

To Be a Relative to “the Other”: “Foreign Son-in-law”*

Dr. Mehmet YILMAZ
Doç. Dr. Güliz ULUÇ

ege üniversitesi, iletişim fakültesi
mehmet.yilmaz@ege.edu.tr
gulizuluc@yahoo.com

Özet

“Öteki” ile Akraba Olmak: “Yabancı Damat”

“Temsiller, tıpkı matematik denklemleri gibi birbirlerini iptal etmemelidir.” (Steeet, 2000:10)

Bir kavram olarak “öteki” olgusu gerek birey gerekse toplum düzeyinde, çok çeşitli kimliklerin içini doldurmakta ve yine bu çok çeşitli kimliklere bir arada olabilmenin olanaklarını sağlamaktadır. “Öteki” olgusu bağlamında “biz”in ve “biz”den olmayan “ötekiler”in konumlandırılmasında, “biz” ve “ötekiler” imgelerinin yaratılmasında medyanın üstlendiği önemli rol yadsınamaz.

Günümüzde olgunun en geniş etkileme potansiyeli ile yaşam bulduğu alanın televizyon olduğunu ifade etmek olanaklıdır. Bu bağlamda çalışmada “öteki” olgusu, “Yabancı Damat” dizisindeki “biz” ve “öteki” temsilleri üzerinden tartışılmaya çalışılmaktadır.

Geleneksel ve dini değerlerin sosyal yaşamdaki ağırlığının görece daha fazla hissedildiği bir yörede yaşayan (Gaziantep) bir aile ile bu değerlerin ulusal ve dini karşıtı olarak algılanan Yunanlı bir ailenin

* Bu makale, bildiri formatındaki kısa biçimi ile The Royal Institute for Inter Faith Studies tarafından 11-16 Haziran 2006 tarihinde Ürdün- Amman’da düzenlenen “İkinci Orta Doğu Çalışmaları Dünya Kongresi”nde (“Second World Congress for Middle Eastern Studies”- WOCMES2) sunulmuştur.

bireylerinin, çocuklarının evliliklerinden doğan "zorunlu" ilişkilerini konu olan dizide; her iki toplum aileler üzerinden birbirine ayna olmakta, toplumlar arasında tarihler boyu yaşanan çelişkiler, çatışmalar, farklılıklar bireysel ilişkiler bazında gerçekleşen olay örgüleri içinde temsil edilmektedir.

İncelenen dizi örneğinde Türk televizyonunda uluslararası aktörler olarak "öteki" olanın varlığı, kimin nasıl ötekileştirildiği irdelenmekte; dolayısı ile temsil alanında çalışılarak, medya dolayimli bir "öteki" yaratan temsil mekanizmalarının değerlendirilmesi ve televizyon dizisinde bu mekanizmaların kullanılma yolları eleştirel bir bakış açısı ve yorumlayıcı bir yöntem ile ele alınmaktadır.

anahtar kelimeler: öteki, yabancı, temsil, stereotip, önyargı, kimlik, televizyon dizisi, Yabancı Damat

Résumé

Être parents avec Autrui : "Le Beau-fils Étranger"

"Les représentations ne devraient pas s'annuler, comme les équations mathématiques". (Steet, 2000:10)

Autrui en tant que concept remplit des diverses identités au niveau de l'individu et de la société et assure la co-existence de ces identités. En ce qui concerne la notion d'"Autrui", on ne peut pas négliger le rôle des média dans le positionnement de "nous" et d'"Autrui", qui n'est pas de nous et dans la création des images de "nous" et des "autres".

Ce phénomène peut être observé dans tout sa puissance d'influence à la télévision. Dans cet article on essayera de discuter la notion de d'"Autrui" à travers les représentations de "nous" et de d'"Autrui" dans la série télévisée nommée "Le Beau-fils Étranger".

Cette série télévisée parle des rapports forcés résultant du mariage des individus d'une famille qui vit dans un arrondissement (Gaziantep) où on sent le plus intensivement des valeurs religieuses dans la vie sociale et d'une autre famille grecque qui est perçue comme le contraire de ces valeurs nationales et religieuses. Dans ce contexte on voit se miroiter toutes les deux sociétés à travers les deux familles et les contradictions, les conflits, les différences entre ces deux sociétés qui existent depuis tant d'années qui sont représentés à travers les événements qui ont lieu au niveau des rapports individuels.

Cette série télévisée nous permet d'examiner la présence d'"Autrui" comme acteurs internationaux; comment et qui est posé comme l'"Autrui" en télévision turque. Donc on fréquente le domaine de la représentation et on

considère les mécanismes de représentations qui créent un "Autre" à travers les médias. Dans l'article les usages qu'on fait de ces mécanismes sont évalués avec une approche critique et une méthode interprétative.

mots-clés : *Autrui, l'étranger, la représentation, le stéréotype, le préjugé, l'identité, la série télévisée, "Le Beau-fils Étranger"*

Abstract

"Presentations, just like arithmetical equations, shouldn't cancel each other." (Steet, 2000:10)

The fact "the other" as a concept fills up various identities in a wide range and, furthermore, provides those various identities in a wide range with the opportunities of being able to be together. In the context of the fact "the other", when placing "us" and "the others" who are not from "us", the important role which is committed by mass media (television and especially television series format) cannot be denied in creating the images of "us" and "the others". With the pre-recognition of the fact "the other" in the TV series called "Foreign Son-in-law" with higher ratings in Turkish television will conceptually and theoretically be discussed over the presentations of "us" and "the others".

In the so-called series with a plot of a marriage that created "mandatory" relations between the members of two families one of which is from a city (Gaziantep) where the traditional and religious values are relatively considered important and the other is from Greece, a country which is considered the opposite of what is nationally and religiously believed as right by the part; both nations become mirrors for each other by the help of these families, and conflicts, arguments and differences between the nations are presented by the events series within individual relations level.

In the example of the mentioned television series, the existence of "the other" as international actors in Turkish television, how and who is forced to be the other is explicated; individual relations and collective perceptions as premise/sequent, and Greece placed as "the other-foreign" with its citizens in Turkish community are discussed with the attributions imputed on them indirectly by mass media creating an "other" in the presentation mechanisms and the ways of using those mechanisms in the television series are evaluated with a critical point of view and a hermeneutic method.

keywords: *the other, foreign, representation, stereotype, prejudice, identity, television serial, "Foreign Son-in-law"*

Introduction

Take up the White Man's burden—
Send forth the best ye breed—
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve the captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild— Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child.
—Kipling (1898),
"The White Man's Burden"

In the connection of the case "Other" no one can deny the role which mass media play in creation of the images "we" and "they" - others, to describe "we" and "others", others not of us. Even today it is possible to suggest that it is television by which the phenomenon concerned can survive with its widest potential to influence.

In this context, with the pre-recognition that television and especially series format take their places in daily life and make their places sounder and sounder day by day and create wide, noticeable and quick effects on the lives of a large number of viewer, the fact "the other" in the series of "Foreign Son-in-law" with higher ratings in Turkish television will conceptually and theoretically be discussed over the presentations of "us" and "the others".

In the example of the mentioned television series, the existence of "the other" as international actors in Turkish television, how and who is forced to be the other is explicated; individual relations and collective perceptions as premise/sequent, and Greece placed as "the other-foreign" with its citizens in Turkish community are discussed with the attributions imputed on them indirectly by mass media means creating an "other" in the presentation mechanisms and the ways of using those mechanisms in the television series are evaluated with a critical point of view and an interpretative analysis.

It seems useful to consider how such a concept came to emerge and therefore what identity is before discussing the ways in which what is 'other' and 'foreign' is represented and fictioned in the related serial that forms the subject of the study.

