suggests that lived realities should be investigated against "the wider social context and its structures of inequalities" (Saukko, 2003, 56).

2.4. Self-reflexivity and Validation Criteria

Researchers play a crucial role in qualitative studies. Like participants, they are also part of a society, their understanding of the world represents their way of life and thus this may affect the way they interprets things. In this respect, self-reflexivity refers to the notion that researchers' experiences and personalities together with the roles they play in their societies have great impact on their research project. As Sarah Tracy says; some people call this social "baggage", but others call it wisdom (Tracy, 2013, 2). She said that rather than denying these realities, qualitative research acknowledges and celebrates it. As she states, the demographic information can provide us the basic components of the researcher's personality or how he/she sees the world. For the same reason, I would like to give information about my background.

When I was at the fifth grade, we moved from a mostly Kurdish populated city (Şanlıurfa, located on the south of Turkey) to a metropolitan city Istanbul. After moving to Istanbul, I rediscover myself in the new environment. Now, with hindsight, I realize that when I came, I also brought my culture with myself. I saw the fragility of social realities by exposing to another one. I began to ask such questions: "who I am and who they are?", "what and who makes me Kurdish and them Turkish?", "who draws the border between us?" and most importantly "Who reifies all of this?"

I agree with Sarah Tracy who claims that "scholarly quality" is not discovered but constructed. She writes: "No matter how real, natural, or objective they may seem, criteria are social products created by human beings in the course of evolving a set of practices to which they (and we) subsequently agree to conform" (Guba and Lincoln, 2005, 269 quoted in Tracy, 2013, 228). We should keep this in mind regarding the quality of any study. In order to discuss the qualitative quality, one needs to understand the yardstick for quantitative quality. Objectivity, reliability and formal generalizability are the yardsticks for non-qualitative research (Ibid., 228). The notion of objective knowledge has been the basis for the positivist paradigm. In this perspective, knowledge is regarded to be "a mirror image of reality". It is something "out there" to be discovered. As for reliability, it means that reliable studies can be repeated in merely the same way irrespective of researchers. Lastly, formal generalizability refers to the notion that findings of a study can be transferred from that study to another and accordingly can help us to predict future events (Ibid., 228).

As Victor Jupp explains, since the 1960s, this approach has been criticized by those who use the interpretivist methods in social sciences on the grounds of ignoring individual subjectivity and "the role of conciseness in shaping the social world" (Jupp, 2006, 230). The concept of objective knowledge has been questioned by most qualitative researchers: "Knowledge is always mediated by preexisting ideas and values, whether this is acknowledged by the researchers or not" (Seale, 1999, 470 quoted in Tracy, 2013, 229). It is not a mirror image of reality, but it is "a social construction of it" (Alinia, 2004, 138). As Mino Aliana continues:

> "Thus the focus has come to lie on the dialogue about the relation between the methods, the results of the study, and the kind of object studied. Hence, Kvale notes that a shift has occurred from verification to falsification. Searching for absolute knowledge is replaced by the notion of defensible knowledge. Validity has then become a question of making reasonable and convincing interpretations" (Alinia, 2004, 138).

I believe that "studies need to be understood and evaluated on their own terms" (Deetz, 2001, 38 quoted in Tracy, 2013, 231). Throughout each stages of this study, I will seek to become faithful and sincere to both my readers and participants and thus I use a self-reflexive and transparent attitude. I also practice thick description in order to notice and share contextual meanings on the things that have cultural significance for the group in question. I tried to catch tacit knowledge which is the "largely unarticulated, contextual understanding that is often manifested in nods, silences, humor, and naughty nuances" (Altheide & Johnson, 1994, 492 quoted in Ibid., 236). I used multivocality as a way of practicing triangulation. I tried to include multiple voices regarding the same issue. In that way, the readers of this thesis can see the same point from different perspectives and I believe this will enhance the credibility of the study.

2.5. Selection of Participants, Interview Process and Limitations

I live in Bayrampaşa where undocumented people can find job in the informal labor market, especially in the textile workshops. In the past, my family also ran a textile workshops and thus my brothers have a network of the employers in the sector. This gave me a free access to my participants since the bosses allow me to make my research in their workshops and encourage them to collaborate with me. I visited those workshops thanks to my brothers' connections. In the first place, I explained the textile workers what my study is about. Then, when they accepted to contribute, I invited them for an interview.

The number of the participants is not determined in advance. I stop to make new interviews when I see a new participant cannot provide new information. I made interviews with 5 Pakistani men, 8 Syrian men, 22 Turkish people (8 of them are women). I included 2 Bangladeshi men, one Bosnian and Uzbek woman to see whether I can catch some commonalities across ethnicity and gender. Except the Turkish ones, all of them have been living in Istanbul at least one year and at maximum 6 years. My youngest participant is 20 years old and the eldest one is 40 years old. For my Turkish participants, age range is between 24 and 52.

My Pakistani participants do not have a good education. Two of them went to high school, the rest just went to primary school. Syrians also have no higher education. Only some went to high school. It is obvious that their education was interrupted by the ongoing war in Syria. Not all my participants work in the textile workshops. Two Syrians work in a company that sells baby strollers. Two of my Pakistani and Syrian participants are married, but while Syrians live with their wives, Pakistanis live in Istanbul like bachelors. They have to leave their wives and children behind.

I used snowball sampling. When I met a participant and convince him to contribute to my study, he acted as conduit for finding another one. Each interview took about 30-45 minutes. I tried to destruct the traditional relationship between participants and researchers. We usually met outside at a silent café, sometimes we ate together. It is like casual friends who hang out together. In other words, we developed a trust-based relationship so that I told them my stories and they told theirs. On some occasions, I went to their houses where I interviewed them. Sometimes I interviewed at their workplaces.

In order to get them talk freely, I informed them that I would never reveal their identities. I thus randomly used a capital letter for each person. At first, I would like to take voice records because I wanted to focus on their body languages and the tone of their voices. But soon, I realized that they felt uncomfortable with the voice recording. Having such an experience, I decided to take quick notes in order not to scare them. As they felt more comfortable without recorder, I received more fruitful results.

With my Pakistani participants, I communicated in English. Although their English are not at a very good level, they could explain themselves. In case of Syrians, although

they are not fluent and used not many words, almost all of them learned to speak Turkish except one. I used one of my Pakistani and Syrian participants as a translator in two occasions. During the translations, some nuances disappeared, especially for the Syrians since their responses first produced in Turkish (which they are not fully capable of speaking) and then translated into English.

All my participants (except the Turkish ones and the Bosnian and the Uzbek women) are males. For Pakistani ones, this is because Pakistani women are not supposed to work, let alone going abroad for it; rather, the traditional role for Pakistani women is to take after their children and parents or work in education. Therefore, I cannot find any Pakistani woman. I could not reach any Syrian woman either. Indeed, I faced difficulties with even my male Syrian participants because they are afraid of being spotted and sending back to Syria. For example, once, in a busy square, I saw the Syrians sitting on a bench. I went nearby to ask whether they can contribute to my study. They felt uneasy and said that they did not have time; but in my opinion, they are scared. Also, there were no Syrian women at workplaces that I visited for this study.

For my Turkish participants, I did my best to have a more diverse sample in terms of education, age, social class, occupation and gender. I interviewed 7 bosses, one journalist, two teachers and one academic, one PhD candidate, three master students, one NGO' coordinator, one engineer, and one banker. The rest are workers. I also made an interview with a skilled Bosnian woman who falls into a different category of strangeness in Istanbul.

3. GEORG SIMMEL AND HIS SOCIOLOGY

> "I know that I shall die without intellectual heirs: and that is as it should be. My legacy will be like cash distributed to many heirs, each transforming his part into use according to his nature- a use which will no longer reveal its indebtedness to this heritage"(Simmel, 1971, xiii, quoted in Axelrod, 1977, 195)

Despite his prediction, Georg Simmel's intellectual legacy is not forgotten. As De Simone says, we are experiencing a "Simmel Renaissance" after the long oblivion (D'Andrea, 2009, 227).

In this chapter, I will analyze Georg Simmel and his sociology. First, I will introduce Simmel and give some information about his background. Then, I will give an overview of his sociology. After that, I will go into the concept of the stranger and highlight some of its important aspects. After briefly giving the spinoffs of the concept, I will try to find out why strangers most of the time have been considered as a threat throughout history. Finally, the relationship between stranger and city will be discussed.

3.1. Georg Simmel

Georg Simmel was born at the heart of Berlin in 1858 and spent almost his whole life there until he went to Strasburg in 1914 for a regular academic position. He died 4 years later in 1918. He came from a Jewish family who was already converted into Christianity. As Everett M. Rogers says, Simmel was exposed to anti-Semitism and maybe this has been one of the reasons for his lack of academic recognition. (Rogers, 1999, 59). As indicated above; despite his scholarly creativity and production, well-attended lecture halls and international reputation; Georg Simmel, called as "brightest man in Europe" by George Santanaya, could not receive a regular position in the academia until 1914 (Goodstein, 2012, 240).

Although Simmel was known among the founders of sociology, he studied philosophy. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Berlin, which became a model for the American research university (Rogers, 1999, 59). In 1885, he became a Privatdozent, a position unpaid and untenured, in which a Privatdozent gains his salary from the students attending his lectures. (Ibid., 59). Simmel had to spend most of his career as a

Privatdozent due to prevalent anti-Semitism in Germany until he finally obtained a regular academic position at a university in Strasbourg at 1914 (Ritzer, 2011, 161). Despite this, he did his job very well as a Privatdozent owing to his excellence as a lecturer. His lectures were well-attended (Ibid., 160).

He has a great influence on the American Sociology. When Simmel was active at Berlin University, many American graduates wanted to establish social sciences in America and looked German universities for inspiration, particularly Berlin University. Albion W. Small, who established the first department of sociology in the USA at Chicago University in 1892, was among the first American sociologists who developed a relationship with Simmel. People like Frederick A. Bushee, Charles A. Ellwood (who called as the "founder of scientific psychological sociology"), Edward C. Hayes, Robert E. Park, Nicholas J. Spykman, and Howard J. Woolston attended Simmel's lectures (Levine, Carter & Gorman, 1976, 815-816). Albert Solomon, once Simmel's student, describes Simmel's lecture as follow:

> "I attended in 1910 classes at the University of Berlin for the first time. I remember vividly the lecture course Simmel gave. In the widest classroom which stretched from the Southside of the university… he lectured at the godless time from 2-3 pm in order to deter the hundreds of people who crowded his classes. He was disgusted with the fact that he was fashionable; but even at such an hour, there were hundreds of listeners in the largest classroom of Berlin University" (Solomon, 1995, 362).

Turner states that Simmel's sociology echoes cosmopolitan life of pre-war Berlin and his sociological articles were considered as "snapshots sub specie aeternitatis" (Turner, 1999, 147).

3.2. The Sociology of Simmel

For David Frisby, Simmel is the first sociologist of modernity according to Baudelaire's understanding of modernity (Frisby, 2013, 39). Baudelaire identifies the elements of modernity as fleeting, transitory and contingent. He writes: "If modernity as a distinctive mode of experiencing (social) reality involves seeing society and the social relations within it as (temporally) transitory and (spatially) fleeting then this implies, conversely, that traditional, permanent structures are now absent from human experiences" (Ibid., 45). For Frisby, Simmel was better than his contemporaries in terms of capturing and analyzing "the modes of experiencing the 'new' and 'modern life-world" (Frisby, 2013, 39).

As Antonio Banfi comments: “It seems to me, then, that in Simmel’s philosophy and pedagogy of life there is a clear conscience of the contemporary spirit’s crisis that causes many structural values to crumble; and yet it raises itself, or strives to raise, to a positive significance” (Banfi, 1961, 211 quoted in D’Andrea, 2009, 228). Robert A. Nispet et al. says “of all the pioneers, Simmel is the most relevant at the present time"(Levine, Carter & Gorman, 1976, 821).

As Elizabeth Goodstein clearly expresses, although he is recognized as a founding father of sociology, he has an unusual status among them. He is remembered as “un-systematic thinker”. As opposed the other founding fathers such as Durkheim, Weber or Marx, he was not remembered for his “fundamental concepts and theoretical frame-works” but still his works continues “stimulate the sociological imagination” (Good-stein, 2012, 238).

His level of analysis is also different than the other founding fathers. Whereas Marx and Weber were interested in “large-scale issues like the rationalization of society and a capitalist economy,” Simmel was identified with his small-scale issues such as indi-vidual interaction. (Ritzer, 2011, 31). According to Theodore Caplow, Simmel is re-garded best as a microsociologist who contributed to the development of small group research (Caplow, 1968 in Ritzer, 2011, 159). As Robert Nisbet puts it:

> “It is the microsociological character of Simmel’s work that may always give him an edge in timeliness over the other pioneers. He did not disdain the small and the intimate elements of human association, nor did he ever lose sight of the primacy of human beings, of concrete indi-viduals, in his analysis of institutions” (Nisbet, 1959, 480 quoted in ibid, 159).

In order for one to understand Simmel’s concept of stranger, he/she should also be familiar with his social theory.

One should know that there was not a modern sociology during Simmel’s life, it was under the process of taking form. As Goodstein says, speaking institutionally, espe-cially for Germany, sociology did not distinguish from philosophy (Goodstein, 2012, 242). Simmel was mainly a philosopher and most of his publications cope with philo-sophical problems (Ritzer, 2011, 158). Indeed, Simmel regarded himself as such when wrote to Celestin Bougle: “I am a philosopher, see my life’s vocation in philosophy, and only pursue sociology as a sideline” (Simmel, 1899 quoted in Goodstein, 240). Goodstein claims that his philosophical nature in his theoretical contribution tends to be “written out of the story” (Ibid., 242).

Georg Simmel concurred with the principle of emergence; the idea that large scale issues emerge out of small scale ones. "Further development replaces the immediacy of interacting forces with the creation of higher supra-individual formations, which appear as independent representatives of these forces and absorb and mediate the relations between individuals" (Simmel, 1907/1978, 174 quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 159). Simmel himself adds that "If society is to be an autonomous object of an independent science, then it can only be so through the fact that, out of the sum of the individual elements that constitute it, a new entity emerges; otherwise all problems of social science would only be those of individual psychology" (Simmel, 1923, 42 quoted in Frisby, 1992, 9). Therefore, Georg Simmel believes that one of the main tasks of sociology is to understand interaction among people (Ritzer, 2011, 31) since he thinks that more complex social structures arise out of simpler interactions among individuals (Frisby, 2002, 49). As Frisby articulates:

> "If one of the features of modernity is that social reality is felt to be in a state of ceaseless flux, then the concepts that can best express this fluid reality must be relational concepts. Interaction (Wechselwirkung) and sociation (Vergesellschaftung) are key concepts for Simmel and what interests him is relationships between phenomena" (Frisby, 2002, 54).

According to Bryan Turner, there can be found three themes at the core of Georg Simmel's social theory, namely "relationalism, sociation and social forms" (Turner, 1999, 148). As for relationalism, for Ritzer and Gindoff, Simmel was a "methodological relationist" (Ritzer and Gindoff, 1992 quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 162) who believes that "everything interacts in some way with everything else" (Simmel, quoted in Frisby, 2002, 36). As Turner states, For Simmel, one cannot understand any item of society in isolation, it can only be grasped by its interrelatedness with totality (Turner, 1999, 148). Simmel's unique contribution is the idea that "objects and phenomena reveal their full significance only when questioned in respect to their social dimension, a dimension which possesses an order of its own" (Tenbruck, 1959, quoted in Goodstein, 2012, 242). Therefore, anything can be studied sociologically since everything is related to everything. By the same token, without context, everything is meaningless. For example,

> "Thus, money as a social institution cannot be understood separated from the total social framework within which it is embedded. Money provides us with an insight into the total workings of a society and the structure of a society provides the context within which we can grasp the importance and nature of money as a social phenomenon. The implication of this argument, which is actually borne out by Simmel's very diverse empirical interests, is that any item of culture can be the starting point for sociological research into the nature of the totality. Fashion, the rules of chess or the use of knives at table would be as appropriate as money for understanding this totality" (Turner, 1999, 149).

There is a dialectic character in Simmel's sociology. As we know, a dialectic approach denies the idea that "there are hard-and-fast dividing lines between social phenomena" and therefore focus on social relations with a perspective including not only present but also past and future (Ritzer, 2011, 162). Therefore, he is deeply interested in contradiction and conflicts. As Donald Levine articulates that for Simmel "the world can best be understood in terms of conflicts and contrasts between opposed categories" (Levine, 1971, xxxv quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 162).

We can see the dialectical thinking in his essays on social forms and types. For example, his work on fashion can show us this mode of thinking. As Ritzer explains; for Simmel, for one thing fashion is a form of relation which enables people who want to comply with the demands of the group. For another thing fashion gives the norm from which people can deviate and be individualistic. We can notice the historical aspect involved in fashion; at the beginning people accept what is fashionable, eventually some people deviate and then this deviation set the new trend. Dialectically, what makes something fashionable, the distinctive feature of fashion leads to its eventual demise because when more and more people come to accept it, it loses its distinctive character, and accordingly its attractiveness (Ibid., 162).

Socialization is one of the main features of the Simmel's sociology. Simmel does not comprehend the society as a substance but an interaction. For him, "Society in the broadest sense is indeed to be found wherever several individuals enter into interaction" (Simmel, 1894, 272 quoted in Frisby, 2002, 39). Bryan Turner is right in saying that Simmel wants to escape both "methodological individualism" which asserts that only individuals exist and "sociological holism" in which large-scale entities such as society or church are treated as something autonomous personalities (Turner, 1999,149). As Simmel articulates:

> "If society is merely a…constellation of individuals who are the actual realities, then the latter and their behaviour also constitutes the real object of science and the concept of society evaporates… What palpably exists is indeed only individual human beings and their circumstances and activities: therefore, the task can only be to understand them, whereas the essence of society, that emerges purely through an ideal synthesis and is never to be grasped, should not form the object of reflection that is directed towards the investigation of reality" (Simmel quoted in Frisby, 2002, 36).

For Simmel, we cannot understand neither society nor individuals without beginning with social interactions and noticing that social structures emerge out of "the process

of sociation" (Turner, 1999, 149). Social reality is too complex. In this regard, as Simmel says, we cannot take a single item out of relentless interactions as the decisive one. However, we may say that it is interaction which unites people under some objective forms (Frisby, 2002, 36). Simmel puts it as follows:

> "That people look at one another and are jealous of one another; that they exchange letters or have dinner together; that apart from all tangible interests they strike one another as pleasant or unpleasant; that gratitude for altruistic acts makes for inseparable union; that one asks another to point out a certain street; that people dress and adorn themselves for each other—these are a few casually chosen illustrations from the whole range of relations that play between one person and another. They may be momentary or permanent, conscious or unconscious, ephemeral or of grave consequence, but they incessantly tie men together" (Simmel, 1908/1959, 327–328 quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 166).

There comes the third theme; social forms. As Randal Colins & Michael Makowsky clearly express that more than anyone, Simmel is the one who refers to the notion that since only individuals exist, the scope of sociology must be limited to "an invisible world symbols and forms of interaction" (Collins, R., & Makowsky,1993, 166). For Simmel, the real life is full of interactions, ceaseless events, actions, and so forth. Thus, in order to deal with "this maze of reality (the 'content')", people classify them by imposing patterns or forms on it (Ritzer, 2011, 166). For Simmel, "Sociology's task is therefore the investigation of the forms of being part of society, namely the forms of sociation [Vergesellschaftung]" (Frisby, 2002, 48).

Rather than the content of it, one of Simmel's key concerns is forms of social interaction (Ritzer, 2011, 166). Simmel's foremost concern is to find forms and types. Therefore, "there are no specific persons in Simmel's snapshots. Rather, there are fleeting images of human types, of types of sociability and interaction that are viewed sub specie aeternitatis" (Frisby, 2013, 71). Randal Colins & Michael Makowsky describe his sociology as "a collection of insights, - a theory of society, as it were, as if seen by a passerby, catching a few features as they struck the eye but never penetrating to the heart of the edifice" (Colins & Makowsky, 1993, 166).

Since Simmel believes that "the interaction between individuals is the starting point of all social formations", he, accordingly, claims that large and complex social structures such as society, state or church arise out of simple interactions between individual (Frisby, 2002, 49). Here, we should refer to Simmel's comment on the role of exchange in human interaction:

> "The exchange of the products of labour, or of any other possessions, is obviously one of the purest and most primitive forms of human socialization; not in the sense that 'society' already existed and then brought about acts of exchange but, on the contrary, that exchange is one of the

> functions that creates an inner bond between men – a society, in place of a mere collection of individuals. Society is not an absolute entity which must first exist so that all the individual relations of its members ... can develop within its framework or be represented by it; it is only the synthesis or the general term of the totality of these interactions" (Simmel, 1978, 175 quoted in Turner, 1999, 149).

According to Theodore Abel, Simmel's interest in sociology emerged out of his earlier studies on the problem of ethics. Abel indicates that over the course of his studies, he confronts with "the problem of the cause for the growth of individuation in historical times" (Abel, 1959, 475). For Simmel, the process of individuation stems from the breakup of primary groups. As Abel says, Simmel ascribes this to the formation of larger groups which emerge out of simple ones. This makes for individuals to have multiple group memberships which is required sociological state for individuation (Ibid., 475)

One should also look at Simmel's ideas on culture. Randal Collins & Michael Makowsky states, the formal background of Simmel's sociology can be considered in the German tradition of philosophy (Kant, Hegel, Dilthey, Wundt), which explains how people see the world through " a veil of their own perceptual forms" and how these forms are transmitted throughout the human history (Colins & Makowsky, 1993, 167). For Randal & Makowsky, in accordance with that, Simmel reasons that society is "an invisible world" that operates on its own law. That law can be found in the flow of culture which shapes each new generation in line with the past generation, and in forms and patterns of interactions between people which have effect on what may they do personally (Ibid., 167).

Axelrod says there is a dialectical character in Simmel writings. His studies are almost all related to the dialectical tension between individual and group (Axelrod, 1977, 193). In this vein, as Ritzer explains, for Simmel, people are affected and threatened by society and its cultural products. Simmel makes a distinction between objective culture and individual cultures; the former refers to all things created by human beings, the latter refers to the capacity of the individual to produce, absorb and control the items of objective culture. The problem is, over the course of time, objective culture come to acquire a life of its own (Ritzer, 2011, 163). Ultimately, objective culture starts to dominate its creators. As Simmel puts it:

> "The deep estrangement or animosity which exists between organic and creative processes of the soul and its contents and products: the vibrating, restless life of the creative soul; which develops toward the infinite contrasts with its fixed and ideally unchanging product and its uncanny feedback effect, which arrests and indeed rigidifies this liveliness. Frequently it appears

> as if creative movement of the soul was dying from its own product" (Simmel, 1921/1968,42 quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 163).

As Ritzer points out, one can see that Simmel endeavours to develop a "geometry" of social relations. Numbers and distance are of great importance in these sense (Ritzer, 2011, 167). As for numbers, Randal Colins & Michael Makowsky point out his analyses of the effect of group size since a too large group will have a different structure than smaller one (1993, 169). In this regard, for Simmel, there is a significant difference between two-person group(dyad) and three-person group(triad). The addition of third person into the group leads to crucial transformation. The first addition to dyad is much more important than other additions because the reality of dyad is its perishability; if one decide to leave, it will dissolve immediately (Ibid., 169).

Two-person groups cannot develop a meaning above the two persons in question. Accordingly, we cannot talk about an independent group structure in dyads. Thus, the people in dyad can hold a relatively high level of individuality since they each share the same power in the formation and dissolution of the group (Ritzer, 2011, 167). But when it comes to triad, it has an independence of its adherents because it will still survive if one member leaves. As a result, individuals become less significant for the group (Colins & Makowsky, 1993, 169). As Simmel puts it:

> "There is the basic immortality of the group, as against the mortality of the individual. There is the possibility of the group eliminating even its most important elements without collapsing an elimination which, applied to the individual, would annihilate him. But the problem was of a more subtle, perhaps psychological, nature. No matter whether one considers the group that exists irrespective of its individual members a fiction or a reality, in order to understand certain facts one must treat it as if it actually did have its own life, and laws, and other characteristics. And if one is to justify the sociological standpoint, it is precisely the differences between these characteristics and those of the individual existence that one must clarify" (Simmel, 1950, 26).

After the addition of third person, we see significant configuration. Several new social roles become available. For example, two of the members can unite against the third, or the third can pit them against each other for his/her interest (Colins & Makowsky, 1993, 169). Since triad can develop an independent structure of its members, it possesses a great threat to its members due to its effect on them. Therefore, as seen, numbers are important for Simmel.

Simmel believes there is quantitative determination in these phenomena. For him, based on daily experiences, groups that reach a certain size, must develop forms and organs which are required to maintain their lives (Simmel, 1950, 87). Simmel explains:

> "Yet there is one constellation of very great sociological importance which is absent in all dyads, while, in principle at least, it characterizes all larger groups: the delegation of duties and responsibilities to the impersonal group structure. In fact, this delegation frequently, though unfavorably, characterizes social life in general" (Simmel, 1950, 133).

We can give an example here, when two individuals marry, they form a dyad but when the first child come into it, now it becomes an institution "family" and there are some roles to play as "father", "mother" and "son" or "daughter." "The child or children, as the third element, often has the function of holding the whole together" (Simmel, 1950, 146). Before the child, it is easy for two people to leave each other because the group has not an independent entity; if one lives the group, it will be dissolved. On the other hand, after child, the group comes its own life under the form of "family" and thus it is difficult to leave. We all hear from our friends and relatives who want to get divorced but for the sake of their children, they sustain their marriage.

When triad continues to grow, eventually it leads to the emergence of a society. In the meantime, individuals become less significant and grow more and more isolated. As Ritzer puts it; this leads to a dialectical relationship between individuals and society. "According to Simmel, the socialized individual always remains in a dual relation toward society: he is incorporated within it and yet stands against it. . . . The individual is determined, yet determining; acted upon, yet self-actuating" (Coser, 1965, 11 quoted in Ritzer, 2011,168). Dialectically it is the society that makes individuality and autonomy possible, but it also hampers it (Coser, 1965, 11 quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 168).

The increase in the group size enhances individual freedom because smaller groups are likely to dominate individuals totally. In larger groups or societies, individuals can join various groups and each group can control only a small section of their personalities. Nevertheless, for Simmel, larger societies also pose threat to individual freedom. Ritzer explains this with the following statement: "The physical proximity of a mass makes people suggestible and more likely to follow simplistic ideas, to engage in mindless, emotional actions" (Ritzer, 2013, 168). As Simmel explains:

> "…large masses can always be animated and guided only by simple ideas: what is common to many must be accessible even to the lowest and most primitive among them. Even nobler and more differentiated personalities in relatively large numbers never meet on complex and highly developed ideas and impulses but only on those that are relatively simple and generally human. Yet the realities in which the ideas of the mass are designed to function are always very complex and made up of a large number of divergent elements. Simple ideas, therefore, must always have the effect of being very one-sided, ruthless, and radical" (Simmel, 1950, 93).

Simmel was worried about that people create things (society, state or money) and then become slave of these things. Money is the epitome of this process. K. Peter Etzkorn

puts it well: “In Simmel’s dialectic, man is always in danger of being slain by those objects of his own creation which have lost their organic human coefficient” (Etzkorn, 1968, 2 quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 163). We see human beings created money as a means and then over time it become an end itself. For example, Simmel stated it: “Once a purpose has engendered the idea of means, the means may produce the conception of a purpose” (Simmel, 1900 quoted in Müller, 2002, 58).

