

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE INTEGRATION PROCESS OF MOREA IMMIGRANTS: EXAMPLES OF ANTALYA AND KUŞADASI

Bilgehan OĞUZ

PhD Student, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, History, Türkiye

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2236-844X> ROR ID: <https://ror.org/05n2cz176>

Abstract: During and after the 1821 Mora Rebellion, the Mora Turks who managed to hold on to life migrated to regions where they could be safe and rebuild their lives. The migration locations were the capital city of Istanbul, the coastal cities of Western Anatolia, Kuşadası, Antalya, etc. The Mora Turks, who also gained a migrant identity with this journey, entered a process of adaptation with both the local people and other migrant groups in the regions where they settled. However, this process did not progress at the same pace in every region. This study aims to compare the integration processes of the Mora Turks who migrated to the Ottoman lands after the 1821 Mora Rebellion in Antalya and Kuşadası. Through both examples, it will be revealed that the migration movement had transformative effects not only on spatial but also on social, cultural and economic structures. In doing so, various archive records, travel books and research works will be used.

Keywords: Ottoman, Balkans, Morea, Antalya, Kuşadası, forced migration, integration

Submitted: 20.02.2025 **Accepted:** 13.03.2025

Corresponding author: Bilgehan Oğuz, bilgeoguz278@gmail.com

Citation: Oğuz, B. (2025). *A comparative analysis of the integration process of Morea immigrants: examples of Antalya and Kuşadası*. In H. Etem (Ed.), *7th International Balkan Summer School: Contemporary Challenges in the Balkans – EU and Migration Issues Proceedings* (pp. Sayfa aralığı). IDEFE Publications.

Introduction

Migration is the process of people moving away from their current lands, their accustomed social structures, existing economic opportunities, and in short, many elements of social life, and opening doors to new living spaces (Yalçın, 2004: 5). Migration, which should not be defined as a mere displacement movement, is a dynamic process that shapes the demographic, cultural, socio-economic structure of societies and their development (Akıncı vd., 2015: 61). This process brings about the formation of new relationships and interactions, and the reshaping of the existing structure. (Dağışan & Aydın, 2017: 740).

The migrations that occurred as a result of the great land losses experienced in the Balkan region in the last period of the Ottoman Empire were one of the most important issues of the 19th century. The migrations that occurred individually or collectively during this period brought about important developments in social, economic and cultural terms. Another migration event that occurred from the Balkan region was the migration to Morea. This process, which started with the 1821 Morea Rebellion, resulted in the massacre of thousands of people and the displacement of thousands of people from their homes. In this sense, it is seen that Morea immigrants migrated to the capital Istanbul, the coastal cities of Western Anatolia, some Aegean Islands and the Antalya district in order to establish a new life during and after the rebellion (Örenç, 2020: 69). The immigrants had difficulties in terms of food, shelter, adaptation, etc. in the regions where they settled. As a result, the state and the local people tried to eliminate these difficulties with the support they provided to the Morea immigrants.

The process of integration of the immigrants to the region where they are settled is at least as important as the rebellion process and the migration event. At this point, communication and interaction between groups have an important place. Migration is not only a geographical movement, but also a dynamism and a combination of differences (Kaya, 2015: 5). Although it can create areas of conflict, competition and sharing, it also creates the energy and synergy that will enable the solutions of the tensions that arise. Ultimately, it emerges as a result of the change and transformation of the social structure (Balcıoğlu, 2007: 46-47).

The integration processes experienced in the regions to which they migrated affect both the new lives of the immigrants and the social, cultural, political, etc. aspects of the region. In this respect, it is an issue that needs to be evaluated how fast the integration between the regions progresses and what kind of effects this process has on the region. In this study, Kuşadası and Antalya districts, where the Mora immigrants migrated, were selected as sample settlement

areas. Because Kuşadası is a district of İzmir Sanjak, Aydın Province, and is one of the areas in the region where the immigrants first entered and mostly migrated. Antalya is the central district of Teke Sanjak, Konya Province, and is far from the hometowns where the immigrants left. It is also located in a region where a small number of immigrants migrated. A comparative study will be attempted while addressing the integration process in these settlement areas located in different regions. In doing so, archival records, travel books and research works will be utilized.