Background of "Other": Identity and Other

When the descriptions and definitions on the concept of identity are assessed, it will be found that there have been used two basic elements of 'defining, identifying' and 'belonging'.

Identity, as defined by Nur Vergin, is "an extreme indicator of social continuum". (Vergin, 1993:5). Identity implies features to explain various

belongings of an individual or a social group, to define him/her or it and which can be conceived through external observations. Identity can also be termed differences to distinguish the subject from the nearest others (Kösoğlu, 1995:113).

“Identity expressing how human being sees himself/herself in his/her eyes and in the mirror of others, involves defining and placing himself/herself in a social surrounding. Relationship with others is formed by identifying with and or rendering himself/herself different from them, either in relationship with interindividual or in the group or groups he/she supposes to himself/herself belong in or with other group or groups others are believed to belong in.” (Bilgin, 1995:63)

Identities, according to Hall are the names to which we have attributed different positions which define us and in which we are defined, that is the stories of the past. (1998:177) Identity is a feeling of belonging to differentiate and render members of a given group different from those of other communities when defined relatively to “other” by creating a contrast in a way that it would represent a political and economic force. As the members of this group therefore define and know themselves as “we”, they differ from “them” contrary to harmony, in a resemblance in which they are and which is in them. To the degree we differ and are differentiated from “they”, “we” become strengthened/ reinforced. The group defines itself in a series of representations occasionally object to “they” and create a narrow frame for itself in doing so.

“ “Other” in origin is a term which the Greek used until 6. and 7.th centuries for foreigners. In 4.th century they preferred it to distinguish themselves from aliens, during which they used the phrase ‘barbar’ so as to develop the concept of sub-humanity within the discourse of “other”. Some studies on the issue explain that the term “others” was not just used in negative sense but for “other places and other people” as well by Europeans, which indicates that it was used in concepts which Europeans were reluctant to define or hardly defined. After intellectuals, soldiers and merchants had encountered new continents, they began to employ the term “barbar” within “other” for those who were not Christian and behaved uncivilisedly. In Renaissance, 18th century, “other” denoted the one or those unenlightened as “other”. In 20th century, however, it implied the third world nations which Europe and America saw inferior to themselves for they were illiterate traditional and less intellectual.....” (Duncan quoted in Sözen, 1995:113)

Social differentiation is a process which appears when an individual sees his/her similarity to “other” as a devaluating, not a relieving case. According to the results of the study by J. P. Codol et al on perceptions of similarity and differences however, the resemblance which any individual conceives among members of the group he belongs in is less than that he does when he is not included in. In addition, the resemblance members of both groups conceive

among those of the other groups is higher than when they do in their own groups. Obviously an individual has a tendency to avoid finding a high similarity between him/herself and the "other" and define himself/herself differently from "them" (Codol quoted in Bilgin, 1996:43-56)

Social identity, territory is a desire to emphasize and distinguish a number of groups established on a given territory from other ones. Put simply, there is a tendency for a group of individuals to develop interests, places and social relationships in a way to know themselves and form a group.

Social identity is the consequence of a given historical process. Identity of a community is shaped by its relationship with other ones in time. It is historically based on a system of representations built up of a series of symbols, memories, works of art, traditions, established behavioural rules, values, faiths, knowledge, myths and legends, in which there exists an accumulation of the past, a sediment of time that is, in terms of prospective relationships, not static but vulnerable to change. An individual conceives him/herself on an objective plain in his/her relationship with others through the desire to be different, differentiated, while in the same mechanism group individuals form an awareness of social belonging and identity in the relationship of contrast to other groups. Confined to what is owned by a cultural community whose borders are defined in a given territory, a social identity is an ethnical one, and when expanded it becomes a national identity variable. (Yavaşgel, 2004:200-201)

National discourse of almost any nation is based on the claims that it is superior to, more courageous, more historical more contemporary than others. National discourse seeks not only to constitute a unity against those different, emphasizing its difference from others but also increase the dependence on the nation adorned by such superior qualities. As almost all nationalistic trends form such a discourse, in other words, try to find out a very justification for their ideologies, they refer to their histories. Therefore, writing history occasionally contributes consciously or unconsciously to the creation of so-called "others" in a way to justify antagonisms and establish their claims of superiority to "them". (Tekeli, 1996:15)

By this way, the fact "the other" as a concept fills up various identities in a wide range and, furthermore, provides those various identities in a wide range with the opportunities of being able to be together. Every so often, defining the identity based on "reliable" time and space coordinates, inevitably, causes different identities to move to the negative pole as "others". It is seen that using the expression of "the other" for the different one at the speech dimension is not an insentient preference, and it does not imply negative associations whereas "the alternate" and as Bauman points out "the foreign" do (Bauman, 2000).

This discourse tends to put forth such positive images in favour of itself as educated, the legend, honest, merciful and civilised, playing on his pride on one hand, and creates on the other the images "we" and "they", showing them to be antagonist to each other. It establishes itself as a dominant subject by means of the related discourses and, culturally representing "we" through "they".

According to Connolly every identity is established in conjunction with a series of distinctions, defining some of them to be bad, abnormal or irrational, put simply "others". An also through the existence of "other", it seeks to verify absoluteness, rightness, normality and rationality of itself, and designed "wrongness" of other by the values/judgements attributed to it/ that other, which is why one has historically invited "other" to adopt the right identity, or has otherwise oppressed, conquered or done away with it when necessary. Connolly, ascribes this attitude in origin to "avenge" he borrowed from Nietzsche. (Connolly, 1995:265-277)

One attributes contrast qualities of the positive to what is referred to as "other". "Other" becomes an element compared with the subject on one hand, and on the other, remains different or differentiated from "we" (Tanriöver, 2008). "Other" is born guilty or convicted: it is devoid of qualities of the chosen subject, also forming a threat to serene world of that subject due to its radical differences.

Fuat Keyman differentiates "other" in such five distinct approaches as an empirical object, a cultural object, an existence; a discursive structure and a difference in sociologic and anthropologic discourses. Behind such approaches are seen two rival cultural paradigms to define the way of acquisition of each other. The first one describes "other" as an empirical and cultural object deriving its existential setting from modern identity and behaves as a way of European based narrative forms. The second is a structural/ post- structural paradigm and accepts culture as an ideological and discursive practise in which meanings and values are built and exchanged within a given space rather than an existential phenomenon, considering language not simply a means of communication but rather the process in which individuals are set up as subjects. (Keyman, 2003:79)

According to Derrida however, there is involved a binary structure in the axis of the terms "dead of subject", "decentralization of subject" and deconstruction subject undergoes, one of which is rendered privilege, becoming differentiated from "other". As a positive value is attributed to one of them, this privileged phrase defines "other" as its negative, in other words a total of qualities rejected by it. The terms, "establishing dominant" and "subject" are determined by negating the other term establishing relation,

setting and identity between the two concepts, with the one being dominant and the other suppressed in reversion, the first step with post-structurist theory and the deconstruction Derrida suggested (reversion of binary antagonists and replacement of antagonists). In the second step, displacement, the term dominant is replaced by the term subject. (Derrida quoted in Yeğenoğlu, 2003:11-13)

Briefly I/we, our identity is based on what is not I/we. In such a definition based on differences, the fact that what is not I/we is made "other" enables I/we our identity no to be dissolved and the course of making "other" runs as a prophecy which realises itself in a very process irreversible for the sake of salvation of I/we, our identity. In other words, differences in formation of identity are turned into otherness in order to secure the identity.