Distance is another important component of Simmel’s social geometry. Simmel believes that the value of something is arranged by its distance from people. If things are too close and easy to obtain or too far and impossible to get, they have no value for people. Thus, “Objects that are attainable, but only with great effort, are the most valuable” (Ritzer, 2011, 169).

We can also see the importance of distance in the stranger: “If he (or she) were too close, he would no longer be a stranger, but if he were too far, he would cease to have any contact with the group (Ritzer, 2011, 169). The distance (the space) between things is of importance in Simmel’s sociology as Elizabeth Goodstein puts: “as a sociological form, the stranger embodies one of the basic and quite general lessons of Simmel’s Soziologie: [that the relation to space is on the one hand the condition, on the other hand the symbol of relations to human beings]” (Goodstein, 2012, 247).

According to Everett M. Rogers (1999, 60), the subjects which Simmel chose to study were connected to his life experiences. As said above, he was born in a Jewish family. He experienced anti-Semitism. Since he knew the Jewish society well, Simmel took the Jewish trader as archetype for the stranger in his essay:

> “Throughout the history of economics, the stranger everywhere appears as the trader, or the trader as stranger. As long as economy is essentially self-sufficient, or products are exchanged within a spatially narrow group, it needs no middleman: a trader is only required for products that originate outside the group… Trade can always absorb more people than primary production; it is, therefore, the sphere indicated for the stranger, who intrudes as a supernumerary, so to speak, into a group in which the economic positions are actually occupied the classical example is the history of European Jews” (Simmel, 1950, 403).

3.2.1. Simmel as the Stranger

Randal Colins & Michael Makowsky calls Simmel as the stranger "like the subject of one of his most famous essay, Simmel was the stranger who sees thing that other humans, wrapped in their familiar routines, cannot see, a man privy secrets given to him because he has no one to tell them to" (Colins & Makowsky,1993, 167). Simmel can be considered as the stranger in the scientific communities of his milieu due to his fragmentary style. As we know, Simmel believes that studying fragments of society gives us a better understanding of society rather than studying of society's major structures (Frisby, 2013, 55). In this regard, fragments of society are key to the totality of social reality (Ibid., 57).

Siegfried Kracauer argues that Simmel came closest to grasping the totality in his book *Philosophy of Money* because in that book Simmel's idea of "everything exists in relationship with everything else" is confirmed by his idea of money as the symbol of exchange in society (Simmel, 1978 quoted in Frisby, 2013, 61). For Simmel, the prehistory of modernity lies in the development of the money economy. "He saw the latter, rather than capitalism, as responsible for the transformation of social relations and for the origins of major features of metropolitan life" (Frisby, 2013, 87).

Simmel's interest in the fleeting, transitory and fragmentary elements of life indicates features of an unorthodox sociological project (Frisby, 2013, 41). Georg Simmel's studies were received by the scientific communities of his time with a degree of ambivalence. His writing style does not fit into the academic criteria for his contemporaries. For example; according to Durkheim, the father of sociology, Simmel's works show no clear system of direction. They are fragmentary and there is no "connection" between them (Axelrod, 1977, 185).

Pitirim Sorokin says that his studies " results in a series of logical inconsistencies, and in a vagueness of theoretical constructions" (Sorokin, 1965, 148 quoted in ibid., 185) Charles D. Axelrod states that even his admirers who are affected by Simmel's studies cannot overlook Simmel fragmentary style and see it as a "flaw of Simmelian thought." For example, Weber considers his writing as "simply brilliant" and adds "nearly every one of his works abounds in important new theoretical ideas and most subtle theoretical observations" but still calls Simmel's methodology as "unacceptable" and "strange" (Simmel, 1971, xlv1, quoted in ibid., 185).

When Theodora Abel evaluates Simmel's scientific stature, he says that the conclusion which Simmel lack the scientific attributions is a misapprehension and it overlooks several things (Abel, 1959, 476). Abel says, Simmel had to conduct his studies under great handicaps. First of all, as I indicated above, he did not receive an academic recognition and assistance until shortly before his death. He had to make a living by his lectures and writing for magazines. For Lewis Coser, this accounts for his literary styles (Abel, 1959, 477).

Fabio D'Andrea provides interesting arguments and asks that a normal thinker should behave differently from Simmel; normally one "should conform to expectations to be more easily accepted, thus getting a chair, a stable job and economic resources apt to let him live a secluded life. Simmel, instead, keeps on misbehaving in spite of several clear warnings and pays the relative price, both human and professional" (D'Andrea, 2009, 230). D'Andrea claims that Simmel's fragmentary works are not due to his lack of ability. He did on purpose (Ibid., 230).

We all know Durkheim as the father of sociology since he established it as a scientific discipline. Durkheim believes that scientific thinking must be different to everyday thinking. As he explains in the Preface to *The Rules of Sociological Method*:

> "(I)f there is to be a social science, we shall expect it not merely to paraphrase the traditional prejudices of the common man but to give us a new and different view of them.... The reader must bear in mind that the ways of thinking to which he is most inclined are adverse, rather than favorable, to the scientific study of social phenomena: and he must consequently be on his guard against his first impressions" (Durkheim, 1938, xxxvii-xxxviii quoted in Axelrod, 1977, 186).

Axelrod says that according to Durkheim and Coser, scientific thinking is more reliable because it is based on thorough processing. For Durkheim ordinary thinking stems from "first impressions" but science is considered as standard of excellence. For them, fragmentation is equated with laziness (Axelrod, 1977, 187). For example, Lewis A. Coser says that: "Simmel, the marginal man, the stranger, presented his academic peers not with a methodical, painstakingly elaborate system but with a series of often disorderly insights, testifying to amazing powers of perception" (Coser, 1977, 2014 quoted in Goodstein, 2012, 245).

Durkheim's main concern was to establish sociology as a discipline of sciences and for that purpose there have to be some rules. As he says, only "methodologically disciplined" approach can realize sociology as a collective intellectual activity (Durkheim, 1960, 356 quoted in Axelrod, 1977, 187).

As Axelrod says: “For Durkheim, all sociologists must work within a single, disciplined framework. He suggests that without such a framework, their speech would be indistinguishable from ordinary, everyday speech” (Ibid., 187). In this respect, form is of crucial importance. According to this attitude, scholars must define their project in accordance with their scientific sector. Durkheim established a sociology which is independent of “individual fancies” with the aim of creating objective knowledge (Ibid., 187). People had to welcome this model and practice it but the expectation was no longer to question this model. As Axelrod explains, Simmel as both an outsider and stranger to this “methodically disciplined” outline, opens other possibilities (Ibid., 187).

For Simmel, a person must go through some alterations to become a member of group because members of any groups unify “on the basis of what is communally intelligible”. As a natural result, “what is not communally intelligible” must be denied (Ibid., 189). As Simmel explains:

> “The reason is that large masses can always be animated and guided only by simple ideas: what is common to many must be accessible even to the lowest and most primitive among them. Even nobler and more differentiated personalities in relatively large numbers never meet on complex and highly developed ideas and impulses but only on those that are relatively simple and generally human” (Simmel, 1950, 93).

For Simmel, what is accessible for many is intellectually inferior. By the same token, complex and sophisticated qualities can be held only by few people and sometimes even by just one individual. Naturally, these qualities do not emerge out of communities and are against expectations of them. When people participate in a group, they must withhold other elements of their personalities that are not communally intelligible. “While the decision to join this community may enable a member to perfect and articulate a certain fragment of his personality, it also restricts his ability to express the remainder of his personality” (Axelrod, 1977, 189). This is also the case for the scientific communities. As a conclusion, Simmel’s attitude can be considered as unorthodoxy in the sociology of knowledge.

3.3. The Stranger

> "Sociologists would be fortunate indeed if more of their concepts were as productive as the 'stranger' " (McLemore, 1970, 93).

Many scholars have claimed that the common interpretation of the concept of the stranger takes the concept out of the context and ignores Simmel’s social theory and

thoughts (Škorić et al., 2013, Goodstein 2012, Marotta 2012). Here, I will refer to Simmel's 7-page essay which has so far inspired many scholars and produced a huge scholarly literature. After giving the essence of the essay, I will provide the discussions on the concept in the next section.

According to the cultural geographers Timothy S. Oakes and Patricia L. Price, geographers always concern themselves with mobility, but it was Simmel who examines it "in the context of social structure." For them, Simmel's concern was the role of the stranger who plays in the sociocultural system. He used it as a tool to reveal "social insecurities of modernity" (Oakes & Price, 2008, 311).

Simmel, in his essay, talks about a mediating figure, a trader who is spatially a member of a group but does not share the sociocultural world of the group (Simmel, 1908, 1-3). The stranger represents both the liberation from a point and fixation to this point (Ibid., 1). For Simmel, this phenomenon shows "that spatial relations are only the condition, on the one hand, and the symbol, on the other, of human relations" (Ibid., 1). Simmel specifies the stranger as opposed to the wanderer who comes today and goes tomorrow. The stranger is a person "who comes today and stay tomorrow. He is, so to speak, the potential wanderer: although he has not moved on, he has not quite overcome the freedom of coming and going" (Ibid., 1). What makes the stranger interesting is that

> "He is fixed within a particular spatial group, or within a group whose boundaries are similar to spatial boundaries. But his position in this group is determined, essentially, by the fact that he has not belonged to it from the beginning, that he imports qualities into it, which do not and cannot stem from the group itself" (Ibid., 1).

We can also see the dialectical character and use of distance in Simmel's definition. Simmel believes that "the unity of nearness and remoteness" can be found in every social relations. In this respect; for the stranger, distance means "that he, who is close by, is far, and strangeness means that he, who also is far, is actually near." To be a stranger is positive for Simmel; "it is a specific form of interaction". Here "interaction" refers to the fact that the stranger is an item of the group as he says: "The inhabitants of Sirius are not really strangers to us, at least not in any social logically relevant sense: they do not exist for us at all; they are beyond far and near." As we mentioned earlier, for Simmel, the stranger appears as the trader who naturally enter into a group where the all economic positions are taken by the members of the group. He is required for the product which are not available in the group. Naturally, the stranger owns no soil,

here, “soil not only in the physical, but also in the figurative sense of a life-substance which is fixed, if not in a point in space, at least in an ideal point of the social environment” (Ibid., 1).

Simmel adds that the stranger can develop a good relationship with people as long as he is considered as stranger by people but still he is not “an owner of soil.” Here, it is important to notice that the good relationship between the stranger and the members of the group sustains as long as people consider them strangers. Simmel says; although the stranger come into contact with the individuals of the group severally, he is not related to anyone on the basis of kinship, locality and occupation. This gives the stranger a particular objectivity:

> “He is not radically committed to the unique ingredients and peculiar tendencies of the group, and therefore approaches them with the specific attitude of "objectivity." But objectivity does not simply involve passivity and detachment; it is a particular structure composed of distance and nearness, indifference and involvement” (Ibid., 1-2).

For Simmel, it is this objectivity which makes people open their inner feelings to the stranger which they mostly withhold from their beloved ones. This objectivity also means freedom; a freedom from any kind of communal commitments which normally colors the group members’ understanding of any given issues. He writes: “He is not tied down in his action by habit, piety, and precedent.” (Ibid., 2). As Simmel explains, the nearness and remoteness of the stranger involves a more abstract kind of relation between the group and the stranger; since they are all human beings, they share some common and universal qualities. On the other hand, more organically related people share more specific qualities in common beyond the general ones. There is a dialectical character in this relation; since general commonness between people can act as an unifying factor, it cannot make people interdependent on each other due to the fact that the same commonness can easily relate everybody to everybody other than the group members. As Simmel explains:

> “This too, evidently, is a way in which a relationship includes both nearness and distance at the same time: to the extent to which the common features are general, they add, to the warmth of the relation founded on them, an element of coolness, a feeling of the contingency of precisely this relation -- the connecting forces have lost their specific and centripetal character” (Ibid., 2).

Accordingly, Simmel says, the stranger is close to us as long as we feel there is some common qualities we share such as “national, social, occupational, or generally human, nature.” (Ibid., 2). In the same way, the stranger is far from us because these common qualities relate us just because they attach us to everybody. At the end of his

essay, Simmel also touches a different kind of strangeness in which the most general feature of involved parties is rejected. As he puts it:

> "The relation of the Greeks to the Barbarians is perhaps typical here, as are all cases in which it is precisely general attributes, felt to be specifically and purely human, that are disallowed to the other. But "stranger," here, has no positive meaning; the relation to him is a non-relation; he is not what is relevant here, a member of the group itself" (Ibid., 3).

Simmel brilliantly draws attention to a particular issue stemming from the above discussion. He says that for the person who is the stranger to a country, or city etc. non-common qualities of the stranger is not individual but "the strangeness of origin" which are shared by many strangers. Hence, by the group members, strangers are not considered as individualistic but "strangers of a particular type"(Ibid., 3). The following passage explains this:

> "This form is the basis of such a special case, for instance, as the tax levied in Frankfort and elsewhere upon medieval Jews. Whereas the Beede [tax] paid by the Christian citizen changed with the changes of his fortune, it was fixed once for all for every single Jew. This fixity rested on the fact that the Jew had his social position as a Jew, not as the individual bearer of certain objective contents. Every other citizen was the owner of a particular amount of property, and his tax followed its fluctuations. But the Jew as a taxpayer was, in the first place, a Jew, and thus his tax situation had an invariable element. This same position appears most strongly, of course, once even these individual characterizations (limited though they were by rigid invariance) are omitted, and all strangers pay an altogether equal headtax" (Ibid., 3).

3.4. Post-Simmel Literature on "The Stranger"

Simmel's concept of stranger has inspired many scholars and it has led to a few spinoffs. Robert E. Park's "the marginal man" is one of them. In his prominent article "Human Migration and The Marginal Man" by referring to Simmel's definition of the stranger, Parks develops his own concept, as equivalent to Simmel's stranger. He exemplifies this as the following quotation shows: "the emancipated Jew was, and is, historically and typically the marginal man . . . he is, par excellence, the 'stranger,' whom Simmel, himself a Jew, has described with such profound insight and understanding" (Levine et al., 1976, 830). Robert Park's marginal man is a person who lives in two different societies due to immigration and he is the stranger in both society (Rogers, 1999, 64) . Therefore, Robert Park calls the marginal man as "a cultural hybrid, a man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples" (Fuhse, 2012, 641). Alvin Boskoff makes a remark as follows:

> "Park borrowed the concept of the stranger [from Simmel] and applied it to the phenomena of migration and culture contact in complex society. Briefly, Park suggested that various kinds of deviant behavior (crime, delinquency, illegitimacy) reflected the experience of persons who, by migrating, had given up old values but had not adequately acquired the norms and skills of their new setting" (Boskoff, 1969, 282-83 qouted in Levine et al., 1976, 830).

It should be noted that although Park is influenced by Simmel's stranger and considers his marginal man as equivalent to the stranger, he is criticized. Donald Levine explains; as opposed to Simmel's stranger, the marginal man aspires to be accepted. Therefore, his definition is different from Simmel's stranger (Levine et al.,1976, 830).

Paul C.P. Sui develops another type "the sojourner" after his study on Chinese laundrymen in Chicago. His study is designed originally as a study of "marginality" but he explains "none of the Chinese laundrymen I studied could be considered a marginal man" (Ibid., 831). As Donald Levine et al. say, Sui does not aim to repudiate Simmel's stranger, he offers a new type who "in contrast to the bicultural complex of the marginal man, clings to the culture of his own ethnic group" (Ibid., 831)

Alfred Schutz also writes a paper on stranger which is considered as a classical treatment on the concept alongside with Simmel (Osseward, 2007, 368; Fuhse, 2012, 640). Schutz's stranger is in contrast to Simmel's because it is not esteemed by the approached group. Indeed, his stranger wants to be accepted into the group or at least to be tolerated. As Schutz puts it, the stranger is "an adult individual of our times and civilization who tries to be permanently accepted or at least tolerated by the group which he approaches. The outstanding example for the social situation under scrutiny is that of the immigrant" (Schutz, 1944, 499).

Eric Pauloas and Elizabeth Goodman, in their studies, work on a concept "the familiar stranger" that first appeared in the physiologist Stanley Migrams' (1972) essay. They describe familiar strangers as individuals whom we observe repeatedly without any interaction. Indeed, this non-interaction is an interaction in which both parties ignores each other "without any implications of hostility" (Pauloas & Goodman, 2004, 223).

S. Dale McLemore (1970), in his article "Simmel's 'Stranger': A Critique of the Concept", questions the analytical power of the concept. For him, Simmel's stranger enjoys a special status from the beginning with an immunity to criticism as though its meaning are obvious (86-87). He claims that "the sociological analyses of the 'stranger,' the 'marginal man,' and the 'newcomer' have been confused with one another" (87). McLemore states that Simmel's stranger should be considered within the scope of the study of marginality rather than the tradition of the newcomer (92).

Vince Marotta (2012) classifies the literature on Simmel's stranger in two camps in his article "Georg Simmel, the Stranger and the Sociology of Knowledge". As shown

above, the first camp contains the studies which try to refine the concept. The second camp prefers to question "the descriptive value of the Simmel's stranger" (Marotta, 2012, 676). For those scholars, Simmel's stranger is no longer reflect the contemporary urban life, in today's world we are all strangers. For example, Lesley D. Harman says that "strangeness is no longer a temporary condition to be overcome, but a way of life" (Harman, 1988, 44 quoted in ibid., 667). Moreover, Zygmunt Bauman adds that "the question is no longer how to get rid of the strangers and the strange once and for all, or declare human variety but a momentary inconvenience, but how to live with alterity – daily and permanently" (Bauman, 1997, 30 quoted in Osseward, 2007, 370).

As said earlier, these interpretations of the Simmelian stranger overlooks Simmel's thoughts. His essay has been read mostly out of context. According to Marko Škorić, Simmel's main concern in the essay is not culture but space and this is mostly misunderstood by scholars who used the concepts. As he puts it:

> "the essence of the excursus is the emphasis of a unique form of social difference (where the person is identified on the basis of their origin) and a unique form of social relation (where distance and proximity are in a state of constant, reciprocal tension). This is indicative of Simmel's wish to emphasize the significance of spatial relationships for the occurrence and continuation of social distinctions" (Marko Škorić et al., 2013, 595).

There is another misuse of the concept. It has been ignored that the stranger is a "specific form of interaction." Therefore, approaching the stranger as if he is a specific person is wrong. Furthermore, as I touched before, we should take the dialectical thinking in Simmel's sociology into account. Vince Marotta is right in saying that the criticism to Simmel's stranger ignores the fact that Simmel was against "binary thinking" (2012, 676). Simmel's stranger is a mediating figure who unifies both remoteness and nearness. As Anna Wessely puts it, Simmel "constantly searches for 'third' categories which might comprehend opposites and makes us comprehend how mutually exclusive forces and principles do not annihilate each other but create, in their interaction, new forms by finding, as it were, a third way out of a dilemma" (Wessely, 1990, 376 quoted in Marotta, 2012, 678).

Nedim Karakayalı (2006), in his article "The Uses of the Stranger: Circulation, Arbitration, Secrecy, and Dirt", pays attention to the role of stranger in the division of labor in societies. He, by referring to Margaret Woods's book *The Stranger*, notes that strangers as people who try to enter into a group may face three reactions; they might

be expelled directly, or accepted unconditionally and lastly they may be accepted conditionally which Nedim Karakayalı says, as Woods points, fits into the Simmel's description of the stranger.

Karakayalı employs a productive approach by asking a simple question "why there are strangers?" when it is easy to repel them. What makes people enter into, as Karakayalı cites Simmel, a "[h]alfway, unclear relations . . .which have their root in a twilight condition of feeling whose outcome might be hatred almost as easily as love, or whose undifferentiated character is even sometimes betrayed by oscillation between the two" (Simmel, 1971c, 80 quoted in Karakayalı, 2006, 313).

He touches upon Simmel's ideas on "forms" and "content" and notes that human beings by forms of interaction realize its interest. He, then, associates contents with problems and forms with solutions. Finally, he asks a meaningful question "for Simmel strangeness is also a form of interaction… What kind of problem(s) does such a form 'solve'?" (Karakayalı, 2006, 314). Karakayalı, to answer this question, refers to Simmel's essay in which we know that the stranger has a special task which cannot be done by the group members (or the members do not want). From the strangers' perspective, they become strangers for two reasons; they have to be or they are basically in search of a better life. Karakayalı by drawing on Simmel's essay, defines four particular domains in which strangers take active roles;

> "(1) circulation (of goods, money, and information); (2) arbitration and conflict resolution; (3) management or policing of secret/sacred domains; and (4) cleansing the group from its impurities or, more generally, "dirty jobs." The first three of these domains can be deduced from Simmel's work but the fourth one, which has become the most prevalent domain of activity for strangers in the 20th century, seems to have escaped his attention"(Ibid., 313).

Karakayalı, in his essay, reveals the limits of Simmel's concept, and tries to modify it so that it can mirror contemporary "stranger-relations." Karakayalı says that the paradigmatic example of the stranger in contemporary world is neither "the trader" nor "the judge" but it is the migrant who perform unskilled job that we can call "dirty job" (Ibid., 324). Karakayalı notes that Simmel is also partly aware of this great change as he says: " 'strangers' in the original sense no longer exist today . . . " but for Karakayalı the disappearance of the traditional stranger does not mean their unique role also vanishes (Ibid., 324). Karakayalı points out that Simmel in his "The Metropolis and The Mental life" argues that "the average urbanities of his time" shows the characteristics of strangers (Ibid., 324).

Karakayalı says that some scholars by referring the notion "we are all stranger" claims that the concept lost its defining character; but they cannot go as far as to leave the concept while still there is a tendency to use it as a sociological category (Ibid., 324). He also mentions another problem which explores whether the modern era leads to a new stranger or not. He refers to Harman (1988) and Bauman's (1991) work; Harman claims that as opposed to the traditional stranger, the modern stranger is in search of " 'community' in a world where formal, impersonal, and distanced relations between people have become the norm" (Ibid., 325). Karakayalı accepts those scholars' contribution, but says the paradigmatic example for today's world is the unskilled migrant. For Karakayalı, the lack of dirt themes in Simmel's concept is probably because of his unawareness of modern colonialism (Ibid., 325). As a conclusion, Karakayalı argues that today's strangers can be classified into two groups; the ones who are skilled and do the things that natives cannot, and the others who are unskilled and do the things natives are not willing to do (Ibid., 326).

Gabriella Lazaridis and Eugenia Wickens (1999), in their studies " 'Us' and the 'Others' Ethnic Minorities in Greece" which based on a fieldwork in two Greek cities Athens and Thessaloniki, focus on the employment experiences of two ethnic groups in Greek; one is Albanian migrants and the other is the western tourist workers. Their study gives us more ideas about the strangers. According to their study, although both groups can find employment in "low paid" jobs, the former group is treated well by the host country than the latter. The study argues that Albanian workers are not only exploited and discriminated but they are also used as scapegoat in the political arena. Accordingly, the paper shows that Albanians are stuck "in conditions of inferiority, immobility and ultra-exploitation" (Ibid., 634). There are differences between them. For example, while Albanians enter the country illegally, European workers come legally. Another difference is that both groups migrate for a better life; but while Albanians came due to "poverty, lack of peace, political persecution at home, unemployment", "tourist workers" come for "kalozoia (the good life): good food, a warmer climate, and other positive features of Greek culture and life" (Ibid., 633). As opposed to Albanians, the majority of European workers are sojourners, they have a clear intention to come back.

Lazaridis and Wickens' study draws on both "a dual labor market framework" and the concept of "the stranger" (Ibid., 634-6). In the dual labor market theory, there is a

distinction between the primary and secondary labor markets. The former includes the jobs with high salaries, good working environments, steadiness, fringe benefits, and career opportunities. The latter is composed of insecure, low-paid jobs with bad working conditions and on-the-jobs trainings, literally the exact opposite of the former. This division of labor stems from employers' strategies to reach the type of labor they need. For the authors, although this approach helps us to understand the disadvantages which experienced by their participants, it has several weak points since it ignores the voice of the sub-employed. For example, it also fails to take the racist ideology into account which leads to the intensification of marginalization and social exclusion of the Albanians.

The above study also uses Simmel's concept of stranger to analyze the underlying reasons for the varying treatments to two groups by the host society. They also rely on Levine, who is influenced by Simmel's work. He developed a continuum of strangers on the basis of two variables of the host communities; namely "compulsive friendliness" and "compulsive antagonism"(Levine, 1979 in ibid., 636). Levine's study indicates the relationship between the host's perception of strangers and their attitudes towards them. When strangers are seen being interested in their culture, the host communities are like to be more friendly and hospitable than those who are considered as intruders and inferiors.

According to the authors, Levine's "marginal man" who come to the decision of staying and finding a permanent job is not treated as good as the temporary workers who come to the country due to their attraction to the host country's way of life. As the authors put it, "while these ethnic minority groups are perceived by Greeks as xenoi (strangers), the words 'Albanian' and 'European' act as labels influencing and shaping differential attitudes of the host towards them. Ideas of Euromania and Albanophobia, provide a possible explanation for this differential treatment" (Ibid., 636). For example: "Moreover, the use of the word 'Albanian' adds another level of meaning to their disadvantaged position. For instance, the expression 'I am not your Albanian' (i.e., ``I am not your slave''), is often used by the Greeks to refuse a job which is seen as menial and underpaid" (Ibid., 651).

Catherine Harris et al. (2017), in their article "Attitudes Towards the 'Stranger': Negotiating Encounters with Difference in the UK and Poland", sheds a light on con-

struction of strangers in a world which described by international mobility and unprecedented scale of migration. For authors, in our globalized world, individuals are likely to encounter strangers and different life styles. Accordingly, they are required to "negotiate discontinuities and contradictions between the values that are transmitted through different sites" (Ibid., 17).

According to authors, although there is a lot of theoretical discussion on the concept, there is not much studies applied the concept of the stranger to specific groups. The study focuses on how we define who is stranger and how we accommodate our relationships with "others"; in other words, how we determine who is different from us and how we approach them. To give an answer to these questions, the study draws on the data collected in two countries; the UK and Poland. It suggests that "the construction of who is a stranger depends on national historical contexts, core values and related visions of the society" (Ibid.,16). The authors state:

> "The figure of stranger is not a pre-given and existing in absolute terms, but it is relational and constructed in everyday encounters. A person or a group is continuously constituted in everyday encounters in a continuum of positions between familiarity and strangeness (Simmel, 1908). Over the last two decades, we see that in the British context the primary regime of producing strangers works along the axis of race, whilst in Poland it works along the axis of sexuality" (Ibid., 18).

The above study claims that the discussions concerning the stranger have a tendency to focus on sociocultural "otherness", "nominally migration status." They, Heringa, Bolt and Djist (2013) develop a research which points out that the unknown-ness of a stranger may also be shown by physical characteristics (Ibid., 21). The study concludes that in both countries, the strangers are perceived negatively, and they are related to minorities groups seen visibly different or unknown. While in Poland this expressed via sexual prejudice (homophobia); in the UK, it is articulated through religious prejudice (Islamophobia).