The Mora Rebellion of 1821 and Forced Migration

The French Revolution, which took place in Europe under the influence of the period called the “Age of Enlightenment” in the 18th century, led to the emergence of nationalism and libertarian movements (Sezer, 1999: 87). This idea of nationalism that emerged after the French Revolution also manifested itself in the Balkans, which were within the Ottoman geography, after Europe. Because the multinational Balkan peoples were influenced by this idea and began to take action (Taştan, 2006: 433). The following statements of Theodoros Kolokotronis, who was among the leaders of the 1821 Mora Rebellion, in his *Apomnimevma* (Memoirs) explain the effects of the French Revolution:

In my opinion, the French Revolution and Napoleon opened the eyes of the world. Before that, nations did not know themselves and people thought that kings were gods on earth and said that everything they did was good. Therefore, it is more difficult to govern a people today. (Mazower, 2021: 36).

One of the peoples most affected by the idea of nationalism was the Greeks. In the early 19th century, the Greeks, who were spread all over the Ottoman Empire, lived mostly in the Aegean and Mediterranean islands, Mora, Thessaly and Rumelia (Çelik, 2013: 183). The Greeks, who always had a privileged position within the Ottoman Empire, were given the right to property on land as well as freedom of language and religion (Karal, 1970: 107). In this context, Arnold Toynbee said, “*The Greeks were like partners of the Ottoman Empire.*” (Toynbee, 1999: 40).

The Greeks, who were in a privileged position within the state, despite all these conditions, especially with the instigation of Russia, were firmly attached to the idea of establishing an independent state. In line with this purpose, the Filiki Eterya Society was established in 1814 (Cevdet, 1966: 93). The number of members of this society, which was in the most important position of preparing the Greek rebellion, reached 200,000 by 1821 and the activities of the society matured the idea of independence (Toprak, 2019: 139). Finally, on April 2, 1821 (

March 21 according to the ancient Greek calendar), they started the rebellion under the leadership of Bishop Germanos of Balyabadra with the slogan “ *Peace to Christians! Respect to the Councils! Death to the Turks!*” (Howarth, 1976:28).

The rebellion that started in Kalavrita Castle under the leadership of Bishop Germanos of Balyabadra quickly spread to the Morea and the islands (Örenç, 2020: 33). The rebellious Greeks committed massacres that will not be erased from the pages of history in all the cities they entered. In the environment created by the 1821 Morea Rebellion, there was no longer a safe life for the Morea Turks who suffered a lot and were subjected to massacres. In this sense, the rebellion process was the beginning of a period full of deep pain for the Turks living in the Morea Peninsula. Because, at the very beginning of the rebellion, the rebels attacked these people mercilessly with the slogans “ *No Turks will remain; neither in the Morea nor in the World* “ (Phillips, 1897: 48), did not recognize the right to life and forced them to choose between death and migration. W. Alison Phillips, who wrote the history of the Mora rebellion, stated that the song that was circulated from mouth to mouth, “ *Let there be no Turks left in Mora, let them be wiped out from the whole world*”, heralded the beginning of a war of annihilation and expressed the rebellion with the following words:

...In April, the rebellion had become widespread. As if they had received a signal from somewhere, the villagers suddenly rose up everywhere and massacred all the Turks they could find, without distinguishing between children, women and men... The song that was passed from mouth to mouth, “Let there be no Turks left in Morea, let them be wiped out from the whole world”, heralded the beginning of a war of annihilation. The number of Muslims in Morea was thought to be twenty-five thousand. Within three weeks of the beginning of the rebellion, there were no Muslims left except for a few who had managed to escape to the cities. (Phillips, 1897: 48; Şimşir, 2017: 30).