The Phenomenon Stereotype in the Process of "Otherisation"

Fowler regards stereotype as a socially constituted mental drawer in which events and individual are placed. (Fowler, 1991) In stereotypes which we can therefore consider people of a nation a "picturing" (Buchanan ve Cantril, 1992:309) other nations in a way to cliché them, imagining them surprisingly simple, exceedingly wrong and different from what they really are lie creation of "other" which Tekeli sees as a question of producing a group prejudice, a social process. In other words there are shared prejudices filled with a general negativity of a group members against those of the other. One both justifies and maintains domination of others and its mechanism by claiming superiority to "other" or with a notion "other" to claim it (İlhan Tekeli, 1998:87).

Prejudices is an attitude learned in the age of development particularly in family. Those acquired individually during childhood continue with group stereotypes needed to form others. The process beginning with individual to continue through ethnical, national, and regional generalizations proves determinant in international relationships. Evidently it is these prejudices that define our case of making sense and constitute our stance of agreement and opening to the world. It should not be overlooked that some nations' creation of stereotypes stems from the fact that they are influenced by the same "Western" culture, rather than by difference of approaches among them.

Stereotypes were defined as "pictures in our heads" by Walter Lippmann who was the first to use the concept as a description of human categorisation of fellow beings. A useful definition of stereotypes, which serves as my starting point, has been given by Arthur Asa Berger, who regards stereotypes as:

" [...] an image of a category commonly shared by a certain group, a grossly simplified notion of how individuals that are members of a group are constituted."

Berger also emphasises that stereotypes consist of suppositions of other groups as lacking in diversity and nuance; i.e. one regards all the persons as cast in the same mould. They are simplifications that prevent people from seeing individuals as they truly are. (quoted in Lillhannus, 2002: <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/>)

Lippmann says "the mold of a stereotype can not be neutral and but guarantor of what we the very respect to ourselves, more simply the extension of our value, position and rights on earth; stereotypes are boundary castle behind which we do feel secure" (Lippmann, 1922:96), contrary to which Tekeli –with whom we also agree– emphasizes that a social group to create the concept other by claiming superiority in fact confines itself to a stereotype, a given relationship with other and a restricted ethics. Its very existence and qualities inevitably become determined by other just in the same way as one happens to fall into the trap set by him/her, in a sense one builds the prison within which to confine and restrict him/herself.

In the connection of international relationships in particular, it is more likely for stereotypes to establish a reactions against a given group and thereafter rationalize them by being implicated in the process rather than corresponding to them in stereotypes. Stereotypes pave the way for rationalization necessary to convince people to kill, cheat one another and commit ethically undesirable demeanours. Presence of friendly and hostile feelings in a group to or against other one depends on the relationships between them, on whether they understand eachothers' discourses and whether they are traditionally impartial or not. In other words stereotypes are not mostly of causative but binding character. This group/nation threatens us, they fought us previously, and also it is our neighbouring nation, we do not understand what they mean in their tongue either so this group/nation must be hostile, threatening, dangerous..... (William and Cantril, 1992:324-325). As in the serial in the forms of Turkish and Greek stereotypes, Turkish party emphasizes such debasing adjectives as "palikarya, hostile, Greek and Christian Greek, Gavur...." similarly the other party uses definitions such as "uncivilised, barbarian, rude, unmannerly.....". (see table 2)

"Other" in Turkish Media

Identity applies to international actors as well as individual and social aspects, and likewise one defines these actors as "others", uses means of otherisation and takes advantage of media in doing so. It is acknowledged that national identity needs "other" to define itself and save its national unity, and media recreates this "otherisation". (Akça, 2000:185)

Many studies related to the ways media frame news and events show that media structures support strong stance of hegemony by reflecting political and cultural circumstances and environment under which they are produced, an also meanwhile include numerous "other" approaches which are different in period and space.

Theoricians make audience discuss the essential role that community-forming media play in establishing the national belonging. Hartley claim that citizenship and social identity is not possible without media. Media produces "a national and political image" by which to create a feeling of community. (Hartley, 1996:39) Media allow audiences to produce their own symbolic realities and cover the world with stories they produce, enabling that world to be ours.

Media also help a social map to be formed which establishes community boundries while stating who is inside and who is outside in national structure, using the formula "we and others".

Inflexible differentiation between stories of "ours" and "others" in vain divides the world into rigid categories. (Hartley, 1996:45) People as media audience are by no means passive recipient of the stories presented them in this way. The answers of the audience if discussed in the light of "we" and "they" as mentioned above, might be quite interesting. There are people who inevitably find themselves "outside" in this country. An example of externalizing view point could be strangers who become the target of political activists and of apparent or concealed xhneophobia. Ironically, such people can provide a critical perspective to elicit internalizing and externalizing mechanisms of media activities. (Uluç, 2009:123-140)

On medias molding "other" as to who it is, Nuri Bilgin substantiates how creation of "other" emerges in the process of "otherisation", in an example he adapted from J. Daniel: If one repeatedly asks Turkish citizens what they think about Bosniac people, whether they let their daughters marry them, whether these people dominate some jobs, they save their own fellow people, whether they could invade every where in Turkey or not, a problem of Bosniac people will soon appear eventhough any negative remarks did not come out about them in media, with Bosniac people becoming "otherised". (Bilgin, 1997:127)

It is clear that Turkey and Greece "otherise" each other with the influence of the common past they went through. If Greece and Greek identity is analised in Turkish media, striking example of other will appear which can be concieved easily considering their attemps to invade Anatolia, motherland of Turks. "Other" Greece is inherited to us from the years of downfall of Ottoman Empire, establishment of Republic of Turkey and from a shared historical

identity. "They bombed Atatürk's house in Thessaloniki" came out as an asparagas in Turkish news media¹, was one of the examples that triggered "otherisation" of the Greece in media. Turkey's peace operation in Cyprus in 1970s forms the basic dynamics of the discourse "other" Greek in Turkish media. Also 12 miles disputes which covers Greece's claim for the right to extend her continental shelf twice helped Turkey to find available ground for other desires. The fact that while once upon a time Turkey agreed to membership of Greece in NATO, Greece is declared in media as an obstacle in Turkey's participation in Community added momentum to the process of "otherisation" of Greece. Turkish discourse against Greece in Turkish media became as hot as at least as in what was the Cyprus Peace Operation, due to the crisis Kardak which appeared associated with 12 mile disputes between the two nations.

All these mentioned negative experiments and their media representations leads to false freezing process confines "other" Greece to a neighbouring nation defined negatively through phrases such as "A pigs hide and a Greek friend are of equally no use" and "They don't want us in a strong unity", "They claim to capture the whole Aegean Sea and suffocate us within our closed sea" (Milas, 1998:254-265), and Turkey to misperceptions and prejudices expressed as "the best Turk is the dead one" by the Greek.

However identities either individual or collective can change in time. It seems rather dangerous and wrong that identities established in a given slice of time tend to be frozen into such instable forms. It appears that in the serial freezing identities in time and exalting one or debasing the other occasionally - in given events and phenomena- can create antagonism among individuals and groups.

Following Marmara earthquake in August 17th 1999 however, Greece aided Turkey for humanitarian purposes, and close friendship of Cem and

¹ Events of September 6-7, was an uprising directed primarily at Istanbul's non-moslem (especially Greek) minority on 6-7 September 1955, were triggered by the news that the Turkish consulate in Thessaloniki, Greece -the house where Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was born in 1881- had been bombed the day before. Essence of matter is that Cyprus affairs was on the agenda of international political debates and Turkish people are wanted to be provoked against non-moslems by using their sensitivity about Atatürk. It is understood that there was not an attack that targets Atatürk's house. An explosion near the house was causing a small damage to house [A planted bomb had gone off in the consulate's garden, but the photographs showing the event in the press were composites, and the reports exaggerated the damage (in reality, there was one broken window)] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Istanbul_Pogrom, retrieved 20.11.2008), but this situation is abused to strike people. İstanbul Ekspres journal was an actor in this provocation process. People learned this news from special issue of İstanbul Ekspres. The headline reads "Our Father's house was damaged due to a bomb". A protest rallied on the night of September 6, on the Cyprus issue and the bombing of Atatürk's house was the cover for amassing the rioters. (Güven, 2005; Aktar, 2005) After this asparagas news, there have been unwanted events between moslem and non-moslem citizens in İstanbul, in September 6-7.