The findings show that while the homophobia in Poland is produced in everyday by individual encounters with difference; Islamophobia in the UK is compounded by negative media reports related to the events occurred on the global or European level (Ibid., 23). These differing attitudes are due to their different historical contexts. The study shows that the perceptions of the Muslim, whether positive or negative, is not based on "face-to-face verbal" encounters or interactions, "rather they are socially constituted, discursively produced positions" (Ibid., 25). When it comes to the strangers

in Poland, they perceived as "the familiar strangers", or in other words "the strangers within." This is pointed out well at the below:

> "These Equality Marches… This is nonsense to me, because if he (sic) has a different [sexual] orientation, he should keep it for himself [and] not show off, as it annoys people, you know. If somebody is normally raised, if one has normal views – and this [guy] shows up dressed as a woman or even worse (sic) – you know – such exposure, such behaviour – it pisses people off. (…) You cannot show off like this. [If] Something's wrong [with you], you're welcome to do these things your way, but don't insist on adoption of children or things like that – so that a child grows up having two daddies or mommies [sarcasm], right? Well, pardon me. (…) This is really a bit wrong, you know – in my opinion (Male, 75–79)" (Ibid., 27).

The authors find that gay and lesbian people by revealing their sexual differences undermine the social contract twice; by showing something in public space which considered unacceptable by the majority, and second by causing people to see their difference and another social reality, and thus make them question their own reality (Ibid., 28). The authors show that "In both presented cases, people produce boundaries to navigate their lives through complex social reality; they depend on visible 'checkpoints', like skin colour or assumed visual sexual difference, to predict how 'strangers' will act" (Ibid., 30).

3.5. Stranger Danger; The Root of Fear

> "In addition to representing the 'great unknown' which all 'strangers in our midst' embody, these particular outsiders, the refugees, bring home distant noises of war and the stench of gutted homes and scorched villages that cannot but remind the settled how easily the cocoon of their safe and familiar (safe because familiar) routine may be pierced or crushed and how deceptive the security of their settlement must be. The refugee, as Bertolt Brecht pointed out in Die Landschaft des Exils, is 'ein Bote des Unglucks' ['a harbinger of ill-tidings']" (Bauman 2004a, 66-67 quoted in Hughes, 2007, 935).

Georg Simmel, in his essay, talks about "dangerous possibilities" which a stranger can face due to his freedom stemming from his objectivity. (Simmel, 1908, 2). I would like to focus on the question of why people are afraid of strangers. Edward A. Tiryakian (1973) says that although the literature on the stranger has revealed much about how the host society see the stranger, how strangers see the society is not a well-trodden road (Ibid., 46). Therefore, here, I would like to provide a balanced approach.

In order to understand this phenomenon, one needs to take a look at the nature of human beings. For Lofland (1973), human beings' linguistic capacity makes them free from the slavery of simple reactivity (which other animals shows). By enabling people to name objects or situations and attach meaning to them instead of only receiving stimulus, this linguistic capacity allows human beings to develop a consciousness of self from their biophysical environments (Ibid., 13). Like other animals, human beings

show fear and anxiety confronting potential physical danger or death; but as opposed to animals, they also show them “in the face of nonphysical injury or death” (Ibid., 13). This is related to their self. Only human beings feel “existential crises, hurt feelings, insult, embarrassment, dishonor, shame” (Ibid., 14).

To protect the self and maintain the self-esteem, knowing how to react to an object or situation is something important for human beings. Therefore, human beings “needs (1) the rules for "coding" or defining, (2) accompanying behavioral repertoires which are appropriate to the coded object or situation, and (3) enough information about the object or situation to be able to activate the coding rules” (Ibid., 14). Although all of these are provided by the culture of group, it is up to the individuals to obtain them.

As we know, for Simmel, to be a stranger is positive. The stranger carries with himself the knowledge of the outside, the unknown, he has special statues within the group; “His familiarity with the unfamiliar gives him a certain power and authority” (Tiryakian, 1973, 48). However, there are a lot of studies that show the opposite. For Tiryakian (1973), although the stranger has the freedom to traverse in the social structure, being a stranger also confines one to some limits. The stranger is an intruder who “intrudes on the familiar, on the taken-for-granted ground of everyday life” (Ibid., 47). The host perception of the stranger entails ambiguity; what is strange is exciting since it is not experienced; but, as Tiryakian says, the unexperienced is also threatening since we do not know it. The stranger makes us aware of another field of social reality out there which is both unfamiliar and strange. He leads to the polarity of “outsider” vs “insider” since he is a representative of the outside. As Tiryakian says “by his presence he is a challenger to insiders’ social organization, to their way of life, to their assumptions about social reality” (Ibid., 48).

> “The stranger as the bearer of the strange is also the person who can unhinge the familiar, the person who as a representative of the strange has powers not available to "locals"; he is a potential disorganizer of the familiar, one who can turn things or the order of things "inside out." Hence the stranger is not only highly welcome; he is also highly unwelcome” (Ibid., 49).

As Lofland (1973) explains; as opposed to the ones in the past who live an isolated life in their bands, tribe and small village, even for people who have great knowledge of the world, the stranger might be a lurking suspicion as we can see in the New Testament: “Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares" (Hebrews 13: 2 quoted in Ibid., 6). Lofland concludes that among many people, strangers were believed to have special powers and it does not matter whether

these powers are benevolent or malevolent, they call for special ceremonies. Even when they are not conceived with special powers, they attract a mixture of fear and joys; they can be an enemy in disguise, and thus have to be strictly observed; or they can break the monotony of people's restricted life by their strange culture and thus welcomed by a great hospitality. For example: "In South Carolina, the planters often posted Negro slaves along the road with instructions to invite travelers to stop for refreshment and lodging" (Miller, 1966, 104-5 quoted in Ibid., 7).

Albert Salomon says: "the situation of stranger is hell!" (Salomon, 1995, 372). He states that "the stranger who decides to settle in a social context experiences the grim fact that he does not belong to these people, that he does not share their traditions and recollections, their intentions and the horizon of meaning they take for granted" (Ibid., 372). Alfred Schutz (1944), in his article "The Stranger: An Essay in Social Psychology", casts a shed on what Salomon indicates. Schutz states that each group has its own cultural pattern which provides its member a scheme of reference that is unquestioned and mostly the members of the group are not aware of it.

The stranger who approaches a group does not share this patterns and assumptions which the group members know it unconsciously. This results in "a dislocation of the stranger's habitual system of relevance" (Ibid., 499). Schutz uses the term "cultural pattern of group life" which includes "all the peculiar valuations, institutions, and systems of orientation and guidance (such as the folkways, mores, laws, habits, customs, etiquette, fashions)" (Ibid., 499). As opposed to sociologists, normal people act and live within its group cultural pattern, use it "primarily as a field of his actual and possible acts and only secondarily as an object of his thinking" (Ibid., 500). People in their daily life do not question everything around them as far as things follow the normal course of actions. For example, it is enough for people when the transportation services function well, and they are no interested in how it happens. For Schutz (Ibid., 501), the knowledge people guide their actions in their lives is not consistent, and only partially clear but for the group members it is sufficiently clear, consistent and coherent which enable them to understand and to be understood. As Schutz puts it:

> "Any member born or reared within the group accepts the ready-made standardized scheme of the cultural pattern handed down to him by ancestors, teachers, and authorities as an unquestioned and unquestionable guide in all the situations which normally occur within the social world. The knowledge correlated to the cultural pattern carries its evidence in itself-or, rather, it is taken for granted in the absence of evidence to the contrary. It is a knowledge of trustworthy recipes for interpreting the social world and for handling things and men in order to obtain the

> best results in every situation with a minimum of effort by avoiding undesirable consequences…the function of the cultural pattern to eliminate troublesome inquiries by offering ready- made directions for use, to replace truth hard to attain by comfortable truisms, and to substitute the self-explanatory for the questionable" (Ibid., 501).

Schutz states that it is the stranger who does not share the above-mentioned assumptions. He is the man who questions everything which is unquestionable for the group members. He is not there when the cultural pattern of the group is formed. Therefore, the history of the group's cultural pattern, although it is accessible to him, cannot be an integral part of the stranger. He can share the present and the future with the group, but "he is a man without history" for the group members (Ibid., 502).

Soon after moving, the stranger will be aware of the fact that his own cultural pattern, his "thinking as usual" is not valid in his new environments. He will not see the cultural pattern of the group who approaches as consistent, clear, and coherent but as a puzzle. He will have to check his action step by step. As Schutz puts it: "He has, first of all, to use the term of W. I. Thomas, to define the situation" (Ibid., 506). As a result, "the cultural pattern of the approached group is to the stranger not a shelter but a field of adventure, not a matter of course but a questionable topic of investigation, not an instrument for dis- entangling problematic situations but a problematic situation itself and one hard to master" (Ibid., 506). Schutz concludes that this phenomenon results in two traits in the stranger's attitude to the group; his objectivity and "his doubtful loyalty" (Ibid., 506). He can see the things as they are because of his limits of "thinking as usual" and that makes him more objective. He is considered ungrateful due to its unwillingness or inabilities to adopt to the group's cultural pattern.

Schutz's articulation of the importance of cultural pattern of group life can give us a good understanding of why strangers are perceived as danger. Lofland (1973) asks why both in the past and now people pay attention to strangers and answer as follow:

> "For these peoples continued co-presence without personal knowing was impossible. In order to relate to strangers beyond the initial seconds of the encounter, the people living in small personal worlds had to transform them into the only kind of human objects they were familiar with-personally-known others. In order for coding to occur and the appropriate behavioral repertoires to be activated, biographical information had to be obtained, and to obtain it, attention had to be diverted from routine activities. Consider, for example, the Australian Aborigines. Behavioral repertoires were hinged to placement of the other in available kin categories. To know who the other was in any sense at all meant to know how the two of you were related. That is, complex categoric knowing, on which interaction depended, was itself dependent on personal knowing. One could not place the other without biographical information, without personal knowing" (Ibid., 21).

Robert Dartnon (1999) explains why classificatory scheme is important in human life:

> "A mis-shelved book may disappear forever. An enemy defined as less than human may be annihilated. All social action flows through boundaries determined by classification schemes, whether or not they are elaborated as explicitly as library catalogues, organization charts, and university departments. All animal life fits into the grid of an unconscious ontology. Monsters like the "elephant man" and the "wolf boy" horrify and fascinate us because they violate our conceptual boundaries, and certain creatures make our skin crawl because they slip in between categories: "slimy" reptiles that swim in the sea and creep on the land, "nasty" rodents that live in houses yet remain outside the bounds of domestication. We insult someone by calling him a rat rather than a squirrel. "Squirrel" can be a term of endearment, as in Helmer's epithet for Nora in A Doll's House. Yet squirrels are rodents, as dangerous and disease-ridden as rats. They seem less threatening because they belong unambiguously to the out-of-doors…Hair, fingernail parings, and feces also go into magic potions because they represent the ambiguous border areas of the body, where the organism spills over into the surrounding material world. All borders are dangerous. If left unguarded, they could break down, our categories could collapse, and our world dissolve in chaos" (Ibid., 193).

An urban anthropologist Hannerz explains that as long as strangers "seem to be in a normal state . . . one largely ignores them" (Hannerz, 1980, 216 quoted in Wells, 2005, 496). The author asks a legitimate question "But what can you take to be normal in a public space that is suffused with difference?" (Ibid., 496). She says that in urban sociology and anthropology, the question can be answered as the city is diverse at a general level; but in particular, and in certain places, its diversity is fragmented, and its space is categorized as if they belong to specific cultural groups (Ibid., 497). Accordingly, the presence of stranger is perceived as a threat to those categories. As Palmer explains: "We are fundamentally threatened by changing human relationships. We are comfortable in neighborhoods populated by people of similar social background, but when strangers move in we feel somehow not at home" (Palmer, 1994, 61 quoted in Bunkers, 2003, 305)

Therefore, setting up cognitive maps and maintaining the borders of it is an existential duty of those people who benefit from this set of categories.

When these cognitive maps crumble, it affects strangers too. For example, Deirdre A. Meintel (1973), in his study "Strangers, Homecomers and Ordinary Men" focuses on the phenomenon called "the reverse culture shock." The study suggests that the most significant shock for the stranger who come back to his home is self-discovery. The author claims that, as Schuetz has already realized, the effect of the reverse culture shock is more acute since the home for the stranger is no longer "home" but an "uncharted territory" (Ibid., 52). As a returned anthropologist says: "even the houses and buildings in the United States seemed to express instability, sterility and a kind of opposition to nature" (Ibid., 52). As a result of this process, the stranger rediscovers a "potential self" which is formerly unknown to him.

Tibor Dessewffy (1996) states that the stranger in any forms entails otherness which causes us to question ourselves and it upsets "our previously unproblematic existence" (Ibid., 600). Dessewffy says that to resolve this psychological tension, the approached community can have recourse to some traditional and horrifying measures that involves both the isolation or annihilation of the stranger. He states:

> "Apart from the field of gastronomy, where the foreign flavors of Thai, Chinese, French, or Ethiopian cuisines are irresistibly tempting, the general tendency is still to reject otherness. Whether we take up arms and set out for insane expeditions of "ethnic cleansing," or merely curse the primitive inhabitants of neighboring countries over our beer, the logic of rejection is at work" (Ibid., 601).

Dessewffy gives an example by referring Clifford Geertz's study; a particular case of sexual strangerhood: "hermaphrodites." Geertz shows this in three cultures: the American, the Navaho, and the Pokot (Geertz, 1983 in Ibid., 603). For the American , as the author explains, the first commonsense reaction is "horrified paralysis." Some questions arise; what to write on their birth certificate or whether they should do military service or not. Those reactions also entail an undisguised pressure especially from parents. Hermaphrodites are forced to fit into our "schemes of comprehension" and chose the role of male or female so that they can be at least "he" or "she" like us. In Novaho society, these people are still seen as abnormal but instead of horror or distrust, they evoke respect and even reverence since they are considered blessed to be both man and women. The Pokot tribe of Kenya, their attitude to them are neutral. Sometimes they are killed due to their uselessness but not because of hatred (Ibid., 603-4).

Dessewffy also states that the rational culture of Western Europe does not encourage "the tolerant acceptance of the stranger". He adds that the modern nation-state fails in this respect. He gives the French and German Völkish model; while the former is based equal rights for it citizens at the expense of otherness, the latter is based on blood which gives priority to only the German irrespective of boundaries (Ibid., 604). Marinus Ossewaarde (2007), in his article "Cosmopolitanism and the Society of Strangers" calls for a new ethos which can embrace all human beings irrespective of their localities, nationalities. In this respect, Ulrich Beck says that the clash between strangers and locals results in "the most barbarous exclusion of strangers: the Holocaust" (Beck, 2003, 35 in Ibid., 379). Therefore, as Ossewaarde puts it:

> "In Beck's opinion, cosmopolitanism has become a necessary cultural condition in an age where the possibility of technical extermination of humanity as a whole has come within reach. For the sake of global survival, and not for some ethical ideal, humanity must come to the fore in a global age, well ahead of locality" (Ossewaarde, 2007, 379).

3.6. The Stranger and City

"city air makes one free" (Rundell, 2014, 11)

In these section, I will analyze city as a sociological phenomenon. Simmel's ideas on space and city life will be given. I will try to answer the questions such as "how city life is possible?" and "how people live in the midst of strangers in cities?"

Cities have always been home for strangers. In our contemporary world, we can simply call each city as a world of strangers. Lynn H. Lofland (1973), in his seminal book *A World of Strangers: Order and Action in Urban Public Space,* focuses on the question "how city life is possible?" She states that "to live in a city is, among many other things, to live like to be surrounded by large numbers of persons who one does not know. To experience the city is, among many other things, to experience anonymity. To cope with the city is, among many other things, to cope with strangers" (Ibid., ix).

As Lofland explains; the city, as opposed to small towns and villages, and due to its size, has a center of particular social situation: people who happened to be in its boundaries at any given moment does not know personally about the majority of other people whom they share the same space (Ibid., 3). Lofland states that throughout history, people live their lives in not cities but in their isolated and small bands, tribes, villages or towns. They share a common and significant feature: "the absence of anonymity" (Ibid., 4). Back then, people, from the cradle to the grave, were surrounded by the same people whom they know and known by them. In this regard, the arrival of the stranger in these isolated worlds is a remarkable moment which merits a sociological investigation.

As Lofland continues, if the group were sufficiently isolated, they might consider themselves as the only human on the Earth and dismiss any stranger as non-human. "In no human society is the appearance of a humanlike non-human a routine event" (Ibid., 4). For example, for the Tiwi, who lived in two islands off the coast of Northern Australia, killing the stranger is the most satisfactory solution because they conceived their islands as the only inhabited lands and dimly seen Australia as the home of the dead where Tiwi souls went after death (Ibid., 4). For the above reasons, castaways or outsiders who somehow appear on the islands were killed since they did not consider them as real or enough human to share the islands.

For the less isolated people who have contact with neighboring people, strangers still can be anything but human. For example, the accounts of European voyagers states that they are perceived by natives "with fear, astonishment, apprehension, ceremonies of propitiation, protective rituals, fainting, and so forth-the exact emotion and behavior of the hosts depending on just what they conceived these strange white objects to be" (Ibid., 5). An interesting example is when some of those voyagers perceived as white monkeys:

> "The late Doctor Stutterheim, Government Archeologist in Java, used to tell the following story: Somewhat before the advent of the white man, there was a storm on the Javanese coast in the neighborhood of one of the capitals. After the storm the people went down to the beach and found, washed up by the waves and almost dead, a large white monkey of unknown species. The religious experts explained that this monkey had been a member of the court of Beroena, the God of the Sea, and that for some offense the monkey had been cast out by the god whose anger was expressed in the storm. The Rajah gave orders that the white monkey from the sea should be kept alive, chained to a certain stone. This was done. Doctor Stutterheim told me that he had seen the stone and that, roughly scratched on it in Latin, Dutch, and English were the name of a man and a statement of his shipwreck. Apparently this trilingual sailor never established verbal communication with his captors. He was surely unaware of the premises in their minds which labeled him as a white monkey and therefore not a potential recipient of verbal messages: it probably never occurred to him that they could doubt his humanity. He may have doubted theirs" (Ruesch and Bateson, 1951, 204-5 quoted in ibid., 6).

Lofland says that the appearance of the stranger in our globalized, urban, mobile and tourist-hunted world may receive a lesser version of above responses in comparison with the past. However, we cannot say that those reactions to the stranger are disappeared totally and thus it can be found in the midst of a city. Throughout history, "the stranger has been the exception, not the rule" (Ibid., 8). The appearance of cities changes this situation, and today people live in the midst of strangers.

The urban context is of central importance in Simmel's account of modernity. He is considered the first sociologist who points out to "the social significance of spatial contexts for human interaction" (Frisby, 2013, 71). Before referring to Simmel's seminal essay "The Metropolis and Mental Life," one should take a brief look to Simmel's contribution to the sociology of space. As Simmel puts it: "Social interaction among human beings is – apart from everything else it is – also experienced as a realization of space" (Simmel, 1908/2009c, 545 quoted in Škorić et al., 2013, 593). As Frisby says, thus, what Simmel wants to show that people by socialization, forms of interaction, fills the space which was previously empty and make it meaningful (Frisby, 1992, 75).

There are five aspects of space which Simmel mentioned (Ibid., 75). The first aspect is exclusivity. Marko Škorić et al. puts it: "This exclusivity implies that an object is

always unique if it is considered only from the viewpoint of its position on Earth's surface and if all its other dimensions are ignored" (Škorić et al., 2013, 590). In that way, as Frisby states, particular formations (the interactions between individuals or groups) are equated with particular spaces (specifically demarcated territories) such as states, or districts in cities (Frisby, 1992, 75).

The second aspect is divisibility; space can be divided by boundaries. People divide spaces for practical reasons and boundaries has significant importance for human relationships (Škorić et al., 2013, 591). Therefore, "the boundary is not a spatial fact with sociological consequences but a sociological fact that is formed spatially" (Simmel, 1903, 287–302 quoted in Frisby, 1992, 76).

The third aspect is fixedness; in Frisby' words, it means "localizing of social interaction in space" (Ibid., 76). Since object can be distinguished by their (im)mobility, certain kind of social relationship must be ordered with immobile material objects which can even obtain a symbolic meaning and accordingly a particular force as in the case of religion (Škorić et al., 2013, 591). By referring to Simmel's attention to the rendezvous whose significant "lies, on the one hand, in the tension between the punctuality and fleeting nature of the occurrence, and its spatiotemporal fixing on the other", Frisby says that this indicates that the human memory is more strongly attached to space than time (Simmel, 1903, 287–302 quoted in Frisby, 1992, 76). Frisby adds that individualization of place is an important urban development.

The fourth aspect of social space is distance and proximity. For Simmel, all social interactions can be mapped on a scale of distance and proximity since two objects cannot occupy the same spot (Škorić et al., 2013 , 591). We see this aspect of space in both "The Stranger" and "The Metropol and The Mental Life."

The last aspect is mobility; namely changing locations. A group can move their spatial elements as we see in nomadic societies. This aspect can be found in Simmel's stranger who unifies remoteness and nearness: "If wandering, considered as a state of detachment from every given point in space, is the conceptual opposite of attachment to any point, then the sociological form of "the stranger" presents the synthesis, as it were, of both these properties…another indication that spatial relations are not only determining conditions of relationships among people, but are also symbolic of those relationships" (Simmel, 1971, 143 quoted in Frisby, 1992, 77).

Škorić et al. states that Simmel understand that interactions must be located spatially but they cannot be caused by it. Space is a form without content, it has to be filled with "a kind of social or psychological energy". Therefore, "an empire does not comprise its geographical area, but people" (Škorić et al., 2013, 592).

David Frisby says that Simmel underlines four spatial formations which stem from the interactions between individuals:

> "These are, first, the structuring of space according to the principles of political and economic organization; second, local structure arising out of relationships of domination; third, fixed localities as the expression of social bonds (i.e. social units located in spatial forms such as the family, the club, the regiment and the trade union all have their 'house'); and, finally, empty space as the expression of neutrality, the 'no-man's land' of state borders and, more recently, of metropolitan areas" (Frisby, 1992, 77).

By referring to Elizabeth Kornea who indicates the general thesis in Simmel' analysis is "a progressive historical development towards forms of social organization increasingly detached from space" (Kornea, 1977, 48 quoted in ibid., 77), Frisby states that the establishment of money economy together with communication technology leads to the process of emancipation from space.

Within the Simmel' sociology of space, city is not defined by its territorial boundaries but sociological ones. The city is not only the place where social differentiations and complex social networks can be found but also it is the place where infinite number of collectivities can be found. The city brings different social strata, yet at the same time separate them in ghettos (Frisby, 2013, 77).

3.6.1. City Life and Blasé Attitude

Simmel's famous essay "The Metropol and The Mental life" is considered as "[t]he most important single article on the city from the sociological standpoint" (Wirth, 1925/1967, 219 quoted in Škorić et al., 2013, 591).

Simmel, in this article, tries to show how individuals develop a certain way to preserve their individuality in the face of overwhelming objective culture and various stimuli in the city. As he puts it: "The deepest problems of modern life derive from the claim of the individual to preserve the autonomy and individuality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social forces, of historical heritage, of external culture, and of the technique of life" (Simmel, 1950, 409).

The city life is described as continuous flow of social interactions. Donald N. Levine et al. states that by drawing on Simmel, Howard Woolston (1912) provides the effect

of Simmel ascribed to the metropolitan life such as "nervous hyperstimulation, accelerated mental activity, blase attitudes, measurement of space and time, monetization of values, impersonal social relations, and the proliferation of cultural facilities" but he ignores the fact that Simmel also points to the individuating aspects of the city (Levine et al., 1976b, 1113). Simmel says that the metropolitan man "develops an organ protecting him against the threatening currents and discrepancies of his external environment which would uproot him" (Simmel, 1950, 410).

As Frisby explains, facing with the potential of ceaseless interactions, individuals pursue some forms of self-protection which finds itself in city dweller's total indifference to not only their neighbors but to whom they encounter in every day (Frisby, 2013, 78). They approaches things with their head instead of the heart. Therefore, for Simmel, we see a predominance of intelligence in the metropolitan life. Simmel also states that the metropolis has been always the center of the money economy. He claims that the dominance of intellect and money economy are closely connected since both share "a matter-of-fact attitude" towards people and things (Simmel, 1950, 411).

> "Money is concerned only with what is common to all: it asks for the exchange value, it reduces all quality and individuality to the question: How much? All intimate emotional relations between persons are founded in their individuality, whereas in rational relations man is reckoned with like a number, like an element which is in itself indifferent. Only the objective measurable achievement is of interest" (Simmel, 1950, 411).

For Simmel, the city is also "the seat of the most advanced economic division of labour" (Frisby, 2013, 81). Therefore, the people who produce and the ones buy these products never see one another. Through this anonymity, the relationship between two parties acquired "a merciful matter-of-factness" and "the intellectually calculating economic egoisms of both parties need not fear any deflection because of the imponderables of personal relationships" (Simmel, 1950, 412). Simmel believes that modern minds become more calculating, and with money economy we see "a reduction of qualitative values to quantitative ones" (Ibid., 412). This leads to a new precision and certainty in life as Simmel explains:

> "The relationships and affairs of the typical metropolitan usually are so varied and complex that without the strictest punctuality in promises and services the whole structure would break down into an inextricable chaos. Above all, this necessity is brought about by the aggregation of so many people with such differentiated interests, who must integrate their relations and activities into a highly complex organism. If all clocks and watches in Berlin would suddenly go wrong in different ways, even if only by one hour, all economic life and communication of the city would be disrupted for a long time…Thus, the technique of metropolitan life is unimaginable without the most punctual integration of all activities and mutual relations into a stable and impersonal time schedule" (Ibid., 413).

Simmel states that all of these color the content of life and leads people to favor rationality, punctuality, and exactness at the expense of "irrational, instinctive, sovereign traits and impulses" (Ibid., 413). As a result of this, the metropolitan man develops what Simmel calls "the blasé attitude" which caused by the constant changing and contrasting stimuli in city life. Ceaseless pursuit of pleasure makes people blasé because it activates the nerves to their highest level of reactivity for a long time, and consequently they stop reacting at all. In the same respect, by "the rapidity and contradictoriness of their changes, more harmless impressions force such violent responses, tearing the nerves so brutally hither and thither that their last reserves of strength are spent" (Ibid., 414). For Simmel:

> "Partly this psychological fact, partly the right to distrust which men have in the face of the touch-and-go elements of metropolitan life, necessitates our reserve. As a result of this reserve we frequently do not even know by sight those who have been our neighbors for years. And it is this reserve which in the eyes of the small-town people makes us appear to be cold and heartless…the inner aspect of this outer reserve is not only indifference but, more often than we are aware, it is a slight aversion, a mutual strangeness and repulsion, which will break into hatred and fight at the moment of a closer contact, however caused" (Ibid., 415-416).

The essence of blasé attitude includes a discriminatory attitude to all things; but that does not mean objects are not perceived, they are seen in the same gray color to the blasé person. For a blasé person, "no one object deserves preference over any other" (Ibid., 416). Money has a special role in this phenomenon:

> "By being the equivalent to all the manifold things in one and the same way, money becomes the most frightful leveler. For money expresses all qualitative differences of things in terms of "how much?" Money, with all its colorlessness and indifference, becomes the common denominator of all values; irreparably it hollows out the core of things, their individuality, their specific value, and their incomparability. All things float with equal specific gravity in the constantly moving stream of money. All things lie on the same level and differ from one another only in the size of the area which they cover" (Ibid., 414).