The scale of the massacres was so great that very few Peloponnese Turks were able to save their lives. Those who managed to save their lives were forced to migrate from the regions they had known as their homeland for centuries, considered their heritage and made prosperous. On the other hand, the migration process left traces of pain on the Peloponnese Turks as much as the rebellion process. Because they suffered many hardships both during the journey and in the places they reached, struggling with hunger, thirst, lack of money, etc. (Oğuz & Menekşe, 2024: 257).

Migration and Population of Morea Emigrants

During the rebellion, the Turks who had to leave Mora due to fear of their lives began to migrate to safer regions, primarily Istanbul and the Western Anatolian coasts, by any means they could find. Because Istanbul, Izmir, Kusadasi, Antalya, Edirne, Varna, Preveza, Yanya, Tirhala and Egypt became the settlement areas for these immigrants (Ipek, 2005: 98). The population information of the Mora immigrants registered in the Izmir Sanjak Districts is given in the table below.

	H.1246/ M.1830-31 Census		AH 1259/AD 1843-44 Census	
	Number of Households	Male Population	Number of Households	Male Population
Peaceful Mora Immigrants in Nefs-i Izmir	61	119	61	120
Calm Kizilhisar Immigrants in Cesme District	78	142	30	70
Kizilhisar Refugees Calm in Alacati Town of Cesme District	20	48	4	9
Kizilhisar Refugees Calm in Seferihisar Town	96	220	96	216
Kizilhisar Refugees Calm in Sığacık Castle of Seferihisar District	76	156	74	148
Kizilhisar Refugees Calm in Tepecik Village of Seferihisar District	2	3	2	3
Kizilhisar Immigrants Temporarily Settled Around Hereke, Seferihisar District	27	64	21	49

Calm Benefşe Immigrants in Kuşadası	252	536	243	513
Peaceful Mora Immigrants in Söke Town	29	57	29	55
Immigrants Added to the Population Book Later				
Refugees from Anatolia	4	9	2	3
Gastonian immigrants say the canine of Mora	10	20	8	17
Kizilhisar Immigrants	22	39	21	38
Total	677	1,413	591	1,241

Source: (Menekşe, 2024:227).

Table 1, shows the population data for the 1830-1831 and 1843-1844 censuses together. In the 1830-1831 general census, it was determined that 1,413 male immigrants were registered in 677 households in the districts of İzmir, Çeşme, Seferihisar, Kuşadası, and Söke. In the 1843-1844 census, it was stated that 1,241 male immigrants were registered in 591 households. Assuming that there were as many females as males, and multiplying the male population by two, it is estimated that there were at least 2,826 immigrants from Mora in the 1830-1831 general census and at least 2,482 immigrants from Mora in the 1843-1844 census within the İzmir Sanjak. The population difference between the two censuses was due to the demographic events that occurred. Indeed, among the immigrants, there were newborns, those who died and those who went to another place. It is stated that the following notes were added to the names of these immigrants: “born”, “deceased”, “reft “ (departed) (Menekşe, 2024: 227-228).

It is also possible to obtain data on the population of Morea immigrants who migrated to Antalya District from archive records. Because it was determined that 522 male Morea immigrants were registered in Antalya in the census of 1830-1831 (Kara1, 1995: 122). It is also possible to obtain data on the population of Morea immigrants in Antalya from the population books of 1840-1841. The population of Morea immigrants recorded in the books of 1840-1841 is given in the table below:

Table 2: Places Where Morea Immigrants Lived in Antalya According to the 1840-1841 Census

Neighborhood Name in the Castle	Number of Emigrants from Morea	Neighborhood Name Outside the Castle	Number of Emigrants from Morea
Cami-i Cedid	4	Timurcu Suleyman	38
Cami-i Atik	9	Bali Bey	7
Makbul Aga	7	Divan Piri	0
Hatib Suleyman	8	Kızılсарay	27
Mecdeddin	11	Elmalı	13
Has Balaban	6	Asık Dogan	2
Karadaî (Karadayi)	1	Sagir Bey	7
Iskender Celebi	0	Keçi Bali	7
Baba Dogan	2	Şeyh Sinan	44
Tuzcular	6	Çavuş Bahçesi	2
Cullah Kara	1	Tahıl Pazarı	0
Ahi Yusuf	4	Igdir Hasan	9
Ahi Kızı	0	Şücaeddin	5
		Sofular	23
		Arab Mescidi	8
		Araban (Urban)	0
		Kızılharım	0
		Takyeci Mustafa	33
		Kirişçiler	2
		Meydan	0
		Timurcu Kara	3
Total	59		230
		Grand Total	289

Source: (Oguz, 2025, 159).