Papandreu (Ministers of Foreign Affairs of both) added a mildness to the heated atmosphere, with Kostas Karamanlis, Greece Premier taking part in the ceremony of marriage of the son of his Turkish counterpart Erdoğan, which all positively contributed to the Greece in Turkish media.

An Analysis of “Other” and “Otherisation” Fact in “Foreign Son-in-law”

“Oedipus has got many identities among which however exists no alien”
(Smith, 1994:15)

One knows that representations or images in television serials are not genuine but real in their consequences. Identifications and relationships in the series of “Foreign Son-in-law” concerned are not in real sense representatives of what or who is present but conceived as real, which changes concept and coverage of what is other thanks to audience setting up map of meaning.

The sample of this study is “Foreign Son-in-law” which is a very popular Turkish television series distributed by Erler Film with 106 episodes in total. Foreign Son-in-law is written by Sulhi Dölek and Selin Tunç, directed by Durul and Yağmur Taylan, and produced by Türker İnanoğlu. Its comedic tone and play on historic antagonism made it a huge hit in both Turkey and Greece. The episodes are shot in Turkey and Greece. The series ran from November 12, 2004 through June 15, 2007 on the Turkish TV channel Kanal D Friday evenings at 20.00 hrs. Approximately run time of the serial 50 min per each episode².

The serial handles inevitable marriage relationships of the individuals, children from a family in a region, Gaziantep, where traditional and religious values are relatively felt in social life, and a Greek family believed to be fully contrast to the other in national and religious values; both communities mirror each other through the families, with historical conflicts disputes and differences being represented in the network of events based on the individuals concerned.

The Greek (Niko’s) and Turkish (Nazlı’s) families use the material acquired from the two essential issues built up on “other” images which fight, contradict and externalise each other. One of them is their history and the other religions which cause them to remain hostile nations, Turks and Greeks, which also greatly frames their cultural perceptions related and contrast to each other. For example a sculpture of a Greek nude woman sent to Nazlı’s family before their meeting by Niko’s family, a dinner, a circumcision ritual, a christmas or new year ceremony can well create symbolically significant disputes and quarels.

In the course of events, the religious factor, the second conflict becomes

2 As an extra information, The Greek channel Mega TV broadcasts it since July 4, 2005.

more important after the episode 8 involving Niko's circumcision ritual and thus his religion.

In the study, marriage of Niko and Nazlı, technical necessity of both parties to adopt "other" or each other and its associated relationships are discussed (until the marriage of Turkish Nazlı and Greek Niko, episode 30). In addition, actions and events until the marriage and those not referring to "other" are excluded.

It is important to note that in the first thirty episodes of the serial "Foreign Son-in-law" Greek identity is otherised and in the sequences of dramatic disputes "other" is realized by being frozen in a given historical past mentioned under "Other" in Turkish Media title.

In the connection of in the related television serial, relationship with "other" is represented pendulum moving between two extremes of differentiation and identification both in the relationship of one group with the other to whom or which individuals and groups feel belong and in interindividual plane, in such a way that some behaviours and discourses in the course of events are described negatively by absolutising individual and collective differences and as positively through extreme or contrast variations in the serial due to historical culture and political implications in the related peoples or nations. This reductive approach occasionally becomes softened through dialogues between individuals, cultures, and relativist impressions which communication and interaction forms and dimensions are definitive can be conceived (mutual national or religious rituals, Christmas ceremonies are celebrated regardless of cultural differences...)

Methodology of an Analysis

A consensus has not yet been reached on a unique method to understand and evaluate chosen facts for television serials. Sociological analysis of different phenomena (for instance other and otherisation) in television serials requires different research designs. The analysis in this study has an assumption that the clues of the "other" and "otherisation" matter are conveyed by plot, characters and dialogue.

Set of the research is 30 episodes of "Foreign Son-in-law" and the explanations about this chosen are provided above.

There are three stages to draw a picture about the evaluation facts. First analysis in the research, was carried out in order to follow subject related dialogues in plot by decoding events and dialogues included in the subject universe. By this way, it will be possible to make a sociologic evaluation about phenomena.

Second and third stages are builded on first step. In second stage, there is a character oriented evaluation. After decoding of 30 episodes, the main characters in the serial plot according to the roles in the process of "otherisation" are classified.

The third stage of the analysis included a qualitative keyword analysis, which is focused in finding out the most commonly used "otherising" expressions and allusions for two parties in the serial.

Stage 1: Decoding of otherising statements in the serial are as follows through the plot

A few days after Nazlı and Niko meet in Bodrum, she learns that he is Greek and tries to make him understand she feels worse at it. Niko asks her what if he is a Greek and why she responds this way. As is seen even Nazlı is affected by "other" cliché established as a prejudice in the community. It is interesting to hear the dialogue below following introduction of Niko to her family as Muslim Naki from Bosnian, not Greek Niko.

Memik: Good. I like Bosnian people. Once upon a time all Balkans belonged in Ottoman Empire. Of course you were also affected by Christian oppression. Is there anybody martyr, veteran in your family (*Niko implies his disturbness by coughing*). Turk has no one friendly but a Turk. What have we seen anything good from Europeans? They are all bad in the same way.

Mustafa Can: Look grandpa, we are going to enter Community, aren't we?

Memik: Come on, they are all conspirators, among whom Christian Greek is the most leading traitor. (*Niko hiccups in astonishment while drinking his raki*)
Memik insists Niko to nod his discourse.

Kahraman (*in his very common sense*): Dad, everything in possible in war, you know.

...

Feride (*When told by Nazlı that Niko is not a Bosnian but indeed Greek faints and becomes so sick as to have to be in bed*): My God, take my life to heavens. Now that you bring a Greek home as if a Bosnian, tell him not to come. Otherwise, he will be killed by your father or your grandfather.

...

Memik (*After Kahraman gets Niko out of in the confectionery shop talks to Kahraman*): Here is a great Turkish fighter. "I won't give my daughter to a Greek" he roars in anger. Her father does decide what to do. Your martyr grandfather would take pride in you. I am proud of you too. You haven't put the enemy into among us as a son-in-law.

...

Eftelya (*When Niko tells his family he loved a Turkish girl*): A Turkish girl, eh, really? I would rather die than hear this. You can never marry her. Never, not ever!

Niko: But just listen to me....

Stavro: You should listen to us! They once drove us all out of İstanbul. We already told you everything, didn't we?

Niko: Forget about that, it has since been 40 years.

Eftelya: We will not forget even if 40 century passed. They gave us a few pences and we boarded a train and were deported.

Stavro: We had nothing by us. We had to start everything from nothing. That was incredible.

Niko: What is Nazlı's guilt with that.

Eftelya: Stop, I don't want to hear about it. I don't want a Turkish bride. I don't want to let them in my home.

Katina: But you can not give up speaking Turkish in any way, can you? Isn't that right Eleni? You make them bring olive oil from Ayvalık. You still listen to songs of Münir Nurettin. Look, sugar candy from Beyoğlu just for your delicateness. I'm telling you the truth. All people are the same everywhere on earth. It makes no difference whether they are Greek or Turk.