From the beginning, Simmel points out to the claim of the individual to protect its individuality in the face of objective culture which stands overs the individual as a levelling force. Simmel also points to the opposite consequence which appears dialectically. People try to heighten their individuality and subjective culture as a compensation for this levelling process. As a result of this attempt, Simmel finds the "exaggerated subjectivism of the period" (Frisby, 2013, 80). The general indifference which provide a self-protection to individual also "in the end unavoidably drags one's own personality down into a feeling of the same worthlessness" (Simmel, 1950, 415). Frisby states that individuals' struggles for self-assertion when face the indifference; this leads them to develop a sense of distinctiveness from other people. This also may

lead to extreme forms that "ultimately entice one to adopt the most tendentious eccentricities, the specifically metropolitan excesses of aloofness, caprice and fastidiousness, whose significance no longer lies in the content of such behavior but rather in its form of being different, of making oneself stand out and thus attracting attention" (Frisby, 2013, 81).

Although we refer to the negative effects of the metropolitan life, we should note that the metropolitan life also provides individuals an unprecedented freedom. City by attracting great numbers of people become home for countless strangers, the increase in number affects the relationship between people as Simmel points out: "increase in number thus involves a changed character of the social relationship" (Simmel, 1938, 11 quoted in Levine et al., 1976b, 1113). For Simmel, there is a tendency in life regarding social formations; a small group needs a closely coherent structure against antagonistic social formations in order to survive at the expense of individuals' freedom. Political parties, religious associations and kinship groups arise in that way. The above groups, at first stage, require "the establishment of strict boundaries and centripetal unity" (Simmel, 1950, 417). Thus, they cannot allow its members the individual freedom. When a group grows in terms of the number of its members, its space, and its content of life; its internal coherence and unity loosens and the boundaries against the other people are also softened due to reciprocal relations and connections. As Simmel states, individuals gain freedom of movement and individuality which is necessitated by the division of labor in large groups (Ibid., 417).

> "The small-town life in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages set barriers against movement and relations of the individual toward the outside, and it set up barriers against individual independence and differentiation within the individual self. These barriers were such that under them modern man could not have breathed. Even today a metropolitan man who is placed in a small town feels a restriction similar, at least, in kind" (Ibid., 417).

When a human settlement is small, it is easy to know personally everybody. As Simmel points out when the group size increases, we see some radical transformation in the group structure. Lofland (1973) refers to the same phenomenon, when the size of the group increases to a degree in which it is impossible to know personally everybody. This leads city to be associated with anonymity. Julie Meyer (1951), in his study "The Stranger and The City", by referring the anonymity, also says that the city is perceived both by outsiders and insiders as "a coagulometer of strangers" in which people do know each other and have no identity; but some of them are in search of identity to emerge from this anonymity (Ibid., 477).

Lofland basically gives three reasons for this anonymity; first of all, it is due to human biophysical limitation which refers to the human capacity for recognizing people's name or face. Second of all, it is due to the division of labor and occupational differentiation by which some people involved in particular activities and thus a restrictive life which lessens the chance of encountering another people. The last one is the time limitation which refers to the fact that in large settlement there is a constant flow of people into the settlement and at the same time a large number of people just pass through it. Both these people, immigrants and visitors have no opportunity to establish close relationship with the city dwellers (1973, 10). As a result, as Meyer puts it, the walls between and in houses does not only divide neighbor's homes but also "the mental communications between the people who are inhabitants and not neighbors" in city life (Meyer, 1951, 477).

According to Meyer, the strangers in the city form actions in two directions; to remain anonym or to escape from anonymity. It is this anonymity which gives the city dwellers freedom, and an opportunity for the criminals who want to be invisible. Some want to overcome anonymity in the city by associations which has a significance meaning for its members. "This association is motivated by rational considerations and is organized on the basis of rules that bind the members" (Ibid., 478). As Meyer puts it:

> "In the city, among the conglomerate of strangers, acceptance in an association very often means for the individual that he emerges from the anonymous conglomerate, that he is part of something, identified and identifiable by it. This social relationship by association can ac- quire this meaning for him because all the others with whom he joins are in the same situation. In such a case, association around a common interest tends to shift orientation from the objective interest to the subjective social relationship, to become the pivot for all actions of its members" (Ibid., 479).

3.6.2. Dealing with Strangers in City

As Lofland says, by the appearance of cities, for the first time, strangers are no longer the exception but the rule. That's why the old ways to handle strangers are untenable. As Lofland puts it: "It's plausible to believe that the first stranger one sees is a god; it strains one's credibility to think that 100,000 gods have congregated in one place" (1973, 12). In Bauman's words: "the question is no longer how to get rid of the strangers and the strange once and for all, or declare human variety but a momentary inconvenience, but how to live with alterity – daily and permanently" (Bauman, 1997,30 quoted in Osseward, 2007, 370). Therefore, Lofland tries to show us how we handle strangers in modern cities. Lofland provides two concepts: categoric knowing

and personal knowing (1973, 15-16). By first one, she means the knowledge of people based on their statues, roles etc. You know one is a policeman, student, whore, male or female by this knowing which is "the primary mode of apprehension" (Ibid., 16). It is simple, since it is mostly based on visually-obtained information. As Simmel states in the metropolis:

> "The person who is able to see but unable to hear is much more . . . troubled than the person who is able to hear but unable to see. Here is something . . . characteristic of the big city. The interpersonal relationships of people in big cities are characterised by a markedly greater emphasis on the use of the eyes than on that of the ears. This can be attributed chiefly to the institution of public conveyances. Before buses, railroads and trams became fully established during the nineteenth century, people were never put in the position of having to stare at one another for minutes or even hours on end without exchanging a word" (Benjamin, 1973, 151, quoted in Frisby, 2013, 78).

Personal knowing is to know one including not only his roles and status but also their biographies. It is recognizing people by their face, or names and it does not have to be actual acquaintance as in the case of celebrities. In her book, Lofland uses the concept of stranger as anyone who is unknown personally to the actor of reference (1973, 18). She says that strangers are the people who are available us visually and therefore we have only categoric knowledge about them. In the same way, the city life is only possible by an ordering in which one can know a great deal about someone just by a simple looking to appearance and location of people. By this way, chaotic word of strangers are ordered into a stable and predictable one by categoric knowing (Ibid., 22).

For Lofland, appearential ordering allow you to place someone according to their appearance, clothing, hair style, and other markings. On the other hand, spatial ordering allows one to obtain a great deal information about a stranger because "you know a great deal about "who" is to be found in the particular location in which you find him" (Ibid., 27). Lofland concludes that we see the dominance of appearential ordering in preindustrial cities, but today due to certain changes, in our modern cities, we code people according to spatial ordering.

For example, in preindustrial cities, costumes, body marking, and language can be sign for categoric knowing. For example, in Elizabeth period in England, "commoners were prohibited by law from wearing clothing fashioned from gold or silver cloth, velvet, furs and other 'luxury' materials" (Sjoberg, 1960,127, quoted in ibid., 46). As for the body markings, it refers to moral difference. For example, in colonial America, a certain symbol burn onto the culprit's forehead which tells people a lot about him. Language is another important indication although it is not visual: "Speech ... is a highly

sensitive status indicator .... Upper- and lowerclass persons employ quite divergent linguistic patterns, as do sub-groups within classes: ruralites vs. urbanites, men vs. women, old people vs. young people, and occupational groups, too" (Sjoberg 1960, 128 quoted in Ibid., 48).

The industrial and urban revolution together with technological advancements lead to the demise of the dominance of appearential orderings. For example, people can buy clothes in fashion of elites thanks to the industrial revolution. For Lofland, the industrial elites and bourgeois merchants follow in the steps of the noble in preindustrial societies to differentiate themselves from the lay people.

> "I am suggesting, then, that this not-so-rich middle class group, growing in numbers and power during the period under consideration, were crucial to the emergence of the spatial order. 14 I am suggesting that many of the instruments which created and which now maintain that order-the police, zoning, "humanitarian" organizations-were and continue to be the instruments of this group. I am suggesting that there is nothing coincidental about the fact that the first modern police force was created in England in 1829,15 that in England and the United States, "humanitarian" concerns and zoning regulations were nineteenth and early twentieth century phenomena, and that this is the same period during which the middle class was struggling to differentiate and protect itself from the "dangerous classes" (Ibid., 65).

As Lofland points, we see "specialized public space use" in modern city. For example, a park for walking, a bar for drinking and socializing, a university for education. We see both the spatial segregation of activities and persons in the city. We can see this in residential segregation by class, ethnicity etc. in today's city such as China town in New York. Lofland says that the appearential ordering can still give us clues that it is not reliable. She explains:

> "A sales clerk is someone who is to be found behind the counter, never mind that he is indistinguishable from his customers. A university professor is someone who stands facing the students in a university classroom. And the fact that he may look like his students, like a Wall Street lawyer, or like a skid row bum should not be allowed to obscure this simple truth" (Ibid., 83).

As a conclusion; Lofland says, in modern times, places have identities which give one enough information about the person who stands there at any given moment. City-dwellers must acquire the knowledge where to go, how to dress and how to act which provided by the culture. Here, the stranger as an representative of another culture may face some problems due to his/her lack of urban know-how.

People develop strategies in order to reduce the possibility of encountering the strangers so that they avoid any possible danger. This is called "avoiding city" by transforming public spaces into private or semiprivate places in various ways. This is not the case for lonely individuals since transforming public spaces requires a group

of personally known people. There are things individual can do it to avoid any contact with strangers by using its body "by controlling gestures, facial expressions, movements, and so on-the individual can create around himself a symbolic shield of privacy" (Ibid., 140). Lofland also touches upon some skilled urbanites who do not want to avoid the city but see it as a setting for adventure, it can be "freeing" and "exciting."

3.6.3. Danger and Incivility in Cities

Although city is associated with freedom and lack of community pressure, it is also associated with danger. Some inhabitants of city, who Marx call as the lumpenproletariat, can give us insights about the danger in the city:

> "Alongside decayed roue´s of doubtful origin and uncertain means of subsistence, alongside ruined and adventurous scions of the bourgeoisie, there were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged criminals, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, confidence tricksters, lazzaroni, pickpockets, sleight-of-hand experts, gamblers, macquereux, brothel keepers, porters, pen-pushers, organ-grinders, rag-and-bone merchants, knife-grinders, tinkers, and beggars: in short the whole indeterminate fragmented mass tossed backwards and forwards, which the French call la boh`eme" (Marx 1973, 197 quoted in Rundell, 2014, 11).

John Rundell adds this list "drug addicts and crack-heads, graffiti-artists, refugees and the homeless, not to mention the psychotic and specific and idiosyncratic world of the serial killer, serial rapist or serial gunman" (Rundell, 2014, 11).

In cities, along with danger, uncivil behaviors are also on the rise. The issue of "incivility" in the city which investigated by Timothy Phillips and Philip Smith (2006) in their study "Rethinking Urban Incivility Research: Strangers, Bodies and Circulations". They focus on how incivility is distributed in cities. They find out that locations related public transportation like railway stations, bus stops, and car parks are more likely to host incivility than consumption spaces such as pubs, clubs and shopping malls.

Interestingly, they find out that going to somewhere is more dangerous than being in somewhere. They propose that "the rush through such transitory locales increases the probability of a rude encounter" (Ibid., 894). In city and while you are at such places, if you are an obstacle to the movement of other peoples, your chances to be a victim of incivility arises. The following statement explain this: "our victim is most likely to encounter an embodied challenge or insult, to be pushed, to be blocked or to have their personal space invaded in some way" while on the way to somewhere (Ibid., 898). This raises the issue of the right to move at a tenable speed. When it comes to leisure

zones, we see an impunity to incivility due to their well-spatial organization and regulation by visible staff. In their former studies, the authors also show that it is not the minority youth, but respectable individuals such as the middle ages or elderly perpetrate incivility in everyday situations.

3.6.4. Strangers and City vs Nation

Lasse Koefoed & Kirsten Simonsen's study "'The Stranger', The City and The Nation: On the Possibilities of Identification and Belonging" emphasizes on the relationality of the stranger and the role of stranger in the formation of nation and the city. The stranger is relational figure, and this suggests that the stranger can take different forms and roles in different context. They also, by referring Bauman (1991), points out the underlying reason for strangers to be a source of fear for the established groups; strangers belong to more than one category, and thus their presence is a threat to the "cosy antagonism" which refers to the friend/enemy opposition, the one that set apart truth from falsity, evil from good (Ibid., 345). The stranger is thus seen as an existential threat to the order of the world.

Koefoed & Simonsen pursue the question "how the stranger is constituted in the spatial formations of the nation and the city respectively" (2011, 346). They point out that the stranger is a national figure by which nations can maintain its boundaries. As they put it: "In order to create, define and invent themselves as familiar spaces and as spaces of belonging, nations need their opposites" (Ibid., 346). They, by referring to Benedict Anderson (1991) and his concept of Imagined Communities, say that nation is imagined because even in the small nation, the member of the nation cannot know each other, and it is also limited because even the largest nation cannot include everybody. They say that "as a space of belonging, the nation is a territorial construction involving the production of bounded spaces in an international world of nation-states" (Ibid., 347). And this begs the question is who is belong and not?

As Paul Ricoeur (2010) states that on our ID cards, our membership of a nation-states is already determined. As he says " 'The stranger' is not just someone who is not one of us, but also someone who is not allowed to become 'one of us' as he or she pleases" (Ibid., 39). There is a lack of equality between members and strangers. The stranger confronts the notion of nation-state due to its ambivalence, his belonging to two cate-

gories as both an outsider and insider. Therefore, the participants of Lasse & Simonsen's study, show ambivalence since they feel themselves as Danish but in fact they were not recognized by others as such:

> "Sometimes I can say: Of course, sometimes it becomes: Never. Sometimes I think: No! So I will never be sure that I will be recognized as Danish. Because I feel 100 percent Danish. But if I go out and experience this discrimination, then it immediately pops up, this thing about that you are not Danish . . . Look at my album and tell me what the difference is except that we have a darker skin . . . We have also been in Legoland with the family. We have also been in the Zoo. We have pictures where we are wearing claphats, Danish flags and Danish clothes. We went to an international football match with our parents. And in Legoland with feathers in our hair roasting twistbread on the fire. I mean, what in hell more do you want? (Hanif, aged 29)" (Lasse & Simonsen, 2011, 347-8).

Lasse & Simonsen state that strangers are perceived as the ones who threaten the stability and coherence of the nation. Therefore, they become the subject of discussion in which the question of whether let them or keep them outside the national territory constitute a great place (Ibid., 349). In case of the city, it is the world of strangers and thus it is inevitable to encounter strangers. The blasé attitude, the general indifference to everything in the city makes people free. As indicated above, it is the anonym character of city life, which makes people feel liberated. In city, at the level of neighborhoods, towns or cities, we see the construction of place which display the same mentality we found in the creation of nation state. It needs boundaries. Although the participants cannot identify themselves with Danish nation, they can easily do with the city, it is their city:

> "If you, instead of posing the question: 'But are you Danish?' If you instead could strengthen people's Copenhagen mentality, if they could proudly say: 'But I am a Copenhagener', which after all is much easier because you can be a Copenhagener in all sorts of ways. Nobody can take away from you that you are a Copenhagener, but to say proudly 'I am Danish!' I obviously have problems if I shall proudly say 'I am Danish' because Pia Kjærsgård [leader of the right-wing populist party] is also Danishness, and I am not Danish in that way" (Ikram, aged 31) (Ibid., in 354).

4. STANGERS, GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURE

> "Every culture must liberate its creative potential by finding the correct equilibrium between isolation and contact with others" (Levi Strauss quoted in Eriksen, 2015 367).

This chapter will explore the ontological assumption about cultures, nations and societies as rooted in soil. The stranger, as a person who has no soil, is a symbol of mobility. With globalization and its concomitants (the advancement in transportations and communication systems), mobility becomes a central theme of our world. This unprecedent mobility leads many to question culture as a spatial concept. To understand this process, I will first give a simple understanding of culture and globalization and how each of them affects one another. Then, I will focus on the connection between culture, space and place. Lastly, I will elaborate on the dilemma of nation in a world described by hyper mobility. At the end of this section, cultural racism and anxiety will briefly be discussed.

4.1. Globalization and Culture

We have already seen that Simmel's emphasis is not on culture but on space in his essay "The Stranger". However, in order to understand to contemporary situation of strangers, one needs to take culture into account. As Jeffrey J. Alexander suggests that if one wants to understand strangeness, she or he has to focus on cultural interpretation of the social structure because it is not commonality but the construction of difference which "makes potentially marginal groups into dangerous ones that are strange" (2004, 91). He, by referring to Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton's study (1993), points out that "…the physical segregation of American blacks did not precede white people's cultural construction of their strangeness" (Alexander, 2004, 93). In that way, culture and cultural dimensions of globalization matter.

According to Raymond Williams, culture is "one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language" (Williams, 1983, 16). Timothy S. Oakes and Patricia L. Price are right in asking "What exactly is culture? Is culture a thing that acts upon humans and human societies? Is culture an independent realm of power relations, an arena of contention, power, and inequality, as with any other social construction? Or

is there in fact "no such thing as culture"?" (Oakes & Price, 2008, 6). Raymond Williams finds out three uses of culture; as Timothy S. Oakes and Patricia L. Price puts it:

> "First, as a noun describing a general process of intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic development since the eighteenth century (similar to the term "civilization"); second, a noun indicating a particular way of life (what we might call an "anthropological" sense of the term); and third, a noun describing works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity (that is, a more "elite" sense of the term)" (Ibid., 15).

Culture as a way of life is central to anthropology. As Eriksen (2015, 4) says, culture can refer both to basic similarities and systematic differences between humans. Culture carries an ambiguity with itself. He writes:

> "On the one hand, every human is equally cultural; in this sense, the term refers to a basic similarity within humanity distinguishing us from other animals including the higher primates. On the other hand, people have acquired different abilities, notions, etc., and are thereby different because of culture. Culture can, in other words, refer both to basic similarities and to systematic differences between humans" (Ibid., 5).

Adam Kuper says that when it comes to culture, anthropologists become nervous because the concept of culture which is related to the classical anthropology(in which culture defined as shared within group, integrated and bounded) are being exploited politically, especially in identity politics (Kuper, 1999, 226 quoted in Eriksen, 2015, 5).

With the advent of factors that leads to emergence of globalization, the commonsense notion of culture (as place-bounded and rooted into soil) become more problematic. Although there is no consensus on a definition of globalization; for Jan N. Pieterse, there is an emerging consensus on some features of it. For example, a common understanding of globalization means that it is time-space compression which refers to the notion that "more intensive interaction across wider space and in shorter time than before, in other words the experience of a shrinking world" (Peieterse, 2015, 8). It is being shaped by technological advancements, and it leads to the reconfiguration of nation-states; but most importantly it is uneven.

Each discipline takes a different definition of globalization. For example, a sociological definition provided by Waters describes it as: "A social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people are increasingly aware that they are receding." (Waters, 1995, 3, quoted in Peieterse, 2015, 17) There is a tension between globalization and culture; a famous anecdote can be helpful. The anecdote tells about a tribe of transhumant camel nomads in North Africa. From the beginning of time; this tribe annually migrates in March, but recently

their migration was delayed and interestingly the reason was that they don't want to miss the final episode of Dallas (Eriksen, 2015, 367).

Globalization, at first, leads to the discussion whether it means the disappearance of cultural variations, or in other words; the worldwide dissemination of certain cultural forms. So far, we have not witnessed such a phenomenon. Instead, as Eriksen says, "global symbols and globalised information are interpreted from a local vantage-point" (2015, 78). For example, as Pieterse puts it, "In wintry Tokyo, upstairs in Wendy's young students spend hours doing their homework, smoking and chatting with friends, because Japanese houses are small" (2015, 53). However, globalization creates an awareness that cultural difference is decreasing, which makes people anxious about the existence of their ways of life, namely their cultures and thus make them more attached to their cultures.

As Eriksen states that since the Second World War, and especially the last two decades, we witnessed great scientific and technologic developments which make flow of people, commodities, ideas and images intensified on a global scale. Especially, with the advent of internet, the limitation on cultural flows have been reduced and cultures become unembedded form space (2015, 371). This has ramifications for both strangers and the local people.

A few words must be said on the unevenness of globalization. We always hear the positive aspect of globalization since it allows us to overcome the constraints of borders, makes us expose to new cultures and ideas and accordingly gives us more freedom. At the same time, there are people who find themselves trapped in place, or forced to move, and receiving the consequences of inequality created by globalization. As Doreen Massey puts it, in spite of great developments in technology and transportation, still "somewhere in sub- Saharan Africa, there's a woman – amongst many women – on foot, who still spends hours a day collecting water" (Massey, 1994, 259). While some people are in a sense in charge of globalization, who turn it to their advantages. The other is just on the receiving end of this process.

> "Or – one final example to illustrate a different kind of complexity – there are the people who live in the favelas of Rio, who know global football like the back of their hand, and have produced some of its players; who have contributed massively to global music, who gave us the samba and produced the lambada that everyone was dancing to last year in the clubs of Paris and London; and who have never, or hardly ever, been to downtown Rio" (Ibid., 260).

4.2. Culture, Space and Place

There is a strong association between one's identity and the place they live. Our identity is being shaped by our culture. When we ask a stranger "where are you from?", we do not ask just the place; our intention is to know their culture and identity so that we can put them into a familiar categorization according to the map we associate cultures with specific territories. As Timothy S. Oakes and Patricia L. Price say that culture is a concept which has particular spatial implications and assumptions: "cultures were assumed to have distinct landscapes and spatial territories or regions that could be mapped with boundaries that reflected these distinctions" (Oakes & Price, 2008, 60).

Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson (1992), in their article "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference", focus on the problems stemming from the idea of overlapped space, place and culture. The uniqueness of societies, cultures and nations is based on "a seemingly unproblematic division of space, on the fact that they occupy 'naturally' discontinuous spaces" (Ibid., 6). As they state, this is apparent when we look at a map of the world represented as a collection of countries, as if it is an inherently fragmented space. This assumption is based on the idea that each country is rooted in its own proper place and personified its own unique cultures and societies. Gupta and Ferguson reveal some problematic aspects of this assumption. For example, as they ask, what is the situation of the people who inhabit the borders, or the people called nomads, immigrants and the member of transnational business elite: "What is 'the culture' of farm workers who spend half a year in Mexico and half in the United States?" (Ibid., 7). They put it as follow:

> "In a world of diaspora, transnational culture flows, and mass movements of populations, old-fashioned attempts to map the globe as a set of culture regions or homelands are bewildered by a dazzling array of postcolonial simulacra, doublings and redoublings as India and Pakistan seem to reappear in postcolonial simulation in London, prerevolution Teheran rises from the ashes in Los Angeles, and a thousand similar cultural dramas are played out in urban and rural settings all across the globe. In this culture-play of diaspora, familiar lines between "here" and "there," center and periphery, colony and metropole become blurred" (Ibid., 10).

In this respect, as Gupta and Ferguson explained, when the distinctiveness between here and there disappears, it is not only the displaced who experience a displacement; but people who remains in their inherited place face the consequence that their relation to place is being changed and the taken for granted idea of a natural and fundamental connection between culture and place broken (Ibid., 10). We can see this phenomenon

in a young white reggae fan's words, who is from an ethnically diverse neighborhood of Birmingham:

> "There's no such thing as "England" anymore . . . welcome to India, brothers! This is the Caribbean! . . . Nigeria! . . . There is no England, man. This is what is coming. Balsall Heath is the centre of the melting pot, 'cos all I ever see when I go out is half-Arab, half-Pakistani, half-Jamaican, half-Scottish, half-Irish. I know 'cos I am [half- Scottish/half-Irish] . . . who am I? . . . Tell me who I belong to? They criticize me, the good old England. Alright, where do I belong? You know, I was brought up with blacks, Pakistanis, Africans, Asians, everything, you name it . . . who do I belong to? . . . I'm just a broad person. The earth is mine . . . , you know we was not born in Jamaica . . . we was not born in "England." We were born here, man. It's our right. That's the way I see it. That's the way I deal with it" (Ibid., 10).

Liisa Malkki points out that the notion of nativeness or native places are becoming more and more complex since people increasingly define or categorize themselves regarding de-territorialized cultures, homelands and origins (Malkki, 1992, 276). Therefore, James Clifford is right asking "What does it mean, at the end of the twentieth century, to speak . . . of a 'native land'? What processes rather than essences are involved in present experiences of cultural identity?"(Clifford, 1988, 275 quoted in Gupta & Ferguson, 1992, 9).

As Oakes and Price note that in 1942, the French philosopher Simone Weil once said that attachment to place is a deeply-felt human need. They state that times of upheaval and human displacement show the importance of rootedness and fixation for people. Therefore, they claim that it is not a coincidence that Weil said this when France was in the middle of the disorder of World War II. (Oakes & Price, 2008, 275). As Liisa Mallki (1992) says, it is a common practice for people who going to exile to take a handful of the soil from her/his country or they just kiss the soil when they come back to their homeland. When people die on foreign land, they are transported back to their country to be buried (1992, 277). She gives an example:

> "On the night of 9 May 1990, 37 graves in an old Jewish cemetery were desecrated, and the body of a man newly buried was disinterred and impaled with an umbrella. One is compelled to see in this abhorrent act of violence a connection to "love of country" in the ugliest sense of the term. The old man's membership in the French nation was denied because he was of the category "Jew." He was a person in the "wrong" soil, and was therefore taken out of the soil" (Ibid., 277)

Liisa Malkki shows that commonsense assumptions which associates people to place, nation to territory are deeply metaphysical. She states that the naturalizing links between place and people are mostly perceived in botanical terms and metaphors. For example, people often think of themselves as rooted in place and deriving their identity from this rootedness. Malkki says that even a brief look into nationalistic discourse can shows us these arborescent root metaphors. For example, metaphors of kinship

(fatherland, motherland) and home (homeland) can be seen in the same sense. Fatherland and motherland suggest that a nation is a genealogical tree rooted in the soil which nourish it. Accordingly, it is impossible for people to be part of more than one tree (Ibid., 276-282).

Culture can be read in the same way. Malkki says that culture like nations has been perceived as something grows in the soil. It is an interesting point that word "culture" is derived from the Latin for cultivation. Both nation and culture are kindred concept. They are depended on a cultural essentialism (Ibid., 278). For Lisa Malkki, in the national order of things, being rooted is not just normal but also it is a moral and spiritual need (Ibid., 279). She refers to a powerful sedentarism in our thinking which leads us to perceive displacement and the displaced as pathological:

> "For example, a prominent 1939 historical survey of refugees states, "Politically uprooted, he [the refugee] may sink into the underworld of terrorism and political crime; and in any case he is suspected of political irresponsibility that endangers national security." …The point to be underscored here is that these refugees' loss of bodily connection to their national homelands came to be treated as a loss of moral bearings. Rootless, they were no longer trustworthy as "honest citizens" (Ibid., 280).

Malkki states that although contemporary literature on refugee is different from the postwar one, there is a commonality which both see refugee as problematic; as if something must be corrected. She claims that it is striking that the literature locates "the problems" not in the political process which led them to be displaced, but in the bodies and minds of refugees (Ibid., 280).