As can be seen from Table 2, a total of 289 Mora immigrants were recorded in Antalya in the 1840-1841 census. When this population is considered as male and female and multiplied by at least “2”, it is estimated to be 578. Apart from this, the Antalya Temettuat Registers for the years 1844-1845 also provide information about the population of Mora immigrants. Because the population information of the immigrants in the mentioned registers is as given in the table below:

Neighborhoods Where Morea Immigrants Lived in Antalya in the Temettuat Records of 1844-1845		
Neighborhoods	Total Number of Households	Number of Households of Morea Emigrants
Sagir Bey	70	5
Cami-i Atik	48	4
Cullah Kara	13	1
Timurcu Suleyman	94	30
Has Balaban	33	3
Bali Bey	65	4
Tuzcular	45	3
Hatib Suleyman	28	2
Sofular	59	12
Ahi Yusuf	31	6
Divan Piri	20	1
Arab Mescidi	34	5
Aşık Dogan	56	1
Takyeci Mustafa	65	21
Kızılsaray	117	55
Igdir Hasan	47	6
Şeyh Sinan	21	4
Keçi Bali	37	11
Araban (Urban)	24	1
Yarbaşı Çandır	52	1
Total	959	176

Source: (Oguz, 2025: 172).

As can be understood from Table 3, according to the Antalya Temettuat Book records, there are 176 households of Mora immigrants in Antalya. When it is considered that there are at least “2” people, male and female, in a household, the total number of immigrants is calculated as 352. In this case, it is seen that there is a decrease in the immigrant population compared to the population books of 1830-1831 and 1840-1841. Considering that there may be births, deaths and the population moving to a different place, it can be said that the population difference is due to the population events experienced (Oğuz, 2025: 171).

Migration and Population of Morea Refugees to Kuşadası

It is seen that during the rebellion, there was frequent migration to Kuşadası, one of the places where the immigrants migrated. For example, on August 5, 1821, the Turks in Benefşe Castle, who surrendered to the rebels, were allowed to leave their property and assets behind and pass to Kuşadası by ship. Thus, around 700 immigrants were brought to Kuşadası (Mehmed Es’ad, 2000: 155). At the end of 1822 and the beginning of 1823, a group of 3,000 soldiers and local people from the castles that were captured by the rebel Greeks were transported to İzmir and Kuşadası by Çamlıca and British ships (İpek, 2022: 106). Again, on January 22, 1823, around 2,500 women and men who were able to escape the massacre at the Anabolu Castle, which was taken over by the rebellious Greeks, set off to be taken to the coast of Kuşadası with ten boats belonging to Çamlıca Island (Mekşe, 2020: 807). Since the children and relatives of many of the immigrants who reached Kuşadası had come with the previous boats, they requested to go to Çeşme to gather in one place (BOA., HAT., 904/29693, 18 Cemaziyelevvel 1238/31 January 1823). Walsh included the following information in his travelogue about the transfer of the Turks from Anabolu to Kuşadası:

When Captain Hamilton had directed his guns towards the town and the Greeks and had them within firing range, he dropped anchor and sent my friend, First Lieutenant Scott, to the shore with a group of marines and crew from the navy, to supervise the evacuation of the garrison, taking some to Cambrian and sending some to Kuşadası on other ships... However, Scott had drawn up a road from the castle gate to the shore with his limited force and had 600 Turks, along with their wives and children, pass through here and board the ships... The entire garrison, consisting of 900 people, was taken on seven ships belonging to the Ipsarans and sent to Kuşadası... A considerable number of the sick and weak were taken to Cambrian and taken to İzmir, but despite all efforts, 40 of them could not be saved. (Walsh, 2021: 295).