Eftelya (cries): I will be mad.

Stavro: If you marry that Turkish girl we will disown you.

...

Niko and Nazlı dialogue about their families reaction:

Niko: My parents say insistently "you can not marry a Turkish girl".

Nazlı: Mine say too, "we have no daughter to marry a Greek".

...

Feride- Nazlı dialogue about the event:

Nazlı: Mother, they are hostile against Turks too. They had to be all deported from İstanbul in 1965.

Feride: But they also drove us away

...

Memik (At the table): Lion hearted Kahraman, he just takes after his grandfather martyred in the battle of Sakarya.

Mustafa Can (Son of Kahraman): But grandfather, my father hasn't fought a battle, at best he has got Niko to go away.

...

The young people persuade their own parents to let them marry in this way. Kahraman invites Niko's parents to ask him Nazlı a bride, as the would-be in laws. The dialogue following this at the table:

Memik: Everything has got upside down. They should never, not ever ask us to give them a bride. You are exerting nothing in vain. You just ask for the impossible. Nazlı, you are not an illiterate girl. Do you make sense of it all? Your father is the grand son of a martyr, as such will not give you to that Greek bastard.

Nazlı: My father does keep his promise, grandpa.

Memik: Kahraman, do speak will you? Just say it won't be possible.

Kahraman: Father, I have told them it is okey. I told them to come and

ask us from Nazlı. No one is to break his promise, isn't he? I would keep my promise.

Memik: Shame on a son like you. You can not break your promise but your ancestors feel agonies of shame, our martyries will undergo pains of embarrassment in their cemeteries. Shame on you. You scandalous man.

...

Master Memik learns that the Greek family will come over to ask them Nazlı a bride and leaves home in anger. Kahraman tries to convince him as follows.

Kahraman: The Greek bride groom will first be circumcised and converted to Islam, ok?

Memik: No matter if he goes to Mecca as a pilgrim or he will be circumcised, a Greek can not be from us. I reject this, thats all!

When people read in a newspaper that the Greek in laws would come to Gaziantep to ask the bride, different reactions appear.

Kadir: If only I were a Greek, you could give me the girl a bride.

Ökkeş (*Ironically*): It's clear that you have something wrong in origin. May the son of the vicar and Nazlı, our girl be happy.

One of those in the coffee: A Greek broom will be circumcised, won't he, Kahraman Usta?

...

Memik (*He speaks to somebody in The Veterans Society but veterans find Memik's reactions unnecessarily extreme*): We will not let Palikarya get Nazlı away, will we?

A veteran: Were you injured in the head in Korea Battles you are not nuts, are you?

Memik: Shame on you all!

...

Kahraman (*Seeing the Greek nude woman the Niko's parents and due to intolerance of nakedness in Turkish culture even if in arts too*): What the hell kind of present. What a an impertinence it is. If they make such absurdities I can't put up with it, I will go away. How impertinent people those Greeks are!

...

Memik (*Ready to protest outside when Niko's parents come to Nazlı's home*): There comes the enemy, Hasan the seargent. Why do you stand up there? We would have attacked them, wouldn't we. Come on, lets make the Greek get out of Antep horrifiedly, shall we!

...

On the day of engagement would-be fathers in law are cool and neutral to eachother. Feride and Nazlı try to calm down Kahraman, and Eleni does so with Stavro. Kahraman does not welcome the guests. His wife Feride tries to bring up the issue:

Kahraman (*Upon Eleni saying "how nice the house of yours", he says, pointing to statue*): It was better and nicer before this stone woman came here.

.....

Eleni: Baklava is a Greek dessert in origin.

Kahraman: What the hell are you saying. *(Upon Feride's warning)* Excuse me lady. You try to own everything of ours. I won't lose my daughter to you, she is ours. *(Mustafa Can warns his father saying "you were just to say baklava")* Excuse me. I won't lose my our baklava to you. It is completely a Turkish dessert. You are claiming everything, our coffee, our baklava, our döner, raki, what is going on with you?

(two families dine in prejudices. Eleni and Stavro are reluctant to eat.)

Kahraman: Use your hand while eating this Sir. Don't try as if you were so gentle. Leave that spoon or fork aside.

Stavro: Don't interrupt me Sir. I will eat how I wish.

Nazlı: Don't interrupt father. A nuisance shouldn't appear.

Stavro: It has already appeared little Lady.

.....

Eleni: Everything I'm eating is almost fat.

Feride: *(Whispers to Nazire's ear complainingly)* She finds mistakes in anything, look!

Memik and his veteran friend Hasan the seargent *(protests the Greek visitors outside):* We don't let a foreign groom in. We don't want the Greeks. Palikarya go home. Palikarya go away. We don't want a Greek groom.

.....

Stavro: We shouldn't have come over here Eleni.

Eleni: I already warned you not to come here.

Kahraman: You shouldn't have come, should you? We didn't beg you to do so, did we?

Stavro: Shame on you, we are the guest of yours here, aren't we?

Kahraman: You should behave like real guests then, shouldn't you?

Stavro: You Turks are always that! I'm just here for the sake of my son.

Kahraman: I'm too for my daughter.

Stavro: Lets come to the issue briefly. We ask your daughter Nazlı a bride from you with the permission of God and prophet, given your traditions.

Kahraman: God permitting. Children love eachother. I have a condition, Niko be a Musliman then circumcised. *(Stavro, Eleni and Katina reacted to this condition with their gestures and mimes.)*

...

After concluding of the marriage agreement Stavro and Kahraman speak:

Stavro: Regardless of this marriage we are friends. At least not enemies.

Kahraman: What enemy Mr. Stavro, we are ofcourse friends.

...

Feride speaks consoling Nazlı:

Feride: Don't cry my daughter. You fall in love with a Greek boy. You thought everything would be so nice, didn't you?

...

When Kahraman shouts at Stavro, Stavro to Eleni and Katina:

Stavro: This man always shouts. They told us Turks have so called hospitality.

Stavro to Niko after a misunderstanding:

Stavro: You don't know Turks. They commit homicide for the sake of their so called honour.

...

Katina goes-between. She used to love a Turkish man but her parents, especially her mother, Eftelya objected to that later when she was deported from Turkey. She had no contact with her lover then she overheard her lover got sick to death, and passed away because of his love and longing for her. In the following episodes her mother, Eftelya was hostile to Turks afterwards she couldn't love anybody so she does not want Niko, her nephew to feel similar pains after Eftelya had told her daughter a lie that he died for Katina to give up her love. She visits Feride to reduce the tension between the families. When asked what she would like to drink, Katina wants Turkish coffee deliberately:

Katina: You know I can not resist a Turkish coffee.

...

Official administrators of both parties support this togetherness. The Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs declares that they are for this marriage and even wants the ceremony to be held in Athens and they will join it in the ministerial level. Upon this development Stavro tries to treat Turks more tolerantly. Niko later learns the government has contacted with his father Stavro. After nuisances and troubles Stavro to Niko:

Stavro: It is impossible even if Kofi Annan intervenes, let alone the Minister.

Just as the Greek party get in touch with Stavro, so does Turkish administration with Kahraman through the Governor of Gaziantep. During the talks is Master Memik who is against this togetherness.

Governor of Gaziantep: They are planning a dinner of friendship in Istanbul for the sake of Miss Nazlı and Mr. Niko.

Memik: Why aren't you speaking. Just tell us this is impossible Kahraman. You are the son of a martyr. You should just say you wouldn't let things happen this way. Do what ever you do. You will have to put up with things bad.

Kahraman: Father please stop. Look, shame on us by the Governor.