We cannot fully explain human's attachment to a place in terms of culture. For example, cultural geographist Yi-Fu Tuan, in his book *Space and Place the Perspective of Experience*, is in search of a general human condition which transcends the cultural peculiarities of people. Tuan says that human beings by their mere presence impose a scheme on space. They do it unconsciously and they are only aware of it when they are lost. He gives an example of a man lost in the wood. It does not matter where to go, where is the left or the right, which side is the front or the back. But if that man sees a light in the distance, immediately left/right and front/back regains its meanings because he/she has a goal now.

As he states:

> "Cultures differ greatly in the elaboration of spatial schemata. In some cultures they are rudimentary; in others they can become a many-splendored frame that integrates nearly all departments of life. Yet, despite the large outward differences, the vocabularies of spatial organization

> and value have certain common terms. These common terms are ultimately derived from the structure and values of the human body" (Tuan, 2001, 37).

For example; Tuan says, when a human being grows, it gains an upright position. He/she gains their full human stature when they are in that position. Accordingly, whatever is superior or excellent is associated with physical height. He writes:

> "Indeed "superior" is derived from a Latin word meaning "higher." "Excel" (celsus) is another Latin word for "high." The Sanskrit brahman is derived from a term meaning "height." "Degree," in its literal sense, is a step by which one moves up and down in space. Social status is designated "high" or "low" rather than "great" or "small." God dwells in heaven. In both the Old and the New Testament God was sometimes identified with heaven" (Ibid., 37).

As a conclusion; Tuan says that irrespective of their culture, people tend to see their homeland as the center of the world and here "highness" is also at work. Even it is not supported by geography; for some people, their homeland occupies the center of the world or located at the top of the world. He gives the following example: once for nomadic tribes of Mongolia, they live at the top of the world and the slopes of which are occupied by other races. Highness is of central importance. Furthermore, there is a belief in Rabbinical literature which says that land of Israel is higher above sea level than other lands and the temple hill is the highest spot in Israel. Tuan says:

> "Modern nations like to think that a high peak, if not the world's highest, lies within their borders. Lack of accurate measurement allows the imagination, fueled by patriotic fervor, to run wild. Even in the eighteenth century, educated Britons could consider Ben Nevis to be one of the loftiest mountains on earth" (Ibid., 40).

He, then, concludes that human beings' attachment to place cannot be fully explain in terms of culture, it is a general human condition we all share:

> "This profound attachment to the homeland appears to be a worldwide phenomenon. It is not limited to any particular culture and economy. It is known to literate and nonliterate peoples, hunter-gatherers, and sedentary farmers, as well as city dwellers. The city or land is viewed as mother, and it nourishes; place is an archive of fond memories and splendid achievements that inspire the present; place is permanent and hence reassuring to man, who sees frailty in himself and chance and flux everywhere" (Ibid., 154).

4.3. Multiculturalism, Nation-State and Cultural Anxiety

Today, it has become easy to travel and emigrate due to the latest advancements in transportation. With the intensified mobility of people, contemporary societies are more ethnic and plural. This makes nation states in a vulnerable position since it is designed to favor only one nation and usually at the expense of others, namely strangers.

Multiculturalism arises as a solution but since it attacks the main tenet of nation-state, a state for one nation and culture. It does not solve the problem for nation-state, instead

it makes it more complex for nation-state. Now, nation-states have to strike a balance in their treatment to their culturally and ethnically diverse inhabitants within their borders. As Eriksen says, the state faces the accusation of injustice; when it promotes equality because ethnic minorities may feel their cultural aspects are not being respected. On the other hand, when it promotes the cultural differences, minorities also may feel they are discriminated (Eriksen, 2010, 175).

Some societies promote multiculturalism, such as Canada, Australia etc. and in those societies, the citizens are given the right to have and protect their culture, but also in many case they are forced to "adorn themselves with an ethic label, whether they want to or not" (Ibid.,176) Therefore, sometimes groups are faced differential treatment based on their assumed cultural aspects, and this makes some people think that they are being discriminated. This can be seen as the paradox of multiculturalism (Ibid.,176).

Eriksen says, we should note that the main variable is power, the majority has the power to when minorities can be like themselves and when not. In other words, they have the power to decide whether to assimilate or segregate (Ibid., 176). For example, regarding American ethnicity studies, Stephen Steinberg claims:

> "Immigrants [from Europe] were disparaged for their cultural peculiarities, and the implied message was: 'You will become like us whether you want to or not.' When it came to racial minorities, however, the unspoken dictum was, 'No matter how much like us you are, you will remain apart'" (Steinberg, 1981, 42 quoted in ibid., 176).

To understand the paradox of multiculturalism, we should first take a look at the definition of multiculturalism. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, it is: "[t]he characteristics of a multicultural society; (also) the policy or process whereby the distinctive identities of the cultural groups within such a society are maintained or supported" (Oxford English Dictionary, 1957 quoted in ibid., 177-8). However, as Eriksen says, this definition also leaves the question unanswered. He says the main problem is that whether the concept refers to "an exaggerated tolerance of foreign customs and beliefs or an uncritical support of any kind of immigration into the country" (Ibid., 178). Another problem is that how solidarity could be created within a multicultural society. Full assimilation is impossible because even within minorities we have diversity and on the other hand in diverse societies, democracy and solidarity are difficult to be achieved (Ibid., 178).

Cultural essentialism and anxiety is at the heart of discussions about multiculturalism. In his article "Cultural Essentialism and Cultural Anxiety", Grillo (2003) provides a wide range information about cultural essentialism and anxiety. Some authors have accused anthropologists who create and spread a misuse of culture which provide the basis for cultural essentialism. For example, Unni Wikan attacks the fact that the misuse of culture is being used in public discourse in order to attack immigrants. Wikan says "[This] notion of culture as static, fixed, objective, consensual and uniformly shared by all members of a group is a figment of the mind that anthropologists have done their share to spread" (Wikan, 1999, 62 quoted in ibid., 158). Grillo (2003, 159) says anthropologists distinguish:

> "(i) 'Culture' as a characteristic of humanity, which like language undoubtedly exists and is something we all have (hence my reaction to the teacher in Lyons);
>
> (ii) 'Culture-as-way-of-life' that I have and may share with others;
>
> (iii) 'A culture' as the property of an identifiable collectivity, and hence cultures (plural) consisting of identifiable peoples who are carriers of that culture: 'the specificities of being Norwegian'" (Melhuus, 1999: 70; see also Kahn, 1995: ix; Parekh, 2000: 2–3).

The third definition of culture is problematic since it supposes that "cultures (static, finite and bounded ethnolinguistic blocs labelled 'French', 'Nuer' and so on) determine individual and collective identities, and the subject's place in social and political schemas" (Grillo, 2003, 160). Accordingly, since culture determines people's identities, attachments etc., it should be protected. This mode of thinking provides justification for people who advocate anti-immigrant policies in the pretext of protecting their cultures. Some authors assert that cultural essentialism is a new kind of racism, a "racism in disguise" (Stolcke, 1995, 4 quoted in ibid., 162):

> "The term 'race', having already outlived its usefulness, will be replaced by the much more appropriate term 'culture'; declarations of superiority and inferiority . . . will be set aside in favor of a glorification of difference . . . What will remain unchanged . . . is the rigidity of determinism (cultural rather than physical, now) and the discontinuity of humanity, compartmentalized into cultures that cannot and must not communicate with one another . . . racist behaviors [appeal] to nationalist or culturalist doctrine, or to the 'right to difference'" (Todorov, 1993, 156–7 quoted in Ibid., 163-4).

Cultural racism needs more elaborations. J. M. Blaut (1992), in his article "The Theory of Cultural Racism", says that nowadays we have a lot of racism but few racists. He makes a distinction between racist theory and practice. Blaut says that racist practice is a form of discrimination at all scale; from personal abuse to colonial exploitation. For him, racist practice like all practices is rationalized and justified by a theory, or a

belief system. It is "supported by a historical sequence of different theories, each consistent with the intellectual environment of a given era" (Ibid., 289).

He says that the racism in the early nineteenth century derives its justification from religion, between 1850 and 1950 from a biological argument grounded in natural science and today it is justified by cultural superiority. Blaut says that as a form of practice, racism is of importance for European society so that it can maintain its capitalist economic system. He explains that before when we accuse someone of being racist, we blame this person for believing the biological superiority of his/her race over others; but today nobody believes this theory anymore. He elaborates:

> "Most academics believe that the typical members of what used to be called inferior races have a capacity equal to that of other so-called races, but they have not been able to realize this capacity. They have not learned the things one needs to know to be treated as an equal. They have not learned how to think rationally, as mental adults. They have not learned how to behave in appropriate ways, as social adults. The problem is culture, not biology. And, naturally, the inequality will disappear in the course of time. But in the meantime, discrimination is perfectly justified. Of course it is not called "discrimination" in this newer theory. It is a matter of treating each person in a way that is appropriate to his or her abilities" (Ibid., 290).

Interestingly; related to this issue, Christoph Brumann claims that "like it or not, it appears that people – and not only those with power – want bounded culture, and they often want it in precisely the bounded, reified, essentialized, and timeless fashion that most of us now reject" (Brumann, 1999, 11 quoted in ibid.,167). Grillo also accepts that, rightly or wrongly, people are really concerned about their "culture"; there is an anxiety for culture. Nevertheless, Grillo says that cultural essentialism is *sui generis* and it is not just veiled racism; it has something to do with nation state and nation buildings. He says that Brumann's words are though-provoking but also ahistorical; essentialism is not natural and universal. Then he asks accordingly: "When, where, and how does this consciousness of *a* culture, and of cultures, of 'our' as opposed to 'their' culture, and of 'us' as cultural subjects (*We, The Tikopia*) become significant, especially politically significant?" (Ibid., 167) The answer is the emergence of nation-state because the process of nation-building created a sense of unique, homogeneous and national cultural identities (Ibid., 167). That's why, phenomena like globalization, transnationalism and large-scale immigration are seen as a threat to nation-states and the ways of life of its people.

Don Mitchell (1995), in his article "There's No Such Thing as Culture: Towards a Reconceptualization of the Idea of Culture in Geography", focuses on the problematic nature of taking culture as something reified, bounded and rooted. There is a ceaseless

interaction between human beings at all level; existence of reified, bounded, rooted culture is just a socially constructed reality and reveals power relations. As he says:

> "The term 'culture' becomes a means for representing relations of power. 'Culture ' is a representation of 'others' which solidifies only insofar as it can be given objective reality as stasis in social relations. In this sense, it is the idea of culture that becomes important rather than culture itself. The idea of culture is not what people are doing; rather, it is the way people make sense of what they have done. It is the way their activities are reified as culture. The lists of processes and activities that Jackson uses to exemplify culture are important not because they are culture but because, through struggle over the power of definition (Western 1981) they are made to be 'culture'… one must understand that it is the 'winners' in the clashes who define what culture is and how it gets represented" (Ibid., 108).

Therefore, Don Mitchell is right in asking "who reifies?" (Ibid., 109). By saying "there is no such thing as culture", he aims to reveal the power relations behind the notion of reified cultures.

As a conclusion, I deal with the concept of culture in relation to the stranger in light of the discussions emanating from the advent of globalization. In addition to previous chapters of the theoretical background, this chapter provide a basis for the analyzing of the situation of my participants in the next chapter.

5.THE STRANGERS OF ISTANBUL: THE PAKISTANIS AND THE SYRIANS

This chapter evaluates the interviews made with the Syrians and Pakistanis who now live in the modern-day Istanbul. For this, I used semi-structured interview method and partial observation in light of the above-mentioned literature which deals with many aspects of "the stranger." Since being a stranger is a relative phenomenon, my main objective of the analysis here is to find out the peculiarities of their strangeness and how they are seen by the local people and vice versa.

In this chapter, I will first focus on my participants' immigration stories. Then, I will go into the life in a metropolitan city, Istanbul, from the eyes of my participants. I will explain the reasons behind my participants' lack of interaction and their limited ability to maneuver in the face of problems. The strangers' perceptions of the host society and the city will be given in the following section. The other sections will deal with the host perceptions of the strangers and the strategies used by the Syrians and the Pakistanis to avoid the city. Finally, a general assessment of the findings including an assessment by a Simmelian stranger, a Bosnian woman, will be provided.

5.1. Immigration Stories

My aim here is to see how and what kind of strangeness that my participants have been experiencing in Istanbul which is a home for over 15 million people. The circumstances that lead them to leave their former places are significant, which eventually pushed them to be stranger. In that respect, Nedim Karakayalı (2006, 313) asks wisely "why are there 'strangers'?" Why did they push it so hard to go to a foreign land where they literally have nothing to build upon? Why did they immigrate to a foreign land where would be judged, harassed and discriminated?

The reasons for their mobility are different but that does not mean there is no commonalities between them. I will first focus on the Syrian participants who came to Istanbul due to the war in Syria. Obviously, they did not come here with their own will; they fled to save their lives. For example:

> "They hit my neighborhood, and some of my relatives were died" (B, man, 29).

In fact, the reasons for their decision to leave their country are intertwined. One can evaluate their situation through Stephen Castles' analysis. According to Castles, distinction between the forced migration and the economic one is blurred since failed economies usually means "weak states, predatory ruling cliques and human rights abuse" (2003, 17). It is hard to distinguish whether their motives are economic, or they just escaped because their lives were under danger. When their city or town were bombed, they could not stay for two main reasons: the fear of death and the failed economy; while the former means they can be killed, the latter means the economy does not provide the necessary food for survival. Eventually, this led them to look for a way out.

Of course, there are political reasons too. All participants said that they do not want to join to either Syrian or the opposition's army. The situation in Syria is so complicated that the possibility of two brothers can join two enemy sides are so high. When a city, town or village falls into the hand of one side such as such Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), People's Protection Units (People's Protection Units: Yekîneyên Parastina Gel [YPG]) and the Syrian government, the occupying group demands young inhabitants to fight for their cause. It goes without saying that if you show any reluctance, it will have dire consequence for both you and your family in that context. The tragicomic fact is that a town can occasionally change hands between enemy forces. Each time they make some changes in town life; for example, they change the education system including the medium of education. See the below expressions:

> "When the war started, our village was captured by first the opposition forces, then the government and finally YPG. After each took the control of the village, they changed the medium of education and they forced people to join in their army" (H, man, 23).
>
> "I fled three years ago because Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS/ISIL) came and if you do not join them to fight, they will cut you" (C, man, 24).
>
> "I left my country because I do not want to kill my brothers because when you join the government army, you have to kill whoever in front of you and if you do not, they will kill you" (N, man, 26).
>
> "I came because I was called for the military service. I did not go because Assad (the president of Syria) was *kafir* (infidel)" (G, man, 25).
>
> "I do not want to do the military service, and I came here because it was the nearest one" (B, man, 22).

(H, man, 23) says that he left because he could not find a job in Syria due to the ongoing war. I argue that although economic reasons are also at work, the main impetus for them to leave was to save their lives.

Before the war, they are content with their lives in Syria. When I asked to compare with Turkey to Syria, almost all of my participants told me how good their lives were in Syria in terms of economy. They said if the war ends, they want to go back. For example:

> "Work is hard here [Turkey], in Syria we work until 1 pm and then you are free. Here you have to work from 8 to 8" (C, man, 24).
>
> "Here, you go out once a month, in Syria every day. Here, if you want to buy a house, you buy in ten years, but in Syria you can buy in 2-3 years" (B, man, 22).
>
> "Life is expensive here, in Syria one person works and he can take care of family of 10 members. I want to go back" (D, man, 27).

Almost all of them came to Istanbul from Aleppo, which is a city in northwestern Syria. Only one of them is from Deyrizor. The reason for preferring Turkey is its proximity. This finding is in line with Ayhan Kaya's study. He (2017, 55) finds out that %86 of the Syrians who live in Istanbul from Aleppo. For Ayhan Kaya (2016, 2), this situation cannot be explained by only geographical proximity but "its cultural intimacy stemming from the common Ottoman past." After crossing the border, they decided to come to Istanbul due to its job opportunities. Except the first comers (two people), they all used their social networks to come to Istanbul. They can be divided into two groups. The first group has some relatives or friends in Istanbul, and they came directly to Istanbul. The second group spent 3-6 months in Gaziantep or Kilis; both are located at the Southern part of Turkey, and then moved to Istanbul. Some of the them paid for the human traffickers to cross the border. Others crossed directly when Turkey opened its borders.

Ayhan Kaya (2016, 16) states, once the first wave of immigrants settled in their new place, they try to bring their family members. The first comers took the brunt of the process and the late comers relatively did not have much problems thanks to the first comers' experiences and help. This is the case for only two of my participants. For example; one of my participant, who came here 4 years ago, had to sleep in mosques and parks until he was able to find a job. Then, he settled and brought his fiancée. The other one brought her family after going through a difficult process of finding a job and a house to live.

When it comes to the Pakistanis in Istanbul; compared to the Syrians, once can say they are not forced immigrants. They decided to come to Istanbul for economic rea-

sons. Interestingly, they do not plan to settle in Istanbul. They see Istanbul as a temporary place to stop and save money for their ultimate destination. Generally, the destination is the European Union (the EU) countries, and particularly for my Pakistani participants, it is Italy or Spain. One of them explain his decision:

> "I have a family and I cannot feed them because there is no job in Pakistan. Pakistan is bad. I planned to go to Italy, but my money just affords Turkey" (S, man, 34).

Some of my Pakistani participants just came here without any plan to go to the EU countries. They just want to save enough money to set up a small business in Pakistan or just pay their debt there.

Zygmunt Bauman once says that "the riches are global, the misery is local" (Bauman, 1998- 9, 74 quoted in Castles, 2017, 16). In our globalized word; for economic and political elites, there is virtually no border and they cross border whenever they want. But the poor have to stay at home; in practice, they do not have the freedom of movement. However; today, economic globalization has forced people in poor countries to go to the rich ones for a relatively better life. As Gordon Hughes (2007, 935) expresses: "'We' (the rich and Western/Northern) are now reaping the consequences of 'our' own success in the process of globalization. Accordingly, people from the poorest parts of the world now wish to endorse the logic of globalization by moving to live in the more affluent parts of the globe, often at almost any price to their own life and wellbeing." In accordance with what Gordon Hughes says, my participants showed great efforts to come to Istanbul. One of the participants explains this difficult journey:

> "We first went to Iran by bus and then contacted the human trafficker. They took us to near the Turkish-Iranian border and we waited for the right time and place since they checked the border. There were two ways; over the mountain or the canal. We walked over the mountain on foot and it took 15 hours. They took us to Doğubeyazıt and then to Istanbul" (M, man, 21).

It goes without saying that the transportation was not comfortable and the treatment they received from the human traffickers is also not humane; they were transferred via trucks and small van in an inhumane way. I asked them why they did not come as tourists instead of taking this dangerous path. They explain in economic terms; they say if one wants to come here via legal ways, he/she has to pay 2500-3000 dollars. However, using the other way, the illegal one, is much cheaper; 1000 dollars. Since they do not have much money, they simply choose the cheapest way, even it is too dangerous. Although the current economic system forced them to remain attached to their place, these people challenge it by bypassing it via a network of transnational human traffickers. At this point, a question arises: how can we categorize them? Are

they forced or economic immigrants ? For my participants, I argue that they are forced because, as they told, nobody would take this much trouble if they have a chance to live and feed their family in their countries. As Oakes and Price (2008, 255) state how people find themselves "on receiving end of globalization:"

> "As Doreen Massey reminds us, globalization is a spatially and socially uneven process. Much of what we hear about globalization involves liberation from the confines of borders, exposure to new cultures and ideas, and the freedom to choose new identities. Yet as many of the selections in this part discuss, people may well find themselves on the receiving end of globalization: impoverished, trapped in place, or forced to move against their will" (Ibid., 255).

There are transnational aspects of my participant situations. Basch et al. makes a definition of transnationalism as "the processes by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement" (Basch et al., 1994, 6, quoted in Levitt and Nadya Jaworsky, 2007, 131). According to some research, immigrants can overcome the poverty which capitalism caused them by living in a transnational way (Levitt and Nadya Jaworsky, 2007, 131). My participants are illegal here, in Istanbul. They are operating on an underground transnational social space in which they move across border without any state restriction by using another transnational group; human traffickers. They send remittances by these illegal transnational networks or in the words of one of my participants by "mafia." The Syrian participants used the same kind of networks to send money to their families in Syria because the banking system does not work there due to the ongoing war.

In her article "The Dynamics of Migrants' Transnational Formations: Between Mobility and Locality", Janine Dahinden (2010, 53) identifies four types of the transnational; namely "localised diasporic transnational formations", "localised mobile transnational formations", "transnational mobiles" and "Transnational outsiders" which I think best suits to my participants' situation. Transnational outsiders are described by "low transnational mobility and, at the same time, a low degree of local anchorage" (Ibid., 57). Asylum seekers, newly arrived immigrants and undocumented immigrants fell into this type. As Janine says, these immigrants cannot circulate between their homeland and the host countries because of "persecution in the home country and, more generally, because they do not have the right to travel due to their legal status" (Ibid., 57). They also cannot develop a local embedding due to their legal status which leave them with limited access to jobs and resources (Ibid., 57).

My Pakistani and Syrian participants show the qualities specific to transnational outsiders. For example, the Pakistani strangers do not seem to develop a feeling of belonging to Istanbul due to their legal status since they are undocumented. They have intention to return to their homeland or go to another country. Furthermore, they cannot sustain a stable transnational social space by circulating between their homelands and Turkey due to their illegal status and the amount of money required for the illegal way which they cannot afford. An example can be helpful to understand their situation; according to one of my Turkish participant, who share the same workplaces with the immigrants, one of the Pakistani workers had an accident. He does not have access to the Turkish health care system since they are illegal. Therefore, in order to receive treatment, he went back to Pakistan by using the same dangerous route which they used to come Istanbul.

When it comes to Syrians, it is more complicated. Although Turkish authorities has provided a legal status called "Temporary Protection" for them, which is to cover "access to health, education, social assistance, and labor market" (UNCHR, [04.06.2018], 2), most of them are undocumented. They do not want to go to the authorities and register themselves for a variety of reasons. For example, they may not have enough information about the legal process. Many do not have enough time to do the paperwork and mostly they are afraid of being sent back to Syria. Furthermore, as they say there is always a long queue at the gate of related institutions and they cannot wait because they have to go back to the work. Some just think that they, sooner or later, would go back to their country and thus for them it is unnecessary. Some are unaware of the rights entitled to them. For example, one of my participants, despite my encouragement, did not go and start the legal process. At first, I think that he does not have enough time, and this is what he has just told me. Later, I asked his boss; I learnt that he is just afraid of being sent back. It is likely for the married Syrians to be get registered because they want to have access to the Turkish health care system for their children. They are also the ones who want to stay here, even if the war in Syria would cease. As a conclusion, I put my Syrian participants into the category of transnational outsiders because their legal status is still unclear and due to the treatment they are receiving by host communities, it is difficult for them to develop a sense of belonging to Turkey and Istanbul.

However, in general, Syrians in Istanbul, develop a sense of belonging and start to embark on a place-building project due to their higher numbers. This is in line with what Simmel says about formation of groups: "increase in number thus involves a changed character of the social relationship" (Simmel, 1938, 11 quoted in Levine et al., 1976b, 1113). When it reaches a certain size, it has to develop some forms and organs in order to maintain its life (Simmel, 1950, 87). This eventually leads to the division of labor in the group. Therefore, with their increased numbers, the Syrians reach the necessary size required to place-making activities. We see this in certain neighborhood and streets of Istanbul. For example, in Fatih district and specially in Akşemsettin street where you can see a typical Syrian landscape.

5.2. A World of Strangers: Life in Istanbul

In this section, I will focus on what it means to live in a metropolitan city from the eyes of my participants; what kind of experiences they have and how they articulate them ?

As Lofland (1973) states in his book, city is a spatial formation in which you live with people whom you do not know personally. Therefore, encountering with strangers, as Koefoed and Simonsen (2011, 351) put it, is "an inevitable condition of urban life". I follow some questions: Does really "city air make one free"? or does everybody who live in a city really experience the same city? Here, I would like to explain how I and my participants experience the city in a different way. We should keep in mind that city is described by ceaseless flow of interactions. As we show in theoretical part, city is not just a mere spatial formation; people produce it by incessant interactions. Therefore, experiencing a city means experiencing and contributing to the interactions happening inside it.

5.2.1. Lack of Interactions and Restricted Maneuverability

According to Simmel, "society" is a form of ceaseless interactions between individuals. As he explains:

> "If the concept "society" is taken in its most general sense, it refers to the psychological interaction among individual human beings… The large systems and the super-individual organizations that customarily come to mind when we think of society, are nothing but immediate interactions that occur among men constantly, every minute, but that have become crystallized as permanent fields, as autonomous phenomena. As they crystallize, they attain their own existence and their

> own laws, and may even confront or oppose spontaneous interaction itself" (Simmel, 1950, 9-10).

Regardless of reasons, when there is lack of interactions, some social problems will arise because interactions "…incessantly tie men together." (Simmel, 1908/1959b, 327–328 quoted in Ritzer, 2011, 166). During my interviews, the first thing that I realized is the limited interactions between my participants and the local people of Istanbul. It seems as if they were not live in the same city. This can be partly due to the blasé attitude of Istanbulites and the unintended consequences of the division of labor in cities, which likely decreases the possibility of encountering other people and thus hinders interactions. For the Pakistani "strangers", the main reasons are lack of time/money and language/physiological barriers. All of these result in restricted mobility for the Pakistanis. For example, they work six days of week between 8 am to 8 pm. Their working days and hours can be changed according to the requirements of the work load. If so, they stay overnight until 10-11 pm and may work on Sundays. As a natural result, they spend almost all of their time at the workplaces, and accordingly they cannot and do not develop any social relationship with the local people.

İlhan Kaya puts the importance of work in people's lives:

> "Work is an essential and universal human activity and has a crucial place in one's identity formation. One's social status in a particular society is closely linked to how one makes a living, and what one does for a living influences who one socializes with and what social activities one participates in" (Kaya, 2006, 431).

The life of the Pakistani stranger seems to revolve around work. I asked whether they have Turkish friends or not. It is not surprising that the only Turkish friends they have are just their coworkers.

Basically, they do not have enough time to socialize. They have only one day off and they rest at their home on that day. The language barrier is another reason. Although they have learned basic Turkish words from their bosses and Turkish coworkers, it is obvious that lack of language skills prevents them from socializing with Turkish people. The language barrier does not just affect their social relations with the local people; but they also face problem in different parts of the urban life, like in the marketplace. They do not easily find job since they cannot look for job by themselves; furthermore, they have to find the places where they have already Pakistani workers so that they can teach them Turkish at work. For example, one of my participants who came to Istanbul one month ago cannot find a job due to the above reasons. When I ask for the reason, his friend who is also my participant say:

> "I am putting lots of effort to find a job to him by using my own personal connections, but they told me he cannot find it without speaking Turkish. He has to work with the other Pakistani people in the same place to learn the language from them" (S, man, 34).

Furthermore, due to their legal status and education, only low-paid jobs are available to them. They seem under stress due to the economic reasons. My newly-arrived participant has told me that his money is about running out, and this is like the sword of Damocles hanging over his head. He said that he has plenty of time and nothing to do. The feeling of being stranger creates tension in his life. Both he and my other participants want to become friends with me. I think it is due to the fact that I am the only local person they know and can communicate outside their workplaces. During the interviews, I find myself in sensitive conversations.