One of the boats carrying the people of Anabol was captured by bandits off the coast of Kuşadası. The bandits took the people on the boat captive and demanded that twelve Greek women from Kuşadası be handed over to be released. However, the guard Mustafa Reşid Pasha gave the bandits a stern warning, stating that if any of the Turkish captives were harmed, all Greek men in Kuşadası would be put to the sword and their children would be taken captive. Following this threat, the bandits killed some of the Turkish captives and released 80 people after completely robbing them. The remaining approximately 25 women and children were taken to Samos; then, after paying a ransom of 4,100 kuruş, they were brought back to Kuşadası (Örenç, 2020: 114-115).

The migration movement towards Kuşadası and İzmir was so great that according to the information given in 1828, there was no place suitable for settlement in these regions. For this reason, İzmir Guard Hasan Pasha and Kuşadası Guard Mustafa Reşid Pasha suggested that the newly arrived immigrants be sent to other settlement areas. In line with this, it was requested that the immigrants who came later, primarily around 600 from Balyabadra, be settled in the suitable areas of Manisa, Hüdavendigar, Menteşe and Kütahya (*BOA., HAT., 850/38091, 15 Rebiülevvel 1244/ 25 September 1828*).

The population registers of the Mora immigrants settled in Kuşadası in the years 1830-1831 provide important clues. Because in the population registers numbered 2908 and 2909, it is possible to determine where the Mora immigrants came from and their population. In a study conducted on the subject, it was determined that the majority of the immigrants registered in Kuşadası Town were from Benefşe. It was also stated that a small number of immigrants from Anabol, Eğriboz, Moton, Navarin (Anavarin), Mizistre, Bardunya, Laleli (Lalalı), Arkadya and Tripoli were also recorded (Menekşe, 2021: 239-241). In the 1830-1831 census, the population of the Benefşe immigrants detected in Kuşadası was determined to be 536 in 252 households. In the 1843-1844 census, 513 inhabitants were recorded in 243 households (Menekşe, 2024: 227-228).

Migration and Population of Morea Emigrants to Antalya

Although it is possible to follow the Morea immigrants who migrated to the Western Anatolian coast, Istanbul and the islands from archive records, it is difficult to follow those who came to Antalya. Therefore, it is not clear exactly when they came to Antalya. Danieloğlu wrote on the subject that the Morea immigrants came to Antalya in 1822 or 1823 (Danieloğlu, 2010: 141). Apart from this, E.

Sperling, who visited Antalya in 1862, stated that the Morea immigrants he saw in the city came in 1822-1823 and that their number was 400 households (Sperling, n.d. (as cited in Koç University AKMED, 2025). These dates also coincide with the period when the rebellion started to become increasingly violent from its first days.

According to the 1840-1841 population records, the Morea immigrants came mostly from Arkadya, Koron, Bardunya/Bardinye, Moton, Andurya, Navarin and Anabolu regions (BOA. *NFS.d.*, 3205). The records of the 1844-1845 census also provide information about the Morea immigrants in Antalya. The neighborhoods where the immigrants were concentrated were mostly in the part of the city called the castle. At the same time, the poorer immigrants lived on the “thatched roofs” in Şarampol. In the 1841 Sharia registry record, it is stated that Zeynep Hatun, who lived on thatched roofs at the head of the Şarampol area of Antalya, passed away, and that her heirs were a person named Hüseyin and his uncle Bekir (AŞS. 19/388b, 5 Rebiülahir 1257/ 27 May 1841). Apart from this, some of the immigrants had to take shelter in coffeehouses in the cities and ports (BOA. *NFS.d.* 3230, 1 Rebiülevvel 1261/ 10 March 1845).

As a result, it can be said that there is a considerable population of Morea immigrants in both regions, which are places of migration. This situation brings about change and transformation in the demographic, social, economic, political etc. life of the region to which migration is made. On the other hand, it also makes relations with the local people and other immigrant groups inevitable.