Governor of Gaziantep: Your in laws are coming too. In addition officials wish to be ready from Turkish and Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Kahraman: But Sir....

Governor of Gaziantep: I quite understand you are really excited. Don't worry. Marriage ceremony will be here in Gaziantep I hope. Our Minister of Foreign Affairs will in person be ready for that nice night.

Memik and Kahraman discuss in front of the Martyrs Monument after leaving Governor:

Memik: Shame on you!

Kahraman: Why are you shouting at me in the public, father?

Memik: How untrustworthy you are. They call me senile, how about you?

Kahraman: What has got to do with it?

Memik: Isn't you that have already told us this is unlikely? Isn't you that you told us the issue of foreign groom is closed?

Kahraman: I told but I don't deny that.

Memik: So why haven't you said anything by the Governor? You kept on nodding just as a monkey shakes its head.

Kahraman: You can not understand what the governor means to be. The governor means the highest administrator. The governor means the state itself. If I had objected to him, I would have do so to the state.

Memik: You should show this respect to our martyrs of the war of independance, to martyr grandfather during the Battle of Sakarya.

Kahraman: Have I promised the Governor I will give Nazlı to Niko?

Memik: You haven't told, you will not. Don't waste your time and energy Kahraman. Go and be ready for the dinner with those Greek in laws of yours.

...

Mayor of Athens and Stavro meet:

Stavro: What has got to do with what? I never imagined my son to be likely to marry a Turkish girl.

The Mayor: Have you received an invitation to the dinner in the from Greek Embassy in İstanbul?

Stavro: One official from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs imperson delivered it. But Mr. Major I actually

The Mayor: Our government pays great attention to this dinner. as the municipality, we will be proud of having the marriage ceremony of your son in Athens.

Stavro (*sighes considerately*): Remembering what Turks did to us and those were the days,

The Mayor: How old were you then?

Stavro: Twentyone. I was just engaged to my wife and how old were you then Mr. Mayor?

The Mayor: Twentythree, married and with a baby too.

Stavro: With in twentyfour hours we were officially ordered to leave from Turkey with what ever we had then, imagine just within twentyfour hours! Do you know we were over 100.000 only in Constantinapolis but now we are all at best less than 2000 in Turkey. Lives were gone, we were obliged to be deported from the land we were born in. Such pains and agonies we suffered from!

The Mayor: Those agonies were mutually experienced and remembered Mr. Stavro. There are a handful of Turks at most in Greece too. Now on however everything will be much better. Marriage of your son to a Turkish bride will make two peoples move closer to eachother. Just like in those days of the very past.

...

What happens during the dinner in İstanbul.

The Greek Ambassador: The love of Niko and Nazlı proves nice as a response to all those against peace. The marital ceremony to be held in Athens soon will mean a fresh beginning to us.

(The dinner is broadcast on television live at the same time Memik protests at what is going on that night. He exhibits some gestures of protest chaining himself to the Monument of Martyrs.)

Memik: A palikarya can not be a friend. We are not to give the Greek a bride. No to Turkish- Greek friendship. We won't give a girl of ours to Greece. Palikarya, go home. We don't want a foreign groom. All Europe is a traitor. No to Europe, palikarya, get out of here. (Memik repeats these protesting expressions in front of the press many times. On the other hand, laymen cheer at this friendship with positive slogans. When asked if he knows that citizen, his own father, or not, Kahraman replies he doesn't.

...

After dinner both families got on a boat to tour in and around Bosphorus. Eleni recalls İstanbul Constantinapolis. Infact the name of the city has ever been controversial between the two parties. The Greeks name it Constantinapolis as in the era of Eastern Rome while it is called İstanbul unquestionably by Turks- she sings a song.

Eleni: İstanbul-Constantinapolis, İstanbul-Constantinapolis, lal lal la...

Kahraman: No Constantinapolis Lady, it is İstanbul, İstanbul!

Eleni: He sounds angry as if he could throw us into sea.

Stavro (angrily): God knows only who will throw who, Eleni.

.....

Kahraman: We will hold an excellent ceremony for his circumcision.

Stavro: What on earth are you saying Mr.

...

Master Memik suffers from an illness in Gaziantep. He needs blood transfusion urgently. Only Niko's blood is transfusable to Memik's. Niko gives blood to Memik, which is concealed from Memik. When they have dinner together, he happens to overhear Niko has given him his blood during his disease:

Memik: What the hell are you saying? How you dared to do to me? Why didn't you prevent that. You poisoned me with Greek blood. Do I have now Greek blood flowing through my veins? That is incredible! Did palikarya get into my blood, I'm the son of a martyr *(protestingly he tries to cut his veins in his arms to get the so cold Greek blood transfused to him out of his body. Everybody averts him from doing so. Then he signs songs of heroism in march rhythm)*

...

In a series of nightmares, Memik dreams himself as the head of Mehter, Ottoman military band, then a verger in a church and then a Greek soldier forced to dance. He wakes up in screams of horror. Kahraman and Feride run to him:

Memik: With the name of the god -bismillah-. *(Ironically)* You see what has been done to me. Thanks to you we become a Greek verger of the church,

a palikarya. We are all disgraced. No longer can I sleep. I won't be able to sleep in peace even in my grave just because of you.

...

Trades men learn Memik has been given Niko's blood in the hospital. Celayir tries to tease Memik:

Memik (to Kahraman): Shame on a son like you. You are scandalous. I would rather die than have blood from him

Celayir: The Greek blood makes you run wild. Look at him, his cheeks got red in blood. You need to find another name Memik. A Turkish name can not be for you. Maybe names such as Memikamis or Memikapulous can be better among those Greek people. You are as if a Christian, you can no longer not pray for the god as a Muslim, either.

...

Eftelya calls Stavro from America. She hasn't heard of the love affair between Niko and Nazlı. But she is furious for not contacting her daughter, Katina who once upon a time fell in love with a Turkish boy too. When she hears from Stavro that Katina has gone to Turkey. She becomes mad. She shouts at Stavro angrily as he let Katina go to Turkey.

...

The second dinner is held in Athens. Memik and Eftelya independently plan to raid the dinner scandalously to protest both the marriage and Turkish and Greek frienship. Two familis calmly agree on where the marriage will be held. Just as Nazlı begins to make herself believe that every troubles have been done away with (eliminated), Memik and Eftelya enters the chamber where the dinner is had given. When Stavro tries to calm down Eftelya, Kahraman does so with Memik.

Memik: I don't want a foreign groom. I'm against my grand daughter marrying a Greek groom. I will not let a Greek in among us. No to a Turkish and Greek frienship

Eftelya: This marriage proves impossible. We hate Turks. You can not marry this girl unless you kill me Niko. No to a Turkish bride.

Nazlı: My dear Grandpa, you hurt me.

Memik: Your coward dad worries me too.

Kahraman: Come on dad, look it is shameful. Look, the Turkish Ambassador is here to honour this event.

Memik: I respect you Mr. Ambassador. Such things happen during warfare. I have some remarks to tell on Cyprus issue.

.....

Turkish Ambassador: This marriage must come true. Therefore, unnecessary tensions will be over. Turkish and Greeks nations are to live together brotherly in peace for centruies.

Memik ve Eftelya: Never can Turks and Greeks be friends, not ever!

...

After dinner Memik continues his protests outside the Greek Parliament.

Memik: Greek is hostile, palikarya oppressant. All Greeks are traitors.

(Kahraman and Memik speak to each other)

Kahraman: Dad, why haven't you enjoyed dinner?

Memik: I have already got something by me to eat. I won't eat anything Greek. Who knows whether they will poison me or not? You should expect all sorts of hostility from them. I've come here to pay back for my grandfather. I will do that with my very heart. I had the spirit of national struggle. You, coward.