When it comes to their only spare time "Sunday", they usually spend half of the day resting. For the other half, they do cleaning, washing the clothes or going shopping. These are their routine on Sundays. But if they still have time left, they visit other Pakistani at their home. Sometimes, they go to well-known touristic places such as Sultanahmet, Taksim or Aksaray. They feel more comfortable in such cosmopolitan places since they pass unnoticed (remain anonym) and there are other strangers like themselves; undocumented people and tourists. But for them even going to such places are not affordable in terms of time and money:

> "In the beginning, we go to Sultan Ahmet, Taksim or Aksaray… but then we just go there when a new friend arrived and just for showing around the Istanbul" (F, man, 26).

The cost of the public transportation is another reason for them not to go outside frequently. Their main purpose is to survive and save enough money to be able to go to the EU countries or just send money to their families back in their home countries. For such reasons, they do not prefer going out because, for them, it means not saving but spending money. Another reason is about their legal status; going out runs the risk of encountering the police and being arrested. But in some cases, they are stopped by the police, and they are just overlooked. The police let them go. One of them explains how the police treat them:

> "They treat Pakistani people very well, they just say 'fuck off' and let us go" (M, man, 21).

Furthermore, they are afraid of being attacked by local people who are known as criminals or vagabonds. Except few of my participants, all of them have experienced such an attack. One of my participants was even stabbed by those "criminals". My participants think that those who attack them know that they are illegal and know that we

cannot call the police for help. They are vulnerable against those criminals. For example, I talked to a stabbed Bangladeshi. He lives in Küçükpazar, a neighborhood which is also populated by the undocumented people. He told me call the police and tell them do something about those criminals in the neighborhood.

Due to the above-mentioned reasons, my participants have confined themselves to a little space in the city. Their lives are limited to their workplaces and rooms. They also have little space where they stay. They have to sleep together with 6-10 ten Pakistanis and sometimes with the Afghans who are also undocumented people living in the same apartment. My participant informed me that for a room shared by 8 other Pakistanis, he pays 125 Turkish lira (TL). At this point, his salary is 1600 TL.

When it comes to my Syrian participants, the situation is almost the same. Like the Pakistanis, they also spend much of their time at work. They share the same room with their fellow Syrian friends. For one case, one of my participants does not even stay at an apartment room but at the basement, which he shares with 15 other Syrian young immigrants.

In terms of reasons for lack of interactions, there are some differences between the Syrians and the Pakistanis. The Syrians, owing to their large number and political atmosphere, are more visible in Turkey. Unlike the Pakistanis, they are subject to the hate crimes and racist discourse. All these make them reluctant to leave their comfort zone, spend their time in restricted places available them and with their fellow Syrian friends. As a conclusion, the Syrians' strangeness is more intense compared to the Pakistanis.

As a conclusion, although the stranger is a figure of mobility, my participants seems to be trapped in immobility since they came in Istanbul. Interactions between my participants and the local people are limited due to above reasons. It is obvious that without interactions, emergence of solidarity and accumulation of social capital are unlikely to develop for them and this eventually relegate them into a position described by ultra-exploitation and inferiority. As known, interactions are the string that holds society together and make what previously empty space a city. Therefore, the city is still an empty space for my participant. That does not mean they do not like Istanbul; but it means they experience it in a completely different way, in a confined space available to them due to their immobility and lack of interactions with the local people.

This have some repercussions for all inhabitant of Istanbul, though. When there is lack of interactions between certain groups, this gap is likely to be filled with misinformation since information distributed through interactions, exchange of ideas. The misinformation eventually leads to the creation of stereotypes and construction of others by whom we define ourselves. This dichotomy of "us and them" is open to abuse by some politicians because a triadic relationship arises here with the advent of strangers: us, them(strangers) and politicians. As Simmel explains, in this kind of relationship, one of them can pit one side against the other for his/her benefit, and generally it is politicians who benefit as we see around the world. For example, far-right politicians in the European countries fit into this definition.

5.2.2. The Strangers' Perception of the Host Community, and the City

The main characteristic of "the stranger" is that he or she comes into a group which is already established and developed its own way of seeing and interpreting the world; in other words, their own system of meaning, namely their culture. When my participants left their countries where they were born, grown up, and their identity formed, the place where their social reality emerged. In Istanbul, they entered an alien world. In Salomon words: "The stranger who decides to settle in a social context experiences the grim fact that he does not belong to these people, that he does not share their traditions and recollections, their intentions and the horizon of meaning they take for granted" (1995, 372). They start to experience what Alfred Schutz says, "a dislocation of stranger's habitual system of relevance" (1944, 499). As Schutz says, the stranger does not see the cultural pattern of the established group as consistent, clear, and coherent but as a puzzle. He has to check his action step by step. My participants have been through this process from the very moment they crossed the border.

I asked for their opinions of Turkish people; both Pakistanis and Syrians, gave the same answer: "There are good ones and also bad ones." The Syrians face more discriminatory attitudes, particularly verbal harassment. Despite that, they keep their opinion neutral and do not stereotype or put Turkish people into the category of "bad ones".

The Pakistani participants says that they like Turkish people. In general, however, they are facing problems. For example; their salary is lower than the local people (and sometimes they are not paid at all), and they are frequently being attacked by some

criminals. Another problem is that landlords do not rent apartments to them due to their marital status. This general attitude of the landlords results in exploitation by few landlords who charge them more because they know that they have no options.

However, the Pakistanis seems to receive a positive treatment from their bosses and even from some loafers as opposed to Syrians. For example, in one case, one of my participants was stopped by some loafers; but he was let go just after they realized he was not a Syrian. His boss also prefers them over the Syrians. As he says:

> "When Syrian come, he does not employ them. He says Syrians are working slowly" (F, man, 26).

He also adds that if the Turkish state gives us the rights like it has already given to the Syrians, Turkish people would not like us either. The unequal treatment seems normal to them because they also think within the national order of things in which nationals, citizens are privileged over the outsiders.

But there are opposite examples when they are treated badly, too.

> "I worked, and they did not pay. When I insisted, they hit me" (S, man, 34).

They compare Pakistan and Turkey in terms of infrastructure, they find Turkey's situation better:

> "Turkey has good transportation, metro, bus and it is not dirty" (G, man, 20).

The Pakistanis like Istanbul; but their attitude to the culture of its inhabitant is ambivalent as I expected. My Pakistani participants see things in the host country mostly through the lens of their religion, Islam. Generally, it is hard to draw a line between religion and culture since they mostly go hand in hand.

As Levitt and Jaworsky state; migration scholars have long neglected the significance of religion in people's social life, but recent studies have now tended to fill this gap. As they put it: "Religion and culture often go hand in hand, carrying and reinforcing one another. It is quite difficult for some people to sort out Mexicanness from Catholicism, Indianness from being Hindu, or what it means to be Pakistani from what it means to be a Muslim…" (Levitt and Jaworsky, 2007, 140). In line with this, my Pakistani participants often refers to religion when they compare both countries and people. For example, they say:

> "There is no Muslim in this culture (Turkey) [sarcastically]. In our country, women are veiled but here they wear mini-skirt" (S, man, 34).

> "Turks get married late, and this is not suitable in Islam…Turkish people do not know Islam. Turkish girls' dress is too revealing, they are nude in beaches. Imams (priests in mosques) have no beards. Turkish girls are bad, %90 are bad. They dress like Europeans. Men piss in wall urinal, that's not good. In Pakistan, nobody calls you Muhammad (since it is the name of the Prophet) but here they call it each other. Here most of the name is English but ours are Islamic" (M, man, 21).
>
> "I do not want to marry Turkish girls, because they wear non-Islamic outfit" (A, man, 28).
>
> "If I find a Turkish girl, (he is also married with children), I would marry because we have right to marry four people as the Prophet did" (R, man, 25).

Simmel says the stranger is not "radically committed to the unique ingredients and peculiar tendencies of the group, and therefore approaches them with the specific attitude of 'objectivity'" (Wolff, 1950, 404). Here, it is obvious that my participants are not committed to Turkish people's way of life, indeed they question it, they judge it. But when it comes to objectivity, we should listen what Dannison Nash (1963, 154) says;

> "The fact that he is an outsider may account for the objectivity of the stranger which Schuetz (1944: 506) and Simmel (1950:405) have noted. These authors undoubtedly correct if they mean that the stranger looks at the hosts and the world from outside. If, however, by objectivity they mean an unbiased attitude, they would (if the stranger is an average citizen) seem to be wrong. The condition of anomie inherent in the stranger's role is unlikely to permit this. Rather, in such an anxiety-provoking situation one would expect an average citizen to develop and maintain strong, inflexible, "black and white" views and to display "perpetual sensitivity" and "perceptual defense" in keeping with them. If his were extreme, marked perceptual disorganization should result."

However, there is an ambivalence, a cognitive dissonance in my Pakistani participants' mind. They are criticizing and finding some behaviors of Turkish people non-Islamic, but they also do not seem to like the fact that Islam is strictly implemented in their country. Obviously, they find more freedom in Turkey compared to Pakistan.

> "In Pakistan, when a girl and man stand side by side, the surrounding people call people at once" (M, man, 21).
>
> "In Pakistan, there is community pressure" (A, man, 28).

In their interpersonal relationship to the local, they markedly use eyes. Which shows that they are using what Lofland (1973) says "categoric knowing" which is based on visually obtained information. This is also in line with what Simmel says: "Here is something . . . characteristic of the big city. The interpersonal relationships of people in big cities are characterised by a markedly greater emphasis on the use of the eyes than on that of the ears." (Benjamin, 1973, 151, quoted in Frisby, 2013, 78). My participants look at girls' dress, how men urinate, beard of imams, conduct of Salah (one of participants thinks that they do not know how to pray). This is a universal condition in cities; but due to lack of interactions, I think it is more intense for my participants.

Although the Pakistanis are also being targeted by certain criminals, vagabonds, tramps etc., the Syrians face more the xenophobic attitudes from a large segment of the society particularly in forms of verbal harassment, stereotyping, and sometimes even lynching attempts. This can be explained as follows: Since their number is higher (According to UNCHR [04.06.2018]: there are 3,589,384 registered Syrian refugees) and they are visible, they tend to be seen as threat to the local people' jobs, their standard of lives and the social fabric of the society.

Stephen Castles (2003, 20) states that: "The result was a politicization of migration and asylum, marked by heated public debates and competition between the political parties to be toughest on 'illegals'. Extreme-right movements proliferated and racist violence became a serious problem." In Turkey, we see the instrumentalization of immigrants, especially Syrian immigrants by both the ruling and opposition parties. The ruling party used them in international politics, especially in their relationship with the EU. For example, regarding the migrant deal, signed in March 2016, the president Erdoğan says:

> "You don't let my minister into the Netherlands. You revoke the landing rights of my foreign minister. You prevent [us] holding meetings at the General Consulate building, which is my land. But after that you'd expect us to do this [re-admit migrants]. That's not going to happen." (BBC, [31.05.2018])

> "You cried out when 50,000 refugees were at the Kapikule border…You started asking what you would do if Turkey would open the gates. Look at me — if you go further, those border gates will be open. You should know that." (Timur and Nordland, [31.05.2018])

Furthermore, Ayhan Kaya says:

> "The level of popular resentment increases even more in the Southeast Anatolia among the Kurdish and Alevi origin local populations due to the rumours that the government is becoming more likely to demographically instrumentalize Sunni-Muslim-Arabs to counter balance the ethno-nationalist and centrifugal claims of the Kurds." (Kaya, 2016, 1).

When it comes to the opposition parties, we see that they also try to exploit the popular resentment among Turkish society. This can be seen from the comment of the leader of the main opposition party as he once addressed to the Roman people: "You do not take care of me as you do for the Syrians, you do not give me as much as money you give them. They are first-class citizen, I have been here from the time of Fatih (the Conqueror Mehmed II, an Ottoman Sultan from the 15th century) but I am third class citizen" (Sputnik, [08.04.2018]). Ayhan Kaya explains further:

> "The Republican People's Party (CHP) and the Nationalist Action Party (MHP) used a populist discourse scapegoating the Syrian refugees for the political, social and economic ills in Turkey. The Syrian refugees were instrumentalized by both parties to express their critics against the

> AKP, which they blamed for deepening the Syrian crisis in the first place, thus leading to the massive migration of Syrians to Turkey at the expense of Turkish citizens (Ibid., 2016, 9)."

The Syrian participants fell into two ethic categories; Arabs and Kurds. The Kurdish Syrian stated that before they came to Turkey, they did not know much about Turkey. But they had heard that Kurds in Turkey are also discriminated by Turks like they are discriminated in Syria. Therefore, when they are stopped by the police, they prefer to hide their identity for fear of being discriminated. Since they can speak Arabic, they pretend to be Arab. In this way, they avoided any possible trouble. One of my Kurdish Syrian participants say:

> "When you crossed the border from the Afrin side, Turkish soldiers treat you bad because they know you are Kurds but if you enter from the opposition's side, you would not face this" (L, man, 29).
>
> "I ask for job, he says we do not need Syrians, they treat us bad. When they heard I am Kurd, they treat even worse" (D, man, 27).

Therefore, they tend to contact mostly with Kurdish people and they mostly prefer to work in places running by the Kurdish people. This can be explained by cultural intimacy and more particularly by the language that they are sharing.

> "I feel comfortable working with the Kurdish bosses. They trust us more" (M, man, 25).

The fact that they share a lot with the Kurds in Turkey in terms of language, culture and ethnicity is decisive to explain their tendency to develop quicker and deeper relationship with the Kurds but not with Turks or Arabs. They also express that Turks also help them:

> "Kurds are the first who help us when we first came here. Turks also help us. There are bad Kurds and Turks" (I, man, 30).

The more interesting thing I found confirms what Simmel (Simmel, 2008, 314) said a century ago:

> "For a stranger to the country, the city, the race, and so on, what is stressed is again nothing individual, but alien origin, a quality which he has, or could have, in common with many other strangers. For this reason strangers are not really perceived as individuals, but as strangers of a certain type."

My Kurdish Syrian participants tell that before everything else, they are discriminated as Syrian. They are all seen by the local people of Istanbul in the same simple category of their origin, the fact that they all come from Syria. But when some racists who find out that they are Kurdish, the intensity of discrimination is increased. Whether it is true or not, in my Kurdish Syrian participants' minds, there is this fear that they may be discriminated due to their Kurdishness.

When it comes to my Arab Syrian participants, they think that they are not welcomed and appreciated by Turkish society:

> "We see people saying that the Syrian people are coward, dirty and thief" (M, man, 25).

Facing this kind of incidents, they turn to their fellow Syrian friends and spend their time with them and their relatives. Yet, for them, Turkish people are good but not all of them. They state that they all had a good perception of Turkey and the Turkish people before they came to Turkey. This perception has changed due to the discriminatory treatment that they face. For the one who learnt Turkish, the degree of estrangement from Turkish society is higher because their chances to be exposed what has been said about the Syrians arise, in other words they overhear the racist conversations about Syrians. For example:

> "Sometimes they said bad things, I pretend not hearing and proceed on my way" (B, man, 22).

> "I do not want to go out because I face problems. They [local people] do not like us. They (vagabonds in the neighborhood) swear at me and stop me. During lunch, or while being outside, I hear people saying 'why are they (Syrian) doing here, they should go to their home'. When I speak with Turks, when they hear I am Syrian they just leave. We are not eating anyone, we are not dogs. When Turks come to Syria, we treat them good, they do not here. I mostly hide my identity because I fear when a fighting arises, all Turks will attack me. Turks are looking down on us, when we speak they do not care, they make jokes but when we also do, they become angry" (B, man, 29).

Like my Pakistani participants, they also think that the outfits of Turkish girls are too revealing and non-Islamic. I ask if they would a Turkish girl, I received various responses. One of my participants said no on the grounds that such girls are haram (forbidden by religion) due to their way of life and dressing. But interestingly he adds that women' having more freedom is something good. This reveal the ambivalence about Turkish way of life inside his mind by exposing to a culture other than his/her own, the stranger also starts to question his own culture. Other participants say that they would marry but Turkish girls do not want them but rich men.

Keren Wells poses a question which I find useful. She writes: "how do you know who the stranger is in the 'world of strangers' (Lofland, 1973) that is the contemporary city?" (2005, 495). She provides a satisfactory answer as follow:

> "The city is only diverse in the abstract or at a general level, but in the particular, in specific places within the city, the general diversity is divided and space is coded as 'belonging' to specific cultural groups, whether based on class, 'race' or national identity (Merry, 1981). Once space is coded and divided, then the problem of ascribing the boundaries of the familiar and the strange is more or less settled" (Ibid, 497).

As I show before, my participants go to more cosmopolitan part of the city in their spare times. They go there because they feel free. But at the level of locality where

they spend most of their time, they are immediately recognized by the local people. Therefore, it is not a coincidence that they are always spotted and harassed in the neighborhood often by the same people (criminals, vagabonds, tramps). But they are also helped by some people such as the grocer, market keepers or the neighbors who know them:

> "I have this kind of incidents twice a week in my neighborhood. I know them, they are the same people. Once I was walking with a female friend of mine, and they said bad things to my friends 'hey Syrian girls come to my house' and I fought with them" (C, man, 24).
>
> "Our home was burgled three times. They know we are Syrians" (I, man, 30).

This is also in line with Gail Mason's findings. He examines 40 crime allegations (20 records flagged as racist and the other half is homophobic) which are extracted from the Crime Report Information System by the London Metropolitan Police Service. He finds that the perpetrator and victim live in the same neighborhood in the %82,5 of the cases. He concludes that "Taken as a whole, such harassment appears to embody an attempt by young white and/or heterosexual males to physically and symbolically defend the racial and sexual identity of their local territory by policing who is welcome and who is not" (2005, 595).

In the face of injustice, the Pakistanis and Syrians react differently. Although both of them are complaining that they are receiving money lower than the Turkish people, The Syrians seem to resent more. This can be explained as follow: First of all, the Pakistanis see their staying as temporary. Also, they think they have no right to demand more since they are not invited to come. They think they do not belong to here, and they cannot be equal with the owners. However, the Syrians come to here due to the war in their countries. The fact that they do not come here voluntarily affect their way to approach differently to the injustice they have been facing. Furthermore, most of them are not sure about their destiny whether they would return to Syria or whether they would be allowed to stay here. On the other hand, although some of them want to go back when the war cease, the protracted war reduces the likelihood of going back for most of them, and as a result, they plan to stay permanently. This may be an explanation because if they are to stay here, they would like to be accepted equally.

Another explanation is that they believe that Turkey has been receiving money from the EU in order to take care of the Syrians; but the state does not fulfill its responsibilities (I did not hear this directly from my Syrian participants. This argument comes from my Turkish participants. They claimed that the Syrian made such an argument).

Furthermore, in addition to this, they believe that they are exploited by Turkish society. Most of my participants compare standard of living with those of the Syrians who have already reached to the EU countries, especially to Germany. This also leads to the resentment among Syrians who stayed here because after the deal between Turkey and the EU, Turkey shut down the border; the road to the European countries. They wish not be here but Europe.

There is a recurrent phenomenon in the case of the Syrian participants, especially the ones who came at the first wave. They witnessed what would happen if the stranger decides to stay permanently. They said that when we first came, we were welcomed and we were treated well, but later local people changed their attitudes toward us. I think that this happened because Turkish society face the fact that the Syrians may stay permanently due to the prolonged civil wars. Over the course of time the number of Syrians and their visibility increased. Furthermore, the local people became much more uneasy when the Turkish government declared that the Syrians would be granted citizenship. I think after all of these; the society began to show an exclusivist attitude toward the Syrians. Similar reactions to the Pakistanis did not arise because the local people do not see them as a threat since they are considered to be temporary residents of the city.

My Syrian participants like to live in Istanbul. They find it better than the places they lived in Syria. All of them feel secure here, but most of them, although they like Istanbul, want to go back to Syria due to the difficult living conditions and discriminatory attitude they have been facing. Some of them want to go to the EU countries instead of going back to Syria.

For those who want to stay say:

> "Syria does not recover" (C, man, 24).

When it comes to their perception of the city, we should remember Simmel's quotation "Social interaction among human beings is – apart from everything else it is – also experienced as a realization of space" (Simmel 1908/2009c, 545 quoted in Marko, 593). People by their interactions fill space and make it meaningful place which is previously empty.

As I said before, Simmel believes that the numbers of people has an impact on the quality of interactions (Ritzer, 2011, 167). Therefore, thanks to their large numbers,

the Syrians partially managed to divide the space according to practical needs that can be seen in the area of Fatih and especially in the Akşemsettin street. I have witnessed how this street has been transformed from a casual Fatih street to a Syrian landscape where one can see the Syrian restaurants and cafes of highlighted Arabic signs and music. As they have their own places and spaces in Istanbul, they develop a sense of belonging to the city. Of course, these developments will have an impact on the way my participant see the Istanbul, but so far they seems to be isolated from this phenomenon happening by their fellow Syrians due to the reasons given above about the lack of interactions and limited mobility.

The changes in the landscape of the city leads another transformation in the local people' mind, a fear. As Gupta and Ferguson put it:

> "Where "here" and "there" become blurred in this way, the cultural certainties and fixities of the metropole are upset…In this sense, it is not only the displaced who experience a displacement. For even people remaining in familiar and ancestral places find the nature of their relation to place ineluctably changed and the illusion of a natural and essential connection between the place and the culture broken." (Oakes and Prices, 2008, 63)

Lastly, according to one argument: "space not only is a container in which events occur but also shapes what happens and how it" (Kaya, 2006, 425). Almost in every society, as Douglas S. Massey (2002, 349) argues, "social and economic resources are unevenly distributed in space, so where one lives plays a significant role in determining one's prospects for education, health, employment, income, and prestige."

When people leave their community and enter into a new one, they also leave the majority of their social network and "social capital" and thus they have to start from scratch to accumulate it in their new environment and generally against great odds.

Social networks and capital are important for everybody, but it is crucial for strangers. Human beings are social animals; we cannot survive our lives without the help of others. Therefore, relationships matter. The people you know form your social network and social capital. John Field (2003), in his book *Social Capital*, focuses on this concept. He explains that modern life is governed by formal rules; but when it comes to making things happen, people deviate from these formal procedures. People, when they make important decisions, refers to the people who they know and trust since it reduces risk. As he puts it: "Calling on trusted friends, family or acquaintances is much less stressful than dealing with bureaucracies, and it usually seems to work faster and often produces a better outcome" (Ibid., 2).

> "Social capital is the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 119 quoted in ibid., 15).

Alejandro Portes and Julia Sensenbrenner (1993) bring the concept of social capital into the sociology of migration (Fuhse, 2012, 643). They show that the social capital can have both good and bad effects on immigrant groups. For example, "high degrees of connectivity in migrant communities can be detrimental if these communities place emphasis on solidarity and connection to the old home rather than upward mobility in the receiving context" (Ibid., 644). Francis Fukayama also refers to the dark side of social capital "…group solidarity in human communities often purchased at the price of hostility towards out-group members" (Fukuyama, 2001, 8 quoted in Field, 2003, 73). For example, Elias and Scotson, in their study ([1965] 1994) "The Established and The Outsiders" reveal "the social and symbolic alignment of the long-resident inhabitants of an English suburb against the newly arrived 'outsiders' " (Fuhse, 2012, 641). For the authors, internal cohesion is the key difference between two groups. The established developed a favorable collective identity because they know each other for a long time. Accordingly, they have an internal cohesion and they can impose a negative perception on the recent arrivals in order to maintain their group's boundaries. Gordon Hughes, on reflecting this study, claims that "the asylum seeker/refugee in countries like the UK, US, Australia and much of Europe remains represented in dominant discourses as the stranger coded as the dangerous and polluting 'outsider' of the established 'host' communities" (Hughes, 2007, 934).

My participants, due to their limited skills and social capital, are depended on their friends' network as Kaya (2006, 431) explains: "such immigrants are usually place bound, and the situational factors they encounter include certain labor-market opportunities and limitations. Once they determine a specific labor-market area, they are trapped in that locality and become dependent on it because of their limited professional and linguistic skills."

My participants are trapped. They have no contact with outside of their own limited groups. Their choice of residence is not independent of their economic situation. They have to live near their workplaces, even most cases if their bosses allow; they live at their workplaces. Those strangers are forced to live a different Istanbul because the city is not a mere physical construction where everybody tastes the same flavor. In fact, the city is a sociological phenomenon where the distribution of interactions and

economic resources are shaped by various factors. The uneven distribution of social and economic resources across space can affect the lives of the people who has a limited access to them.

5.2.3. The Strategies to Avoid the City

My participants, due to their lack of urban know-how, pursue some strategies to avoid the local people. "Hanging around with their friends" was one of these strategies drew my attention and led me to embark on this study. Both the Pakistani and the Syrians do what Lofland called "Creating Mobile 'Homes': The Traveling Pack":

> "A sufficiently large group provides for its members a kind of mobile "home territory" which they may move about with them from setting to setting. This is possible because a group is (by definition) made up of persons who know one another well and who identify with one another and who thus reciprocally ensure mutual protection and self-confirmation." (1973, 137).

They go out together and this provide them a kind of protective shield against possible danger which can come from strangers in the world of strangers. As we know, there is safety in numbers. Simon N. Herman and Erling O. Schild (1961, 165-7) explain this tendency among strangers; in a new environment, the psychological result is lack of security. Both this insecurity and need for "a social reality given by a group" drive strangers to any available group. This group is probably a stranger-group; "the strangers in the same position" because the host groups cannot fulfil strangers' needs for affiliation and group verification due to various reasons such as language and cultural barriers, and hosts' unwillingness. Accordingly, strangers develop a cohesive group structure. As Simon N. Herman and Erling O. Schild find out, the stranger-group becomes a mediating link between strangers and host societies. They argue that although this is useful for strangers' adjustment, they may have some repercussions because the stranger-group develops a certain perception of host societies and establishes this perception as a norm. In that case, as they put it, "the conformity of the stranger to his group may be dysfunctional to his adjustment to the host society" (1961, 171). This strategy is effective, but it is counterproductive. As Lofland states below:

> "Just as the rural villager, secure in his own territory and surrounded by his own people, may care nothing for the good opinions of persons in surrounding villages (and in fact, may even view a lack of approval on their part as indicative of the superiority of his own group), so too the member of a group in a public setting may be unconcerned about the responses which his behavior elicits from surrounding strangers. The group itself provides all the reassurance and support necessary." (1973, 138).

When one sees them together in the park or encounters them on a street, he or she may feel insecure due to their relatively high number. Furthermore, the local people do not

know much about them; their language, culture and intention. They walk together because they are afraid of being attacked by some criminals. But for an ordinary local person, this can be interpreted differently in the absence of interactions between them and he or she may develop an unpleasant feeling toward them. This was the case for me and it was an "aha moment" for me when I learned the underlying reason for their behavior; the fact that they are also afraid of us. There is another reason for them to walk together because in case they are stopped by the police, there should be at least one person among them who can speak Turkish. In this way, they can communicate with the police and avoid any troubles.

Another strategy for avoiding the city is simply staying inside their houses or go to their friends or relatives' houses. In case of the Syrians, they also go to Syrian restaurants, shops etc. and spend their free time in the neighborhoods which are mostly populated by the Syrians. This is also perceived wrongly by the local people as one of my participants shows:

> "They think only themselves even here, they do not go shopping in Turkish shops but those running by the Syrians. They have established their own neighborhood" (S, woman, 35).