Integration Processes of Morea Immigrants in Antalya and Kuşadası Settlements

Migrants bring their own cultural background, lifestyle, and perspective on life and society to the region they arrive in (Karpát, 2014: XXXVIII). This situation necessitates the coexistence of an existing cultural accumulation in the region and individuals with different backgrounds, in other words, the formation of a common living space. While a common living space is being formed, the immigrants experience some adaptation problems. Therefore, another difficulty awaiting the immigrants is the process of cultural and social adaptation (Tekeli, 1990: 69).

When the Morea immigrants settled in Antalya and Kuşadası entered an adaptation process in a different region, it was inevitable for them to communicate with both the local population and other immigrant groups. The communication of the Morea immigrants with these groups was also important for the continuity

of their existence in the region. Despite this, in the first years after the migration process, their communication with the local population did not progress sufficiently due to both the differences in spoken language and their own traditions. This situation caused them to keep their distance from the local population. Likewise, the local population, aware of these differences, kept their distance from the immigrants (Oğuz, 2025: 240).

One of the most important reasons why the Morea immigrants were distant from the local people was the differences in spoken language. The fact that the Morea immigrants spoke Greek while the local people spoke Turkish also affected their social life (Menekşe, 2020: 817). Despite this, the Greeks in Antalya began to relearn their forgotten mother tongue thanks to the Morea immigrants (Beaufort, 2002: 129). Regarding the subject, E. Sperling, who visited Antalya in 1862, stated that the Morea immigrants retaught the “Turkicized” Greeks their mother tongue and revived their national feelings (Sperling, nd, as cited in Koç University AKMED, 2025). As a result, although the difference in spoken language created a barrier between the locals and the Morea immigrants, it also increased their relations with the Greeks.

The Morea immigrants who settled in Kuşadası, as in the case of Antalya, had some disagreements with the local people. This was caused especially by their inability to speak Turkish. However, the fact that Kuşadası was close to the Aegean Islands and that some Greek gangs attacked the shores of Kuşadası by boat during the 1821 Morea Rebellion may have also been effective. Because it is thought that the reason for the local population’s prejudice and distance towards the Morea immigrants was that the Morea immigrants spoke Greek, like the rebellious Greeks (Oğuz, 2025: 294).

When the relevant population registers are examined, the difference between the population of Morea immigrants in Antalya and in Kuşadası is striking. While a total of 1,413 Morea immigrants were recorded in Kuşadası in the 1830-1831 Population Registers (Menekşe, 2024: 227-228), 522 Morea immigrants were recorded in Antalya on the same date (Karal, 1955: 122). This situation is due to Kuşadası being closer to the Morea Peninsula and being one of the first migration stops for immigrants. The fact that the immigrant population in Kuşadası is larger caused them to carry out the adaptation process with their own internal dynamics. This situation limited their interaction with the local people, causing the adaptation process to progress slowly compared to Antalya. In Antalya, the neighborhoods where Morea immigrants and local people resided also caused distance. While the Morea immigrants were settled more densely in the neighborhoods of the city outside the castle, the local people lived inside the castle.

This situation prevented cultural exchange and communication (Oğuz, 2025: 288).

Due to the above reasons, the immigrants established more relationships among themselves. Because in Kuşadası, the local people kept the Mora immigrants away from all kinds of shopping, and exchanging girls with each other was not welcomed (Belen, 2004: 96). This situation caused a distance between the immigrants and the local people. In Antalya, due to the distance that initially formed between the two groups, the immigrants established more ties among themselves. The most effective way to do this was to establish interaction between families through marriage. For example, in Antalya, Moralı İbrahim Ağa's sister Derya Hanım married Moralı Tosun Paşa's son Salih Efendi (Beden, 2004: 230). Similarly, Moralı İbrahim Ağa married Moralı Tosun Paşa's daughter Fatma Hatun (Dayar, 2018: 32). In addition to establishing a relationship with each other through marriage, the immigrants also acted as each other's guardians, witnesses or representatives in many cases, and this situation is reflected in the archive sources of the period (Beden, 2004: 114).