...

Memik, speaks in The Society of Veterans upon returning from Greece.

Memik: Hopefully I had a triumph against the Greeks after the state of war. I both did away with the Greek groom and I found a permanent solution to the problem of Cyprus. Hey veterans, we will shoot this conspiring Greek with his own weapons. Now that they want no solutions to the problem, we will surely give no solutions either. The honourable Turkish flag will always wave over Northern Cyprus. I telegraphed my plan to Ankara. When necessary, I will fight on the front line against them.

...

Stavro *(To Niko and Nazlı staying together in Istanbul before the marriage):* Don't misbehave otherwise Mr. Kahraman will cut us all.

...

(Nazlı and Niko talk about their marriage and Turkish- Greek friendship on a live television programme and Eftelya and Memik react while watching it on tv.)

Eftelya: That Turkish girl will never be our bride. They will have to kill me if they are to marry really.

Memik: My son Kahraman is not a coward man. He will not give my grand daughter, Nazlı to that Greek man.

...

Eftelya goes to Gaziantep and makes a plan together with Memik who is also against this marriage too. According to the plan a gang so called El-Antep Soldiers would kidnap Eftleya and put forth a mere condition that this marriage should be canceled to release her.

Memik and Eftelya call names after each other such as below:

Eftelya *(for Memik)* old goat, crazy senile, old senile

Memik *(for Eftelya)* witch

...

Stavro speaks to his wife after he learns his mother has gone to Gaziantep:

Stavro: Why she has gone to Gaziantep, what do you think of the reason why? Perhaps my mother loves Turkey and Turks so much you know (!)

...

Collaboration of Memik with Eftelya continues even in the marital ceremony. Both rented a helicopter to land on the platform where the ceremony was held. In spite of all the objections, the marriage came true, with Turkish-Greek friendship winning in the end.

Stage 2: Character oriented evaluation

When we classify the main characters in the serial story according to the roles in the process of "otherisation" , the following table (1) appears.

When Niko revealed to his family that he loved a Turkish girl (Nazlı) and wanted to marry her, his parents, Eleni and Stavro full of negative prejudices reacted as severely and rigidly as Memik Usta and Kahraman did. The fact that Nazlı is a Turkish girl poses Niko's family a problem. Considering this dispute symbolically, the approaches of the two parties, namely nations, Eleni and Stavro and later Niko's grandmother Eftelya and Memik Usta and Kahraman represent negative extremes, while aunt Katina, Nazire, and Feride despite her occasional reluctance remain go-between.

Table 1

Turkey				Greece		
nonconciliatory	mild	go-between	conciliatory	go-between	mild	nonconciliatory
Memik	Kahraman	Feride	Nazlı Niko	Katina	Stavro Eleni	Eftelya

Negative extremes are regarded as "other" to continue and create differences based on historical negativities with stereotypic adjectives, and meanwhile go-between representations support arguments such as being human, sameness in humanity sharing the same geography and history, leaving the negative history behind etc. Also through Athens Mayor and Governor of Gaziantep, Turkish and Greek Embassies, attitudes of friendship are exhibited in the serial. In the process of the serial, tolerance appears from younger to older generations. Sympathy between the two nations in the representation of Nazlı and Niko continues with their parents mutually renewing and loving one another in view of their childrens' affair. Both Kahraman and Stavro gradually diminish "otherising" statements and actions so much that the generation against friendship of both nations through Nazlı and Niko's togetherness struggles to change attitudes of Nazlı's grandfather Memik Usta and Niko's grandmother Eftelya although they object to their marriage of Nazlı and Niko. New generations' attempts following the marriage give rise to positive results, and prejudices in Memik and Eftelya undergo significant breakages.

Identity "we" is not limited to nation and also embraces religion, country, village surrounding, race and origin, profession, ideology, status in the family, football team and sex, mankindness, which all form identity "we". (Milas, 2003:12) As long as characters know one another and personality traits and internalise the feeling of members or part of a family occasionally encounter in the common denominator of sex, they tend to constitute new "we's".

Although the characters Memik and Eftelya in the antagonism column of the table categorising the first thirty episodes to define the sample resist for sometime and build the reasoning of “otherisation” in discourse and actions, it is observed that friendly attempts of new generations become positive, with significant breakages emerging in mutual prejudices of Memik and Eftelya. After Nazlı and Niko have a baby, the tension continued by Memik and Eftelya on how to name the baby and what religion to choose for him is dissolved with manoeuvres of conciliating figures.

With Stavro experiencing a heart attack (cardiac failure), Nazlı supposed to stay in Athens with Eftelya, his grandmother rather hostile to Turks for Niko to deal with his business for a time comes to remain perhaps for the last time the object of the process of otherisation based on nationalism exhibited in the serial. Put more simply, Eftelya bans speaking any languages but Greek, chooses those who do not speak any tongues but Greek from the baby sitter to the driver for Nazlı and imposes a compulsory policy upon Nazlı and her baby to learn Greek culture only.

Stage 3: “Otherising” expressions and allusions used for two parties in the serial

After decoding and analysing 30 episodes, it is seen that two parties are positioned each other with these “otherisation” discourses mentioned in table 2.

Table 2

“Otherising” expressions and allusions used for two parties in the serial	
Those used for the Greek	Those used for the Turks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have no daughter to give a Greek as a bride • Don’t put the enemy into among us as a groom • I won’t put a Greek among us • Hostile to Turks • Greek bastard • Greek boy • Greek in law • Son of the vicar • Palikarya (go home, get out, can not be a friend) • Nonsense, doublestandard • You try to own everything of ours (what ever is ours) • Greek admirar • We don’t want a foreign groom. • We don’t want a Greek groom. • We don’t want Greeks • No to Turkish- Greek friendship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would rather die than learn you will marry a Turkish girl. • They forcibly deported us from İstanbul. • We would always remember the pains they made us suffer even if forty centuries passed. • They gave us a few pences and we boarded a train and were deported. • I don’t want a Turkish bride • I don’t want to let Turks in my home. • If you are to marry that Turkish girl we will disown you. • uncivilised • barbarian • rude • Turkish admirer • The Turkish girl will never be our bride. They will have to step on my dead body if they are to marry. • Old goat

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eurpea is traitor • Do I have Greek blood throguh my veins just because of you • Collaboration with Greek means insulting Turkish martyrs. • witch • coward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crazy old • Old senile • Hate Turkey and Turks • A Turk can not be a friend • They homicide for their so-called honour
---	--

In the succeeding episodes parting caused by an unilateral malicious feelings of love of Esra for Niko who comes from Turkey to help him with business causes both families to become one including Memik and Eftelya that are against this marriage from the beginning. Moreover a sentimental closeness appears between Memik and Eftelya to constitute the togetherness of the most unconciliatory extremes. Their marriage is maintained with the efforts exerted by all members of both families, with the result that “otherising” discourses dissappear completely later in the serial. There are if any disputes between the parties, which are however merely caused by usual human relationships not by a different ethnicity. Briefly both parties rejecting eachother in representation manage to accept to become a large family, and with triumph of common sense and messages of friendship, peace is crowned between two other shores of the Aegean Sea.

Conclusion

In the initial 30 episodes of the serial which forms the sample of the study in which the phenomenon of otherisation, teoritically and conceptionally different otherisation mechanisms and instruments in which to use them as prejudices, stereotypes, differentiations, exclusions, reductions etc are comprehensively analysed.