Two of my Syrian participants, who look like Turkish, say that when they need it, they pretend to be Turkish in order to avoid any possible danger. For example, as I said before, one of my Kurdish participants points out that when the police stop them, they speak Arabic in order not to be noticed as Kurds. When it comes to the Pakistani participants, although they cannot hide their identity due to their skin colors, they do not feel insecure compared to the Syrians. This is simply due to the positive attitude by Turkish society. Turkish people show compassion for them because they regard Pakistanis as honest but unlucky people who went through a difficult journey to come here so that they can save money for their family by working without recourse to stealing or other bad things. In the next section, the attitude of Turkish society towards both groups will be covered.

5.3. The Host Perception of the Strangers

The present section will exemplify the host society's perception of the strangers and the underlying reasons for their attitude towards them.

As Koefoed and Simonsen (2011) argue that the stranger is a relational figure. It means that he/she can take different shapes and roles in accordance with contexts in which

they are living. According to Catherine Harris et al.: "the construction of who is a stranger depends on national historical contexts, core values and related visions of the society" (2017,16). Here, I will provide what I found during my interviews with the Turkish people from all walks of life.

The result of my interviews shows that there is a widespread discontent inside the Turkish society against the Syrians while they are neutral about the Pakistanis. In case of Pakistanis, sometimes their reaction to them is even positive in forms of having pity for them. Pakistanis are considered temporary and thus harmless to their jobs, and identity. Furthermore, they are not demanding more and do what they do not want to do (menial and dirty jobs). Therefore, the below reasons are given by Turkish people in an attempt to justify their exclusivity attitude towards Syrian people who came here to save their lives.

5.3.1. "Why Should I Share My Resources with Others?"

Almost everyone explains their resentment about the presence of Syrian strangers in economic terms. I received the harshest comments from the working class who share the same working and living environments with Syrians and are the ones who are affected more in terms of economy. For example, a textile workshop's boss who employs both the Syrians and the Pakistanis and also works with them as a worker says:

> "They should live in their motherland. They reduce the value of labor. The rich benefit from this while low-income families' life is getting harder. Why all these rich Arab countries, Qatar, are not taking any Syrian? In the past, a plasterer takes 100 TL, now it is just 50 TL because Syrian do it at that price. Why should I share my resources with others? I do not want to pay 3000 TL for my rent" (I, man, 35).

Other participants also refer to the economic side of the issue:

> "Since they came, rent prices doubled. I do not love them, I do not" (T, man, 33).
>
> "Those Syrians become troublemakers for us, I wish they would go home so that we get rid of them. We will be pleased if they leave our homeland. Rent prices would be decreased, labor wage would be up" (D, man, 42).

There is a prevalent resentment about the healthcare that the Syrian people are receiving:

> "They are living here without paying taxes. I pay a lot of taxes. I receive a second-class healthcare in my own country" (S, woman, 35).
>
> "Send them all back. They are damaging the healthcare sector. The Syrians say that the EU give you money for us, but you just put in your pocket" (A, man, 43).
>
> "We went to a hospital in the European side. They told us we cannot hospitalize your father because there is no place, all places are spared for the Syrians. We kicked up a fuss and then they accepted us. If you do not give your own citizen priority, I do not care about the rest" (M, woman, 25).

"They went to hospitals free, we cannot go with money. Everything is free to them" (M, man, 38).

"I would like to go to hospital with Syrian identity" (T, man, 33).

5.3.2. "How Can I Trust Someone Who Abandoned His/Her Own Homeland?"

Most of my participants refer to the same argument when they explain why they do not want the Syrians or they cannot trust them. For them, Syrians abandoned their own homeland and this is an unacceptable act of impiety in the eyes of my Turkish participants. This reaction of the Turkish participants is related to their national historical context. We, the people of Turkey, all take proud of the fact that we defend our countries when it was under the attack by great powers during the First World War, at the battle of Çanakkale and later the war of independence. We are culturally inherited that the homeland is sacred because it was watered with the blood of our soldiers. Therefore, for Turkish people, not defending their country against enemy and leaving it is an unforgivable crime. This value is crucial for Turkish people so that they are suspicious against people who do not have it and practice it. For them, if they (Syrians) leave their country in the time of hardship, they will or may do the same if Turkey, one day, needs them.

The attachment to the homeland requires elaborations. By referring to Simmel, Frisby states that the human beings are more strongly attached to on space than on time (Frisby, 1992, 76). People by forms of interactions fill the empty space and give meanings to it. In that way, what we call "space" become a "place," a home and "homeland". As I explained earlier, space can be broken into parts in accordance with our practical needs, therefore, some particular forms of interactions can be associated with particular spaces. As Simmel puts it: "the boundary is not a spatial fact with sociological consequences but a sociological fact that is formed spatially" (Frisby, 1992, 76).

We tend to think culture as if it belongs to particular places on the world map. For example, when we think Sweden, it comes to our minds as an overlapped Swedish place and culture. As we refer before, Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson put it: "the representation of the world as a collection of 'countries,' as on most world maps, sees it as an inherently fragmented space, divided by different colors into diverse national societies, each 'rooted' in its proper place" (1992, 6).

This idea of rootedness is something we have to elaborate on. As covered in theoretical part, Liisa Mallki (1992) reveals the common metaphors (tree and soil) which has been

using to commit people to their so-called respective places. She states that the national order of things is seen as normal or natural order of things. The soil is in this context is "national soil." She points out that considering nationalistic discourse, we see that people tend to think in botanical metaphors in which nations are seen as a grand genealogical tree rooted in the national soil. In this sense, you cannot be part of more than one tree. Therefore, in this thinking, "territorial displacement" is regarded as "pathological" (Ibid., 279). She refers to a 1939 historical survey of refugees and concludes that "the point to be underscored here is that these refugees' loss of bodily connection to their national homelands came to be treated as a loss of moral bearings. Rootless, they were no longer trustworthy as 'honest citizens'" (Ibid., 280)

My Turkish participants refer to this kind of thinking in their explanations to why they do not want to live with the Syrians:

> "If there is a war, you will die but they will take refugees in another country. They do not care about here. They were not born and grown up here. They did not feel belonged to here. For example, we have Kurdish Question but if you asked me whether you prefer to live with the Kurds or the Syrians, one Kurd is more important than 1000 Syrians because a Kurd feel belongingness to this country as they thinks: we are on the same boat. But the Syrians say if this boat sinks, I will go to another one" (I, woman, 40).
>
> "They do not belong to this country. They did not pay the price for this country. They abandoned their own country, they will betray us too" (S, man, 45).
>
> "They do not even like each other. They are not loyal; if someone pay 10 TL extra, they go there for work" (Z, man, 32).

The defending the homeland is a man job for some of my participants because in Turkey women do not do the military service. And the presence of Syrian men here instead of in Syria defending their country are not acceptable for Turkish people:

> "The people (the youth) who are supposed to fight for their country are here, the ones (the elders and women) was supposed to be here are there (Syria). It should be the exact opposite" (A, man, 28).
>
> "How can I trust the people who abandoned their country? (S, woman, 35).
>
> "I first curse those countries caused this war, then, those who left their countries" (C, man, 33).

The fact that Turkish soldiers are involved in the war for bringing stability to Syria and the Syrian presence here does not sound fair for them:

> "Their youth is working here, our soldiers are dying for their country" (I, man, 35).
>
> "One of my friends from the army says that they fuck women here while our soldiers are dying there in their country" (S, man, 40).

A reference to rootlessness surfaces during the interviews, the Turkish participants says they do not trust Syrians because they do not know where they can be found in case of any crimes.

"If they kill someone here, nobody knows their identity or place. How will you catch them?" (I, man, 35).

There are lots of references to lack of morality:

"They damage our moral system. In my neighborhood, there was no theft before. You go out and who is who is not known" (M, man, 38).

"There was a Syrian girl in my class. She was excluded by her classmates, and they justified their actions on the basis of her lack of morality. She was accused of stealing. I tried to fight with this, but I cannot overcome these barriers. I guess children are being exposed to polarized discourses by their families" (G, man, 36).

"In my hometown, there was no that much prostitution in the past" (T, man, 33).

They take an essentialist version of culture and use it as a justification for their exclusion:

There is a cultural gap between us. They do not respect the elders on the bus. Their way of life is different" (S, man, 40).

"They would like to live Syria here. They cannot conform. For example, they move to the buildings in Zeytinburnu and they damage the order of apartments. They leave their doors open. They do not want to learn. Our understanding of Islam is even different. Do I have to live with those people?" (I, woman, 40).

"Their tradition is not suitable with ours. They do not have a care in the world. They do not like working" (I, man, 35).

"They do not get used to here. They do know how to walk in the street" (S, woman, 35).

"We cannot see the Arab culture which we admire and read in the books in Syrians we see on the streets here" (G, man, 38).

"Thanks to the Syrians, our Kurds become French gentlemen. There is no potential of conformance in them" (C, man, 33).

Other participants also convey the same opinion:

"If you come somewhere, you conform to there. They spoil the culture. The ones who come from Aleppo are good because they saw a city culture" (M, man, 38).

"Their presence came to a degree which damage to the society. When there is a issue, they immediately get together for fighting. They do not like working, they have no discipline; they do not come to work on time. They are the army of the uneducated, I do not encounter wise ones. It is unnecessary to study them, here we have Africans and Afghans, have you ever heard that they make troubles? They expect get things without doing nothing. Throughout history, Arabs do nothing and use religion instead" (H, man, 32).

Interestingly, an Uzbek woman, who is also a "stranger", complains about the lack of compliance too:

"They do not know how to behave on the public transportation and on the streets. They speak loudly" (O, woman, 37).

5.3.3. "I am Angry with the Policy-makers, not with the Syrians"

Although, the density of criticism varies, all my participants blame the present government (formed by Justice and Development Party [AKP] that has been ruling country since 2002) for mishandling the issue of Syrians. They used the term state and the government interchangeable, in both cases, they mean the current government. Here,

the root of fear against strangers has a unifying function. Because, personally, my observation is that even the supporters of the government criticize its policy on the Syrians. They say:

> "It is not their fault. It is our state's fault. The state should not have put them among us. It should put them into containers" (S, woman, 35).
>
> "Turkey did not follow a good policy. They let the Syrians spread all over the country. Turkey cannot afford this in terms of security and economy. Those explosions are the example of this. They have to share this burden with international communities. Those Jihadist structures come from Syria. When we look at economic indicators, we see that we at the most difficult stage in the history of the Republic. When we are in need of qualified man power, can we take this much unqualified me? You cannot take people's money and distribute. Each Turkish citizen will have to sacrifice 2000 TL from his/her salary" (G, man, 40).
>
> "The state should have confine them to an area, they should not have let them spread to cities" (S, woman, 40).
>
> The number of the people who came are so high. They direct their anger to the state not to the Syrians because they are not taken with a plan" (Z, woman, 26).
>
> "I do not have a negative feeling about them but I think the policies are not enough. They are not integrated into Turkish society. I do not think we are producing good policies" (F, woman, 24)
>
> "I am not worried about them and I do not see them a lot. I am worried about the state's policies because the Syrians are left unattended. If the necessary policies are not produced, we will see the consequences in social life" (U, man, 26).
>
> "At times of war, I cannot think about having a baby. Those Syrians came here 3 million, now they may be 10 million. The government cannot say the exact number because people will rebel" (Z, man, 32).

They criticize the government for not selecting the "good Syrians":

> "Look at what kind of Syrians the EU took and we took? The good ones went to the EU, the gypsies are all here" (A, man, 28).
>
> It is like a united nation; all poor are here!" (I, man, 35).
>
> "There was a crime report in TV, they say someone foreign national, it is wrong; why you did not say he is Syrian? Because Tayyip (Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the president of Turkey) does not want. The media is concealing the crimes of Syrians" (S, man, 40).

Some of the participants have concerns about the fact that the government may instrumentalize the Syrians in the domestic politics:

> "I have concerns about the instrumentalization of the Syrians in domestic politics. They are settled in the Kurdish-populated areas as a policy of social engineering" (G, man, 36).
>
> "I am not saying that the state should not have taken them, but I do not know whether the policy they have been implementing are right or not. I do not care about identities. The Turkish State can give them citizenship, but they should not be instrumentalized in politics" (D, woman, 30).

5.3.4. "They are Eating Our Girl with Their Eyes!"

Almost all of my male participants consider the Syrian and Pakistani youth (since they are single) as a threat to women. None of the female participants said that they have had such a direct attack from neither Pakistanis nor Syrians. Interestingly, the concern about their women is not specific to only Turkish men but also my Syrian participants

who are married. They also express their concerns about the Pakistani youth, the fact that most of them being single. For example, they all say:

> "What are that much young men doing here; we all have families. At weekends, they spend their time staring at women, after all they are single men" (I, man, 35).
>
> "Mashallah, as soon as they see a girl in the street, they eat them with their eyes" (C, man, 33)
>
> "They look at girls as they themselves are monsters" (S, man, 40).
>
> "A group of Syrians committed verbal harassment to 13/14-year-old-girls, the locals beat them" (S, woman, 40).

Three of my female participants share their concerns about the Syrian in terms of way of life because they think that women are oppressed in Syrian culture. The growing visibility of the women covering themselves from foot to head make them worried about their way of life. They think the normalization of this would pose a threat to their secular way of life.

> "The fact that they (women) are dressed the same type of attire scares me. This type of dressing connotes authoritarian religious regime. I am a secular person. If there was no an Islamist party in power here, I would not see this as a threat" (J, woman, 45).

Also, all the female participants draw attention to the Syrian women who are being exploited by the Turkish men who take them as their second wife or old men who take the young Syrian women as wives. For example, one of my female participants says:

> "I am worried about the Syrian women in Gaziantep who are taken as second wife by men. It is too bad that their vulnerability is being exploited by men" (K, woman, 30).

5.3.5. "They Are Too Dirty…"

According to my interviews and my own observation, the Syrians are considered low in terms of cleaning. Personally, I like the Syrian cuisine, I invite my friends to the Syrian restaurants; but, most of the time, they shrug their shoulders and say no and explains that it is due to their concerns about cleaning. I did not ask for their opinions about whether they consider the Pakistani and the Syrian strangers as dirty. The issue of the uncleanness of the Syrians was raised by the Turkish participants over the course of interviews:

> "You go to park, they eat food and just dump their thrash in the park. You cannot go to the Golden Horn anymore" (M, man, 38).
>
> "They are dirty people. Their culture is different in terms of cleaning" (T, man, 33).
>
> "They live under bad conditions. We could not go into a house due to foul odor" (Z, woman, 26).
>
> "They are too dirty. Once one was working for me, if you ask me, he did not take a bath for three months. He does not change even his t-shirt at that much time" (M, man, 31).

As covered in the theoretical background, Nedim Karakayalı (2006) casts a light over the phenomenon. He draws on Simmel's essay "The Stranger". He says: "strangers often carry out special tasks that no one else in the group is capable of (or willing to) perform" (313). Then, Karakayalı identifies four domains in which strangers are active; "(1) circulation (of goods, money, and information); (2) arbitration and conflict resolution; (3) management or policing of secret/sacred domains; and (4) cleansing the group from its impurities or, more generally, 'dirty jobs'" (313). Karakayalı states that the last domain, which cannot be deduced Simmel's essay, is the most common area of activity for today's strangers. As one of my participants say:

> "In cities, the old inhabitants leave the realm of jobs who require physical job. For example, I read an article yesterday, there is a factory in Mardin, and it cannot find workers even in Mardin. People do not want to this kind of job, therefore, we will encounter more Pakistani and Afghans in the future" (G, man, 36).

Although all bosses who I interviewed say negative things about the Syrians and the Pakistanis, one of them thinks (my observations also confirm it) that if there are no Syrians, it would be impossible to find people to work in textile sector:

> "There is no man, nobody wants to work in textile anymore. People woke up, they do not want to work in this kind of hard works. Everybody employs the Syrians here. If there were no Syrians, one could not find anyone for work because you cannot find natives" (M, man, 31).

One participant adds:

> "They had to come here, the government brought them here, it is the government's fault. The Syrians are being exploited here, when they raise their voices for their right, they become bad for the Turkish society. There can be cultural difference, if I go somewhere, maybe it will not be cleaning but something else will arise in terms of culture. If the Syrians go now, there will be an economic crisis here" (Y, man, 31).

In that way, in the division of labor in nation-states, strangers do the jobs which the local find difficult and dirty. It is the duty of the Pakistani and the Syrian strangers to clean the group from this kind of low-paid, hard and dirty jobs. As Karakayalı says: "Conversely, by performing such tasks, the stranger him/ herself appears as an impure being" (2006, 323). Elias and Scotson's study ([1965] 1994) "The Established and The Outsiders" shows how the established group can impose a negative image on the newcomers in order to maintain their groups' boundaries. Therefore, both Syrians and Pakistanis but especially Syrians are seen dirty. The fact that Syrians are more associated with dirt can be seen as a exclusivist strategy employed by the more cohesive group, Turkish society.

5.4. General Assessment

In our globalized world, geography become dead for most of human beings thanks to cheap flights and instant messaging apps. Freedom of movement along with the advent of internet causes many to question their social reality by exposing them to other social realities, other cultures. This leads to social transformations all around the world. We are now in the middle of a transition from placed-based identities and social organizations to transnational ones. This transition like every social change will not be an easy process. Strangers, as harbinger of these transformation at level of locality, are on the center of attention of the people who are mostly conservative and nationalistic. They want things to stay as they were.

By referring to Ernst Gellers and Benedict Anderson' perspectives on nationalism, Eriksen says that "nations are ideological constructions seeking to forge a link between (self-defined) cultural group and state..." (Eriksen, 2010, 120). As scholars point out, "cultural racism is embedded in the language of nationalism. It is a language that is performed with symbolic power and that transforms the 'other' into an enemy of the nation" (Koefoed and Simonsen, 2011, 349). Therefore, my participants always refer to cultural difference as a legitimate tool to exclude the Syrians and the Pakistanis as seen above.

Most of my participants criticized the government due to its incapability to maintain the boundary between us and them. Interestingly, without strangers, boundaries cannot be drawn. As Koefoed and Simonsen explains: "In order to create, define and invent themselves as familiar spaces and as spaces of belonging, nations need their opposites" (2011, 347). In this respect, nation-state is a limited construction because it cannot include everyone. This can be seen from one of my participants'opinon:

> "Syria is not the only country where there is a war, in this logic, we Turkey should take all of them. I do not support the idea of giving them citizenship, we want to be citizen of any countries, but we cannot. I do not like the idea of someone becoming that much easy a citizen" (M, woman, 25).

Simmel also points out the nature of relation to the stranger; people have "only certain more general qualities in common" with strangers, "…whereas the relation with organically connected persons is based on the similarity of just those specific traits which differentiate them from the merely universal" (Simmel, 1908, 313). In my participant's view, the general qualities which they tie them with Syrians can tie them with almost

everyone. As Simmel says: "A similarity so widely shared could just as easily unite each person with every possible other" (Ibid, 314). Therefore, it becomes implausible to prefer Syrians over the others.

My Turkish participants, in the beginning of the civil war, felt close to the Syrians and thus welcome them. As time went by, when the number of Syrian increased, they started to question their presence in Turkey. They start to think that there are ongoing wars all over the world, they cannot give shelter to all of them. Some participants point out the fact that we have not solve our people's problem yet. For example, the economic conditions of people who are living in the southern part of Turkey are not good. For them, we cannot afford including, integrating and feeding them.

Furthermore, I want to emphasize that some of my participants seem to accept the Syrian presence in Turkey. These people fall into two groups. The first one has no connection with neither the Syrians nor the Pakistanis because they live in, let's say, protected areas of high economic standards and status. Simply, they have no interactions with neither them nor other strangers of the city. Therefore, they approach the issue in terms of human rights, economic stability and integration. They do not show any aggressive or xenophobic attitude, unlike the working-class people do. The second one is the people who received good education, went abroad and know what being stranger is like. The second one accepts the realities of a cosmopolitan city. This second group wants the situation of the Syrian and the Pakistani strangers to be improved and necessary steps to be taken. One of my participants states:

> "My considered opinion, those people forced to come here under the difficult conditions, and nobody came if they had not to; I know that from my experience that I have been abroad with my family. I understand them, they took the road without knowing anything. We visited families in Balat, there is a little home shared by 3-4 families. There was this old woman whose home was hit by a bomb and her leg was wounded. When you see this, you want to do something…I think we should think about unrecorded ones; there are children who do not receive education and they pose a threat for the future. They live under bad condition, they can do different things as they see us happily and not caring about them in the future" (T, woman, 26).

> "I do not have any negative opinion about them, but I find the government's policies inadequate. I want them to be integrated well. When I say integration, I do not just see from immigrants' perspective, Turkish society also should be integrated to the new situation and accept it. That's why, I think projects should be done for social peace. Otherwise, there would be some conflicts. For example, generally, the employers prefer the Syrians since it is cheaper and this leads Turkish workers to be less employed. And this situation is seen as those people come and take our jobs. Furthermore, the landlords put price up and rent to the Syrians even bad houses and overcharged them. But this is perceived by the society as the prices are increased due to the Syrians. They do not see the source of the problems, they simply direct their grievances to the Syrians as if they are the real perpetrator. Also, there is a possible danger waiting us; the children who do not go to school. After a few years, they will be a group without education and job, they will pose a serious menace to society; an uneducated and angry group" (F, woman, 24).

I covered the main reasons of why the local people are afraid of strangers in the theoretical part. As Simmel says, in order to deal with the constant and fleeting nature of reality, we human beings impose some forms, patterns, and boundaries upon it (Ritzer, 2011, 166). As Catherine Harris et al. put it: "People produce boundaries to navigate their lives through complex social reality" (2017, 30). Over the course of time, we start to see these human product of boundaries and categorizations as natural. Since the stranger "is not radically committed to the unique ingredients and peculiar tendencies of the group"(Simmel, 1908, 1-2), his presence is perceived as a threat. From the group's point of view, strangers are the people who do not respect the boundaries of the group and instead come with their own ones. This makes the group members anxious because we are so deeply embedded to our own categories that we cannot accept that our social world is not the sole reality, instead it is constructed by previous generations. This means they can be reconstructed. Bauman explains why we fear from strangers:

> "In addition to representing the 'great unknown' which all 'strangers in our midst' embody, these particular outsiders, the refugees, bring home distant noises of war and the stench of gutted homes and scorched villages that cannot but remind the settled how easily the cocoon of their safe and familiar (safe because familiar) routine may be pierced or crushed and how deceptive the security of their settlement must be. The refugee, as Bertolt Brecht pointed out in Die Landschaft des Exils, is 'ein Bote des Unglucks' ['a harbinger of ill-tidings']" (Bauman 2004a, 66-67 quoted in Hughes, 2007, 935).

Strangers are the people who by their mere presence can destruct our "schemes of comprehension". As Triyakian says "he is a potential disorganizer of the familiar, one who can turn things or the order of things 'inside out.' " (1973, 49).

Collins & Makowsky state, people see the world through " a veil of their own perceptual forms". Simmel believes that society is "an invisible world" that operates on its own law which can be found in the flow of culture that shapes each new generation in accordance with the past generation, and in forms and patterns of interactions between people which have effect on what may they do personally (Colins & Makowsky, 1993, 167). Therefore, we build our entire life on these patterns, categories, and boundaries, value systems that all constitute what we call our culture and we cannot let those categories and boundaries collapse or blurred by those strangers whom we do not know. Furthermore, those strangers, in the national order of things, are considered representative of other nation cultures, and in other words, they are mostly considered enemies. Simply, consciously or unconsciously people are aware of that without boundaries their world may fall into chaos. Thus, they can resort even to violence in order to protect them as we

see all around the world. In a way, they are the litmus test for the groups' confidence. Accordingly, the Turkish society's attitude toward the Pakisanis and the Syrians can be read as an attempt to preserve their cultures. However, as we know that the notion that culture is something bounded, fixed, and reified is wrong. As Don Mitchell (1995) says culture involves power relations: when strangers do their designated roles; purifying the groups from the dirty things, nobody care about them. But when they demand equal rights, an exclusivist attitude arises and the established group use the notion of reified culture for a justification. However, culture have not been as such throughout history. Instead, it is in a constant flow and reshaping.

In terms of relation, both the Pakistanis and the Syrians are not like Simmel's stranger. The relationship they are in with the local people is not a "positive relation". They have not freedom of coming and going. They did not decide to cross borders freely, they are first forced due to the unequal nature of global marketplace and the civil war. In both cases, they are relegated into unfair positions. They go through a painful process; left their beloved ones and social capital behind and put their lives into danger at the hand of human traffickers. Furthermore, when they reach their destinations, they face people who unhappy with their presence. They face discrimination and hatred while they do the least-preferred jobs, the dirty jobs of societies. In addition to this, by exposing to a new culture, they also experience the process that undermine their "previous unproblematic cultural existence." It is almost impossible for them to learn the new culture because once you are aware of other cultures, you see the inconsistencies in them and cannot think as usual. As Schutz puts it: "the cultural pattern of the approached group is to the stranger not a shelter but a field of adventure, not a matter of course but a questionable topic of investigation, not an instrument for dis- entangling problematic situations but a problematic situation itself and one hard to master" (1944., 506).

They are considered ungrateful by the host societies just because they do not see the world as they see and did not adopt to the host societies' cultural patterns. For example, I occasionally hear that people stereotype Syrians as lazy people. Actually, when I first go to the Syrian restaurant, I also was surprised with their service time. Unlike Turkish ones, they were not fast, and it was difficult for me to wait those delicious Syrian food to eat. But this is not because they are lazy people; it is their way of being, it is in their culture. It is just as normal as we do things hectically here. This is how they do in Syria.

5.4.1 An Assessment by a Simmelian Stranger

I made an interview with a woman who I think fall into the definition of the Simmelian stranger. Therefore, I think her evaluation of the issue would be more objective.

She first came to Turkey for her education. She is employed by a company due to her excellence in interpersonal communication, managerial and language skills. She is not a citizen and the company went to great strengths to employ here (in Turkey, it is easier to employ citizens than foreigners) because they cannot find someone with those skills. Like Simmel's stranger, although she "has gone no further, has not quite got over the freedom of coming and going" (Simmel, 1908a, 312). She has not settled here permanently, but she has not decided where to go yet. As opposed to my Syrian and Pakistani strangers, she develops good relations with the Turkish society and it can barely be noticed that she is not native by her appearance, she has a relatively good Turkish. These all make her a perfect observer who can approach the issue of strangers in Turkey with objectivity. But her objectivity does not come from mere detachment, it is "composed of remoteness and nearness, indifference and involvement" (Ibid, 313). She describes the situation as follows:

> "How can I say, the society, I think did not accept them that much actually how it was expected because the government invited them and tried to protect them. However, I do not see that the positive feedback from the people? Some people, of course, they are trying to treat them nice but most of them as far as I could understand they are like 'what they are doing here? Taking our places, they are taking our job' and this is what makes me really sad. In some hand, people here, of course not everyone, I am not saying, but in general, people do not treat them nice and they do not behave how they should because just put yourself in their places; you are trying to escape and save your life, wife and your family, and somebody closing doors for you. You can always talk 'oh my God these people... we need to help them…' but this is the opportunity for you to help them since they are living here. But they are talking negative. It is easy to talk from far away. For example, we are talking about Palestinian, we are feeling so sad but when we have opportunity to have these Palestinians, in a way, to invite them to live here, to give them some opportunities and it's hard, it's really hard to do that much. It's easy to send them some financial help but please don't come close to here" (K, woman, 26).