In Antalya, the group that the Morea immigrants had the most contact with was the Arab immigrants. Because the Arab immigrants settled in the Antalya district constantly came together with the Morea immigrants on issues such as marriage, trade, etc. For example, Arab Süleyman Efendi married Zeynep Hanım, the daughter of Moralı İbrahim Ağa (Dayar, 2019: 115). Marriages between the two immigrant groups are frequently encountered in the Antalya Şer'îyye Sicili Books. Apart from this, the active role played by the Arab and Morea immigrants, especially in the field of trade, was effective in strengthening this bilateral relationship (Oğuz, 2025: 245). At the same time, these two immigrant groups played an important role in the commercial life of the city over time. This situation even caused the local population to rebel after a while. Because certain employment areas in Antalya were monopolized by Arab and Morean immigrants over time, and the job opportunities of local tradesmen and craftsmen were limited in parallel with this situation (Dayar, 2018: 24). It was also seen that Arab and Morean immigrants stood side by side in these negativities between locals and immigrants. For example, more than one Morean merchant and tradesman were signed on a petition prepared against the accusations against Arab immigrant merchants Hacı Ömer Ağa and Süleyman Efendi (BOA, İ. MVL, 399-17360, left: 12a (a), 20 Zilhicce 1274/ 1 August 1858).

It is seen that there was cooperation in relations with Arab immigrants in Antalya who were in the same process, they acted together and traded. Therefore, having a group of immigrants like themselves in the process of holding on to

life provided them with an advantage in a sense. However, such a situation did not exist for the immigrants of Morea in Kuşadası, and the communication they established remained constant among themselves. Thus, the integration process progressed more slowly compared to Antalya.

It is seen that the Mora immigrants in Kuşadası were not as prominent in the commercial life of the city as in the Antalya example. In this respect, some of the negativities experienced in Antalya in terms of profession are not encountered in the Kuşadası example. Because the Mora immigrants in Kuşadası were more interested in business lines such as daily workers, servants, grocers, coffee shops, tailors and greengrocers (Menekşe, 2024: 240). This situation did not create a conflict area with the local people in areas such as trade etc. as in the Antalya example. At the same time, no relationship was established with a different immigrant group in areas such as trade etc. as in Antalya.

The cultural and class differences between the Mora immigrants and the local people are also evident in other areas. Because the clothing style and consumption habits of the two groups are also among the elements that create these differences. For example, while the local people used shalwar, robes and turbans, the Mora immigrants were distinguished by their use of shirts, belts, vests and fezzes. Apart from this, the Mora immigrants frequently used items that could be examples of westernized consumption that the local people did not use. Examples of these items obtained from the estate records are goblets, Frankish chests, paintings, hourglasses, blue and white cups (Beden, 2004: 232). Apart from the different cultural elements they brought to the city, the Mora immigrants were renowned among the people as masters of culinary arts and as people who were loyal to their debts. As a result, this situation was also an indicator of their changing positions in society over time. At the same time, a quatrain was even written about the beauty of the Mora immigrant girls:

*I bought salt from the grocery store
Don't take the girl from the local,
If you take it, take the morale
It has both taste and salt. (Çimrin, 2012: 460).*

As can be understood from the examples given, although the Mora immigrants in Antalya were initially distant from the local people, this situation changed over time. Likewise, there were no separatist movements against the immigrants in the city. As a result, despite certain differences between the immigrant groups and the local people during the integration process, all segments of society got

used to living together (Oğuz, 2025, p.255). Thus, with the settlement of the Mora immigrants in the city, the human mosaic of Antalya became quite diverse. In this respect, he explained the harmony between the different cultural groups of Antalya as follows:

There was an intercultural dialogue. Everyone was respectful of each other. For example, when Muslims went to the mosque on the “Night of Power”, Christians would also come to visit the Beard of the Prophet. When corners were made to symbolize the birth of Jesus at Christmas, Muslims and Jews would also go and watch. When a funeral passed through the middle of the market, shopkeepers and coffeehouse owners would stand up, take off their hats and salute (Çimrin, 2012: 462).