For all prejudices and oppositions following 30th episode, friendship outwits hostility in representation and otherisation based on nationalism regresses. In the picture until the marriage, after so called mild characters find opportunity to get to know eachother and question how maintainence of previous negativities hinders the peace friendship could bring in future, they tend to move to the conciliatory process, which further accelerates following the 30th episode and their otherising discourse vanishes, since events which enable the parties to discover that there are more shared qualities to herald collaboration rather than differences caused by discrimination become more significant thanks to a relatively obligatory togetherness of the marriage institution.

Every identity has an “other”. We know and interact with what is different from us, in which what is different means “other” to me. However, these “others” do not create a force to do away with me/us, rather we should

know and see them as elements to form or compliment our very identity. We should recognize that neither their ancestors nor ours had the target to exploit and destroy eachother. Aware of the fact that one can not do without other, one lives together with "other" by recognizing and respecting what is different as "other". (Yavaşgel, 2004:192)

The study that analysis representation mechanisms to create "other" through media confirms once again "presentations, as Linda Steet denotes, just like arithmetical equations, shouldn't cancel each other" to be an undisputable reality (2000:10). Wishing a world to be established in which in the relationship between "we" and "they" to be discussed theorytically and conceptionally our knowledge is –will be- welcome with tolerance, admitting all differences while defining "we" and "others" and not attributing associations synonymous with "worse" to the difference, what is different.

Bibliography

AKÇA, Emel B. (2000) "Türk Yazılı Basın Söyleminde Yunanistan'ın Ötekileştirilmesi ve Kardak Krizi Örnek Olayı" ("Otherisation of Greece In Discourse of Turkish Media and Case Study of Kardak Crisis"), 3-5 May 2000, Declarations of 1st National Communication Symposium, *Political Communication*.

AKTAR, Ayhan, "Ellerinde Sopalarla Beyoğlu'na Girdiler" ("They Entered to Beyoğlu with Bats in Their Hands"), Sabah, <http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2005/09/06/gnd115.html>, 25.09.2006, retrieved 20.11.2007

ASHLEY, Richard (1989) "Living on Border Lines: Man, Poststructuralism and War", J. Derrian ve M. J. Shapiro (ed.) *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Reading of World Politics*, Toronto, Lexington.

BAUMAN, Zygmunt (2000) *Postmodernlik ve Hoşnutsuzlukları* (Postmodernism and Its Associated Displeasures), İsmail Türkmen (trans.), İstanbul, Ayrıntı Publications.

BİLGİN, Nuri (1995) "Kimlik Sorununda Evrenselcilik-Farkçılık Gerilimini Aşmak" ("Management of Universalism- Differentialism in Identity Problem"), *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Vol: 33, March- April, 1995, Ankara.

BİLGİN, Nuri (1996) *İnsan İlişkileri ve Kimlik* (Human Relationships and Identity), İstanbul, Sistem Publications.

BİLGİN, Nuri (1997) *Siyaset ve İnsan* (Politics and Humanbeing), "Medyanın Sorumluluğu: Günah Keçisi Yaratmak Mı?" ("Responsibility of Media: Creating a Goat of Sin?"), İstanbul, Bağlam Publications.

BUCHANAN, William and Hadley Cantril (1992) "Ulusların Stereotipleri" ("Stereotypes of Nations"), *Kitle Haberleşmesi Teorilerine Giriş* (Introduction to Mass Communication Theories), Ü. Oskay (ed.), İstanbul, Der Publications.

CONNOLLY, E. William (1995) *Kimlik ve Farklılık; Siyasetin Açmazlarına Dair Demokratik Çözüm Önerileri* (Identity and Difference; Proposals of Democratic Solution to Political Dilemmas), F. Lekezizalın (int.), İstanbul, Ayrıntı Publications.

DERRIDA, Jacques (1991) "Eating Well" or the Calculation of the "Subject", *Who Comes After the Subject*, E. Cadua, P. Connor ve J. Nancy (der.), New York and London, Routledge.

DUNCAN, James (1993) "Sites of Representations, Place, Time and the Discourse of the Other", *Place/Culture/Representation*, J. Duncan ve D. Ley (der.), London, Routledge.

FOWLER, Roger (1991) *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*, London and New York, Routledge.

GÜVEN, Dilek, "6-7 Eylül Olayları (1)" ("Events of September 6-7"), *Radikal*, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=163380>, 08.08.2005, Retrieved 10.10.2006.

HALL, Stuart (1988) "The Social Production of News: Mugging in the Media", *The Manufacture of News*, S. Cohen ve J. Young (der.), London, Costable.

HARTLEY, John (1996) *Popular Reality*, London: Routledge.

KEYMAN, E. Fuat (2003) "Farklılığa Direnmek: Uluslararası İlişkiler Kuramı'nda 'Öteki' Sorunu" ("Resistance To Difference: Question of "Other" in The Theory of International Relationships"), *Doğu-Batı*, Vol: 23.

KÖSOĞLU, Nevzat (1995) "Kültür/ Kimlik Üzerine" ("On Culture/ Identity"), *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Vol: 33, March- April, Ankara.

LILLHANNUS, Ruth (2002) "Open, Closed, and Locked Images, Cultural Stereotypes and the Symbolic Creation of Reality", *Intercultural Communication*, Issue: 5, <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/>

LIPPMANN, Walter (1922) *Public Opinion*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

MILAS, Herkül (1998) "Türk Ders Kitaplarında 'Yunanlılar': Bütünleştirici Bir Yaklaşım" ("Greece' in Textbooks of Turkish Curricula: A Uniting Approach"), *Tarih Eğitimi ve Tarihte Öteki Sorunu* (Education of History and Question "Other" in History), İstanbul, Foundation of History, Yurt Publication.

MILAS, Herkül (2003) "Öteki ve Biz" ("Other and We"), *Zaman*, 29.05.2003.

TANRIÖVER, Hülya Uğur (ed.) (2008) *Sen Benim Kim Olduğumu Biliyor Musun? Toplumsal Yaşamda Kimlik İzdüşümleri* (Do You Know Who Am I, Identity Projections in Social Life), İstanbul, Hil Publications.

TEKELİ, İlhan (1998) "Tarih Yazıcılığı ve Öteki Kavramı Üzerine Düşünceler" ("Thoughts on the Concept "Other" and History Writing"), *Tarih Eğitimi ve Tarihte 'Öteki' Sorunu* (Education of History and Question "Other" in History), A. Berktaş and H. C. Tuncer (ed.), İstanbul, Turkish History Publications.

TEKELİ, İlhan (1998) *Tarih Yazımı Üzerine Düşünmek* (Thinking on Pondering Over History Writing), Ankara, Dost Publication.

SÖZEN, Edibe (1995) "Kimlik Kavramının Yeniden Tanımlanması" ("Redefinition of Identity Concept"), *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Vol: 33, March-April, Ankara.

SMITH, Anthony D. (1994) *Milli Kimlik* (National Identity), B. S. Şener (int), İstanbul.

STEET, Linda (2000) *Veils and Daggers: A Century of National Geographic's Representation of the Arab World*, New York, Temple University Press.

VERGİN, Nur (1993) "Değişim ve Süreklilik" ("Change and Continuity"), *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Vol: 25, Ankara.

ULUÇ, Güliz (2009), *Medya ve Oryantalizm* (Media and Orientalism), İstanbul, E Publications.

YAVAŞGEL, Emine (2004) *Siyasal İletişim* (Political Communication), Ankara, Babil Publications.

YEĞENOĞLU, Meyda (2003) *Sömürgeci Fantaziler* (Colonial Fantasies), İstanbul, Metis Publications.

<http://www.kanald.com.tr/dizi/yabancidamat/>, retrieved 10.10.2006.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yabancı_Damat, retrieved 11.10.2007.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Istanbul_Pogrom retrieved 10.10.2006.