She also draws attention to the feeling among Turkish people that there are more foreign people than Turkish people in the city.

> "I actually had one experience with my really close friend from university. Exactly, she made a comment that made me really frustrated when she said 'oh my god Istanbul is full of foreigners. Even its more foreigners than Turkish we cannot live here anymore.' When you go to the center; Aksaray, Fatih, you know there a lot of people (Syrians); they are begging on the street and this kind of things made me frustrated especially because I was a refugee in the past and I know how it was really hard to survive and I know how much my mother was working to feed my family since my father was in my county fighting for our country" (K, woman, 26).

This is a common theme I received from my participants for example:

> "You go to street and there are no locals, everybody is a stranger. They are more than us" (M, man, 38).
>
> "I feel myself as refugee in my own country" (C, man, 33).

She, by exposing a culture other than hers, makes sense of her own culture, we can see this from her comparison of two countries:

> "The concept of word inşallah, in my country, it means if I tell you inşallah, it really means inşallah like I will come only storm, or only accident, me being at hospital means that I would not come. When I came here people say inşallah and nothing happens. They like leaving everything at the hands of God. Many times, we agree nine o'clock and people are coming at ten o'clock" (K, woman, 26).

And she continues:

> "I am coming from more liberal society, you need to respect the place where you are, although I don't like some things. Okay, let me give you an example, according to our religion that people believe; everybody should behave and practice religion for themselves and do not try to correct people because you don't know what is the correct. But, here, what I see a lot of times in mosques especially women; they are coming, and they are saying to you that you are praying wrongly you should do this, you need to wear this …they are trying to correct you which I think it's really wrong because I mean did I tell you anything ? If I did not ask for your opinion that gives you right and plus you don't know this people, but they come and say to you your way of praying is wrong... who are you to tell me ?… how can I tell you, I felt more alive in Izmir just because it was a little bit closer to the way of my country because nobody was …" (K, woman, 26).

Her presence is also appreciated by the local people like Simmel's stranger:

> "When they hear I am from Bosnia, they say: 'O my god Bosnia is our brotherly country' and they always want to learn something new from there, they always try to be so nice" (K, woman, 26).

She does not avoid the city, on the contrary:

> "I go to Sultan Ahmet and pretend like I am tourist, you know pretending with these buyers they are trying to sell me these things which I already know. They tricked me long time ago not anymore. When I speak that sometimes prices can be changed for me. They think if I am a foreigner I have money you know. I got used to this living standard. I know where to buy, what to buy… I am coming from the capital but a really small city when you compare with Istanbul, here you can always discover new places. Yes, it gives me freedom to taste new things you know just to feel…" (K, woman, 26).

Although she has a fluent Turkish, the moment she speaks, she is immediately identified. The stranger almost every time fall into an inevitable existential trap. Tibor Dessewffy explains what my participant's experience:

> "The learning of the unlearnable means much more than the inaccessibility of the past: it is the general existential experience of the stranger. The fabric of culture keeps fraying instead of wrapping protectively around us; the possibility of making mistakes exists in even the most perfect action. Re- member the foreigner who speaks a language with absolute precision and subtlety, and yet betrays himself by his own perfect pronunciation, for it is the clumsiness and negligence in the use of the native tongue that are impossible for a foreigner to learn." (1996, 606)

As a result, her strangeness is quite different from the Pakistanis and the Syrians; she is an educated woman who do a job that the local people cannot. Accordingly, she is not perceived as a threat by them since she does a skilled job which cannot be done by

the locals. Furthermore, the positive image of Bosnia in the mind of Turkish society is also another reason for Turkish people's positive attitude towards her. On the other hand, The Pakistanis and The Syrians are the strangers described by Alfred Schutz (1944). They are the people who want to be at least tolerated by the group they approach.

6. CONCLUSION

In the present thesis, I studied two stranger groups in modern-day Istanbul by applying Georg Simmel's concept of the stranger and its different formulations developed mostly by the post-Simmelian scholars. In order to study the Syrians and Pakistanis as strangers/undocumented immigrants of modern-day Istanbul, I gathered my data through the semi-structured interview method; I also relied on my partial observation. In the thesis, my purpose was to portray a specific part of urban life in Istanbul by showing how strangeness has been created by the interaction or lack of interaction between the host society and the stranger groups. This explains why the host society treat differently to the Pakistani and Syrian strangers. I provide the strangers' perception of the host society and vice versa.

In the second chapter of the present thesis, following the introductory chapter, I discussed my methodology in terms of positivist and interpretivist paradigms. As part of the interpretivist paradigm, I preferred to use the qualitative research method. Also, I explained my preference to use the semi-structured interview method which provides both researchers and participants a maneuvering space that produce fruitful results.

In the third chapter, I focused on Georg Simmel and his sociology in order to understand "stranger" as a sociological category. Unlike the other founding fathers of sociology, his level of analysis is based not on large-scale but small-scale forms of exchanges and individual interactions. I discussed how, for Simmel, interactions between individuals occupy a central role in the formation of complex social structures. For him, society emerges because of ceaseless interactions between people.

For Simmel, being stranger is a specific form of interaction. I detail how Simmel explains the importance of numbers and distance in human interactions. As for numbers, there is no independent group structure in a two-person (dyad) group. When one member decides to leave, the group ceases to exist. However, when a third person enters into a dyad, a significant transformation occurs; now an independent group structure can arise along with social roles and responsibilities. The third member can pit other members against each to benefit or it can play a mediator role to resolve conflicts. As

for distance, it decides what is important for us. A value of something is determined by its distance to us. If something is too close and easy to get or too far and impossible to get, it is not valuable for us. It is valuable when it is attainable but with great effort. In this regard, strangers represent the third person who enters into a group with a specific kind of distance.

For Simmel, to be a stranger is a positive relation since they bring qualities into a group, which otherwise cannot be produced within the group. Also, they can see things as they are since they are not tied by the tendencies of the group. However, the literature of sociology of stranger also shows other possibilities. There is a distance between strangers and group members, which makes them stranger; when they decide to settle permanently, to close the distance, they lose their position as stranger (as a positive relation). Accordingly, in the eyes of the host society, they become less significant. Even so, they are still strangers. Now, their relation to the host society change from positive relation to a negative one or at best a neutral one. I thus argue that the Syrians who likely to stay in Turkey would face this situation.

My findings confirmed Simmel's point that strangers are not considered as individual beings but as a particular type such as Pakistanis or Syrians which are full of stereotypes. They are seen as people with no history and individuality. In this regard, while a personally bad Pakistani can receive a positive treatment from the society due to his/her being Pakistani, a good Syrian can face a negative attitude due to his/her being Syrian. For example, although my Syrian participants are composed of Arab and Kurds, the host society does not see their ethnic differences and name all of them as Syrians. "Syrians" became a value-laden word. Syrians face the same discriminatory attitude. Their personal differences are not recognized by the host society.

In this thesis, I also relied on some scholars after Simmel. I especially considered Nedim Karakayalı's work that draws upon Simmel's stranger and modifies it to portray today's stranger-relations. His work shows that in today's world, immigrants who perform unskilled jobs "known as dirty job" or those who perform skilled jobs represent the contemporary strangers. These jobs are not done by the host society because they are regarded too dirty or they require some sort of skill. The present thesis aimed at demonstrating this aspect, too.

Moreover, I took Simmel's another argument into consideration, the cultural aspect of being a stranger: when strangers traverses in space, they carry their own cultures with themselves. In this regard, even their mere presence poses a threat to the group's social organization, ways of life and perceptions of the world. Strangers, I argue, question everything that is unquestionable for the group members. Since they are not deeply committed to the group's values, they are not seen loyal and trustable. Instead, they are seen as outsiders and enemies. Therefore, in times of crisis, they are the first who would be put blame on. As such, the extreme right wing in Turkey stigmatized the Syrians.

I focused on people's assumption about cultures and nations as rooted in soil. The cultural dimension of globalization was discussed to shed a light on culture as a spatial concept. At first, there is a fear of the disappearance of cultural variations, later it is witnessed that global cultural forms are interpreted from local vantage-points. However, globalization leads to an awareness that cultural difference is decreasing. This makes people anxious about their culture and way of life and thus more attached to it. I maintained that the idea of overlapped space and culture is problematic since it implies that each country on a map is rooted in its own proper place. In this discourse, being nomad or mobile is a deviation. In a nation state, being rooted is not just normal but also an indication of the morality. Furthermore, one cannot be a part of another society since nation is seen as a genealogical tree rooted in the soil. As a figure of mobility, the strangers are the ones who expose the fault lines of societies facing fluidity and hybridity in the age of globalization. The situation of the Pakistani and the Syrian immigrants are described in a world defined by hyper-mobility and transnational migration, a world where local people firmly cling to their culture in the face of constant change as if it is fixed and rooted in place. I demonstrated that it is a world where strangers are not welcomed. By considering all these points, I wanted to understand why the host society treat the Syrians differently from the Pakistanis.

Like scholars who have touched similar issues, here I asked: "why are they strangers?" I have look at if there is a difference between the Pakistanis and the Syrians in terms of their circumstances, which made them leave their homelands and seek a better life on another lands. While the Syrians fled from the war in Syria, the Pakistanis came when poverty in Pakistan hit them. As other scholars have pointed out, the line between forced and economic immigration blurred since the failed economies also mean to have

weak states, under which people had difficult lives and face violation of their rights. Therefore, I argued that both the Pakistanis and Syrians are forced immigrants.

My interviews revealed that there is a lack of interactions or a limited interaction between my participants and the host society. As it is known that city is not a mere spatial formation. It is a space filled by limitless interactions. Therefore, without interacting each other, strangers and the local people do not experience the same city. In other words, without interaction, not only society but also city does not arise. Together with the blasé attitude of the local people in Istanbul and the deepening division of labor in the city, lack of money/time and language/psychological barriers explain why there is lack of interaction between the two. It can be derived from my interviews that my participants are exploited at their workplaces. They receive less money than the Turkish workers and they work six days a week from 8 a.m. to 8-10 p.m. In other words, they do not socialize since it is not affordable in terms of money and time.

When it comes to the Pakistanis and Syrians' perception of the host society, they show the characteristics of a stranger. Generally, they do not have a bad perception of the host society, but they tell about the problems that they face, such as exploitation at work and attacks by city criminals. They mostly see the cultural difference between themselves and the Turkish society within the lens of religion, Islam. It is hard to draw a line between religion and culture in their case. They see their cultural reality as the only reality and act accordingly, which is also a product of the lack of interaction.

As my interviews have shown, although the Pakistanis receive a positive or at least a neutral treatment from the Turkish society, the Syrians receive a negative one, especially from the lower segment of the society. My participants thus tend to develop strategies to avoid the city and the society. For example; they go out as a group, in this way, they want to take guard against the city criminals. Since they are undocumented, they look ways to hide themselves. They for example prefer to stay at home unless they have things to do outside. If they go outside, they choose to go to cosmopolitan places. Furthermore, the ones who can pretend to be Turkish behave as such to avoid any problems or discriminations.

Globalization in general and strangers in particular became the harbinger of the disappearance of boundaries between cultures and spaces. As this happens, those who cling to traditional values and advocate the nation state respond in a conservative and

reactionary way. The host society especially the working class who are conservatives or nationalists discriminate the Syrians, but not the Pakistanis (since they are considered as temporary). They seem to try to purify the national space from outsiders/strangers and fortify the existing border between them and outsiders.

Again, in the final chapter of the thesis, I illustrated how the Turkish society justify their attitudes towards these undocumented groups. The Syrians are accused of betraying the sacred homeland which they fled from. In the eyes of the Turkish people, they commit the worst of the crimes. For that reason, they are seen as traitors and thus they cannot be trusted. The same attitude is not much shown towards the Pakistanis because for the Turkish society they came in order to earn their livelihoods. Furthermore; instead of discriminatory attitude, they are facing a positive treatment due to their economic situations.

I maintained that nation-state exists at the expense of strangers. It is a limited and imagined community since it cannot include everybody. Therefore, the Syrian strangers, as a representative of another nation, are not included. In this regard; when the Syrians decided to stay permanently and demand equal rights, an exclusivist and discriminatory attitude began to arise. In this nationalistic thinking, the only role for strangers to play is that they would do dirty jobs or jobs that the owners (the citizens) of the country do not want to do. They are not seen in a position to make the same claims that the citizens would make.

I find that the Pakistanis do not seem to stay here permanently. They do not feel that they are belong to Turkey and therefore unlike some Syrians, they do not demand equal rights. One of my Pakistani participants, by referring to the Syrians, says that if we want that much rights, Turkish people would not also like us staying here. The Syrians seem to be trapped here. As the war still has not stopped yet, they do not want to go back to Syria. Since the European countries do not welcome their entrances, they are left not many options but to stay in Turkey where they want to have equal treatment or at least toleration.

I also argued that both groups do not develop much relations with the host society. The lack of interaction is the main problem that produce cultural and racial stereotypes, which eventually lead to more conflicts. Both groups, live their lives in a restricted and isolated areas of Istanbul, which they share with fellow strangers only. However, what

really makes a city a city is people's interactions that fill the space and make it a place, a home, a homeland. This is not much the case for my Pakistanis and Syrian participants. However, some Syrians in Istanbul have begun place-making activities. They have constructed small Syrian streets thanks to their huge numbers. In the future, if they stay, they likely fill the space and make it a place for themselves. If both sides are able to interact each other, a healthier city life would be possible.

As a conclusion, I would like to finish my thesis with advice for the future studies. I studied the relationship between the stranger groups and the host society but there is an ongoing tension between the Pakistanis and the Syrians who live in Turkey. This and also the changing relationship between the Arab Syrians and the Kurdish Syrians in their new settings would be the topics for future studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, Theodore. 1959. The contribution of Georg Simmel: A reappraisal. **American Sociological Review**. p. 473-479. American Sociological Association.

Alexander, Jeffrey Charles. 2004. Rethinking strangeness: from structures in space to discourses in civil society. Thesis eleven, 79(1), p. 87-104. SAGE Publications. DOI: 10.1177/0725513604046959

Alinia, Minoo. 2004. Spaces of diasporas. Kurdish identities, experiences of otherness and politics of belonging. Doctoral dissertation. Göteborg University.

Axelrod, David. 1977. Toward an appreciation of Simmel's fragmentary style. **The Sociological Quarterly.** 18(2), p. 185-196. Wiley.

BBC. **Erdogan threatens to scrap EU-Turkey migrant deal.** Retrieved from: http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-39294776 [31.05.2018].

Berg, Bruce Lawrence. 2007. **Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.** California State University: Allyn and Bacon.

Blaut, James Morris. 1992. The theory of cultural racism. **Antipode.** 24(4), p. 289-299.

Bunkers, Sandra Schmidt. 2003. Understanding the stranger. **Nursing Science Quarterly.** 16(4), p. 305-309. Sage Publications. DOI: 10.1177/0894318403257124

Castles, Stephen. 2003. Towards a sociology of forced migration and social transformation. **Sociology.** 37(1), p. 13-34.

Collins, Randall, and Michael Makowsky. 1993. **The discovery of society.** McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Dahinden, Janine. 2010. The dynamics of migrants' transnational formations: Between mobility and locality. In Bauböck, Rainer, and Thomas Faist. 2010. **Diaspora and transnationalism: Concepts, theories and methods.** Amsterdam University Press.

D'Andrea, Fabio. 2009. Georg Simmel from a different standpoint. Cultural variants and the limits of interpretation. **International Review of Sociology.** 19(2), p. 227-240. DOI:10.1080/03906700902833437

Darnton, Robert. 1999. **The great cat massacre: And other episodes in French cultural history.** Basic Books.

Dessewffy, Tibor. 1996. Strangerhood without boundaries: An essay in the sociology of knowledge. **Poetics today.** p. 599-615. Duke University Press.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2010. **Ethnicity and nationalism: Anthropological perspectives.** Pluto Press.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2015. **Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropolog.** Pluto Press.

Field, John. 2003. **Social capital.** Routledge.

Frisby, David. 1992. **Simmel and since. Essays on Georg Simmel's social theory.** London and New York: Routledge.

Frisby, David. 2002. **Georg Simmel (Key Sociologists).** Taylor & Francis Group/Books.

Frisby, David. 2013. **Fragments of Modernity (Routledge Revivals): Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer and Benjamin.** Routledge.

Fuhse, Jan A. 2012. Embedding the stranger: Ethnic categories and cultural differences in social networks. **Journal of Intercultural Studies.** 33(6), p. 639-655. DOI: 10.1080/07256868.2012.735109

Goodstein, Elizabeth S. 2012. Simmel's Stranger and the Third as Imaginative Form. In Colloquia Germanica (Vol. 45, No. 3/4, pp. 238-262). **Narr Francke Attempto Verlag GmbH Co.** KG.

Grillo, Ralph D. 2003. Cultural essentialism and cultural anxiety. **Anthropological theory.** 3(2), p. 157-173. Sage publications. [1463-4996(200306)3:2;157–173;033159]

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1992. Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. **Cultural anthropology.** 7(1), p. 6-23. Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the American Anthropological Association.

Harris, Catherine, Lucy Jackson, Aneta Piekut, and Gill Valentine. 2017. Attitudes towards the 'stranger': negotiating encounters with difference in the UK and Poland. **Social & Cultural Geography.** 18(1), p. 16-33. DOI: 10.1080/14649365.2016.1139165

Herman, Simon N., and Erling O. Schild. 1961. The stranger-group in a cross-cultural situation. **Sociometry.** 24(2), p. 165-176.

Hughes, Gordon. (2007). Community cohesion, asylum seeking and the question of the 'stranger.' Towards a new politics of public safety. **Cultural Studies.** 21(6), p. 931-951. DOI: 10.1080/09502380701470676

Jackson, Lucy, Catherine Harris, and Gill Valentine. 2017. Rethinking concepts of the strange and the stranger. **Social & Cultural Geography.** 18(1), p. 1-15.

Jupp, Victor. 2006. **The Sage dictionary of social research methods.** Sage.

Karakayali, Nedim. 2006. The uses of the stranger: Circulation, arbitration, secrecy, and dirt. **Sociological theory.** 24(4), p.312-330. American Sociological Association. 1307 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005-4701.

Kaya, Ilhan. 2005. Identity and space: The case of Turkish Americans. **Geographical Review.** 95(3), p.425-440.

Koefoed, Lasse, and Kirsten Simonsen. 2011. 'The stranger', the city and the nation: on the possibilities of identification and belonging**. European Urban and Regional Studies.** 18(4), p.343-357. Sagepub. DOI: 10.1177/0969776411399343

Lazaridis, Gabriella, and Eugenia Wickens. 1999. "Us" and the "Others": Ethnic minorities in Greece. **Annals of Tourism Research.** 26(3), p.632-655. PII: S0160-7383(99)00008-0

Levine, Donald N., Ellwood B. Carter, and Eleanor Miller Gorman. 1976. Simmel's influence on American sociology I. **American Journal of Sociology.** 81(4), p.813-845. The University of Chicago Press.

Levine, Donald N., Ellwood B. Carter, and Eleanor Miller Gorman. 1976. Simmel's influence on American sociology II. **American Journal of Sociology.** 81(5), p.1112-1132. The University of Chicago Press.

Levitt, Peggy, and B. Nadya Jaworsky. 2007. Transnational migration studies: Past developments and future trends. ***Annu. Rev. Sociol.*** *33*, p.129-156.

Lofland, Lyn H. 1973. **A World of Strangers; Order and Action in Urban Public Space.** New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Malkki, Liisa. 1992. National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees. In Oakes, Timothy, and Patricia L. Price (Eds.). 2008. **The cultural geography reader.** Routledge.

Marotta, Vincent. 2012. Georg Simmel, the stranger and the sociology of knowledge. **Journal of Intercultural Studies.** 33(6), p. 675-689. DOI: 10.1080/07256868.2012.739136

Mason, Gail. 2005. Being hated: stranger or familiar? **Social & Legal Studies.** 14(4), p. 585-605. SAGE Publications. DOI: 10.1177/0964663905057596

Massey, Doreen. 1994. A Global Sense of Place. In Oakes, Timothy, and Patricia L. Price. (Eds.). (2008). **The cultural geography reader.** Routledge.

Massey, Douglas S. 2002. Residential Segregation. In Goldberg, David Theo, and John Solomos. (Eds.). 2002. **A companion to racial and ethnic studies**. p: 233-255. Blackwell.

Mathers, Nigel Joseph, Nicholas Jeremy Fox, and Amanda Hunn. 1998. **Using interviews in a research project.** NHS Executive, Trent.

McLemore, S. Dale. 1970. Simmel's 'stranger': a critique of the concept. **Pacific Sociological Review.** 13(2), p. 86-94. University of California Press.

Meintel, Deirdre A. 1973. Strangers, homecomers and ordinary men. **Anthropological Quarterly.** p. 47-58. The George Washington University Institute for Ethnographic Research.

Meyer, Julie. 1951. The stranger and the city. **American Journal of Sociology.** p. 56(5), 476-483. The University of Chicago Press.

Mitchell, Don. 1995. There's no such thing as culture: Towards a reconceptualization of the idea of culture in geography. **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers.** p. 102-116. Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers).

Morrell, Gareth. 2008. Globalisation, Transnationalism and Diaspora**. Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees.** School of Social Science at City University, London.

Muller, Jerry Z. 2002. The Philosopher of Money. **The Wilson Quarterly**. (1976-), 26(4), p. 52-60.

Naidoo, Loshini. 2012. **Ethnography: An introduction to definition and method.** In An ethnography of global landscapes and corridors. InTech.

Nash, Dennison. 1963**.** The ethnologist as stranger: an essay in the sociology of knowledge. **Southwestern Journal of Anthropology.** 19(2), p. 149-167.

Oakes, Timothy, and Patricia L. Price. (Eds.). 2008. **The cultural geography reader.** Routledge.

O'Reilly, Karen. 2012. **Ethnographic methods.** second edition. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ossewaarde, Marinus. 2007. Cosmopolitanism and the Society of Strangers. **Current Sociology.** 55(3), p. 367-388. DOI: 10.1177/0011392107076081

Pathak, Anil, and Charatdao Intratat. 2012. Use of semi-structured interviews to investigate teacher perceptions of student collaboration. **Malaysian Journal of ELT Research,** 8(1), p. 1.

Paulos, Eric, and Elizabeth Goodman. 2004. The familiar stranger: anxiety, comfort, and play in public places. **In Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems.** p. 223-230. ACM.

Phillips, Timothy, and Philip Smith. 2006. Rethinking urban incivility research: Strangers, bodies and circulations. **Urban Studies.** 43(5-6), p. 879-901. Routledge. DOI: 10.1080=00420980600676196

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2015. **Globalization and culture: Global mélange.** Rowman & Littlefield.

Ricoeur, Paul, & Alison Scott-Baumann. 2010. Being a stranger. **Theory, culture & society.** 27(5), p. 37-48. Sage. DOI: 10.1177/0263276410380425

Ritzer, George. 2011. **Sociological theory.** The McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc. New York USA.

Rogers, Everett M. 1999. Georg Simmel's concept of the stranger and intercultural communication research. **Communication Theory.** 9(1), p. 58-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00162.x

Royan, Media. 2012. Transnationalism Practices by the Kurdish Diaspora Elite -The role of the Swedish Kurdish diaspora elite. Master's thesis. Stockholm University.

Rundell, John. (2014). Imagining cities, others: Strangers, contingency and fear. **Thesis Eleven.** 121(1), p. 9-22. DOI: 10.1177/0725513614528783

Salomon, Albert, and D. Jaworski. 1995. Georg Simmel Reconsidered**. International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society.** 8(3), p. 361-378. Springer.

Saukko, Paulo. 2003. **Doing research in cultural studies: An introduction to classical and new methodological approaches.** (Vol. 137). Sage.

Schütz, Alfred. 1944. The stranger: An essay in social psychology. **American journal of Sociology.** 49(6), p. 499-507. The University of Chicago Press.

Simmel, Georg. 1908. The stranger. **Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings.** p. 4.

Simmel, Georg. 1908a. The Stranger. In Oakes, Timothy, and Patricia L. Price. (Eds.). (2008). **The cultural geography reader.** Routledge.

Simmel, Georg. 1950. In Wolff, K.H. (ed. and trans). **The Sociology of Georg Simmel.** Glencoe, Illinois. Free Press.

Škorić, Marko, Aleksej Kišjuhas, and Jovana Škorić. 2013. Excursus on the stranger "in the context of Simmel's sociology of space**. Sociológia–Slovak Sociological Review.** 45(6), p. 589-602.

Sputnik. **Kılıçdaroğlu, Dünya Romanlar Günü'nde konuştu: 'Suriyelilere baktığın kadar bana bakmıyorsun' diyeceksiniz.** Retrieved from: https://tr.sputniknews.com/politika/201804081032948003-kilicdaroglu-roman-gunu-chp/ [08.04.2018].

Timur, Safak, Rod Nordland. **Erdogan Threatens to Let Migrant Flood Into Europe Resume.** Retrieved from: https://nyti.ms/2goyQ2v [31.05.2018].

Tiryakian, Edward. A. 1973. Sociological perspectives on the stranger. **Soundings.** p. 45-58. Penn State University Press.

Tracy, Sarah J. 2013. **Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.** John Wiley & Sons.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. 2001. **Space and place: The perspective of experience.** University of Minnesota Press.

Turner, Bryan S. 1999. **Classical sociology.** Sage.

UNCHR. **Syrian Refugees in Turkey Frequently Asked Questions.** Retrieved from: http://www.unhcr.org/tr/wpcontent/uploads/sites/14/2017/02/frequently_asked_questions.pdf [04.06.2018]

UNCHR. **Syria Regional Refugee Response.** Retrieved from: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria [04.06.2018]

Wells, Karen. 2005. Strange Practices: Children's discourses on transgressive unknowns in urban public space. **Childhood.** 12(4), p. 495-506. SAGE Publications. DOI: 10.1177/0907568205058611

Williams, Raymond. 1983. Culture. In Oakes, Timothy, and Patricia L. Price. (Eds.). 2008. **The cultural geography reader.** Routledge.

CURRICULUIM VITAE

EMRAH YAĞMURLU

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

Date of Birth	*25/11/1989*
Nationality	*Turkish*
Contact	*eyagmurlu@gmail.com*

EDUCATION:

2015-2018	***Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul***
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences
	M.A., Humanities and Social Sciences
	GPA: 3,25 /4,00
2011-2015	***Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul***
	Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences
	B.A., Political Science and International Relations
	Honor Student
	GPA: 3,25 /4,00
2014-Winter	***Umea University, Umea, Sweden***
	Erasmus Exchange Program

PROJECTS & CERTIFICATES:

2017	*Language and Management Training in Malaysia*
	Organized by Albukhary Foundation and Mental HR
2014	*A Field Study on Kurdish Diaspora in Sweden (Undergraduate Thesis)*
2013	*Turkey - Mediterranean Youth Peace Ship Project*
2013	*TIKA and UGED's Joint Project on Media in Tanzania*
2013	*REHEMA Friendship and Solidarity Trust*
	A Certificate on Ramadan Activities in Dar es Selaam

2013 *Gulf Cooperation Council*

Turkish Youth Gathering Project