In Kuşadası, due to the distance between them and the locals, the immigrants created another cemetery for themselves (Belen, 2004: 96). This Moralı cemetery was established in front of the Kuşadası Marina where the second public beach was reopened. The Mora immigrants buried their bodies in this cemetery until 1931. After Atatürk visited the region, Mayor Sedat Akdoğan removed the cemeteries on the beach and the bodies were moved to the Adalızâde Cemetery, which is currently the only cemetery in Kuşadası (Belen, 2004: 96). In Antalya, there was no question of creating a separate cemetery for the Mora immigrants. Because, in the field study, it was determined that they were together with the local people.

Despite some disagreements between the Mora immigrants and the local people in Kuşadası, harmony was achieved between the two groups over time. After the integration process was completed, the immigrants even took their place in the government positions in the region. For example, it is determined that the first mayor of Kuşadası, Hacı İbrahim Ağa (1879/1296), was a Mora immigrant. However, it is known that names from Hacı İbrahim Ağa’s generation also served as mayors during the Republican period. Apart from this, it is stated that Hasana Bey, the father of Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, who had a very important place in the history of the National Struggle and was the mayor of Kuşadası in 1900, was also a Mora immigrant (Belen, 2004: 96-97). The first headman of Kızılsaray Neighborhood, where the immigrants were most densely located in Antalya, was also a Mora immigrant. Today, this neighborhood is still under the headmanship of Recep Şengün, who belongs to the same generation of Mora immigrants (Oğuz, 2025: 267).

Conclusion

During and after the 1821 Mora Rebellion, the Mora Turks who managed to hold on to life migrated to regions where they could be safe and rebuild their lives. After the migration process, the immigrants entered a process of adapting to the region and the local people of that region. When the examples of Kuşadası and Antalya among these migration regions are examined, it is not seen that the Mora immigrants and the local people experienced a major disagreement. Despite all their differences, the two groups integrated with each other over time. Despite this, the adaptation process in both regions did not progress at the same pace. Because there are no incidents that caused a separatist event in the relations of the Mora immigrants who settled in Antalya with the local people. However, due to the distance between the local people and the Mora immigrants in Kuşadası, the immigrants created a separate cemetery for themselves. However, it is seen that a common cemetery was created in Antalya. In addition, it has been determined that marriages between the local people and the immigrants in Kuşadası were not welcomed for a period. When we look at the example of Antalya, shortly after the adaptation process, marriages between the two groups were considered normal and this situation is also reflected in the archive documents of the period.

There are three factors that are effective in the differences experienced in the integration of immigrants in these two settlement areas: 1) Geography 2) Proximity to the rebellion region 3) Social structure in the settlement area. First of all, when the geography factor is considered; Kuşadası has already been a region with a dense Greek population. In Antalya, the large Turkish population has ensured that the local people do not feel any threat. At the same time, Kuşadası has received more migration than Antalya during this process, which has caused the local people in the region to be affected more negatively. Secondly, the prejudiced approach in Kuşadası also stems from the fact that the rebellion has spread to areas such as Kuşadası, İzmir and Seferihisar. Because the rebels' landing in Kuşadası and carrying out looting operations have also led to a reaction against the immigrants coming from Morea. This dilemma experienced in Kuşadası has also caused distance. Because the Turks coming from Morea and the rebels speaking Greek have caused the local people to keep their distance from the immigrants. Apart from this, while the immigrants who migrated to Kuşadası entered into an integration process only with the local people, the immigrants who migrated to Antalya also entered into an integration process with the Arab immigrants. This situation allowed the two different immigrant groups to interact and balance this process. When we look at the example of Kuşadası,

there is no immigrant group that can be interacted with other than the local people at that time.

Although there were some disagreements and distances at the beginning, the immigrants provided important services in the administrative, political, economic and cultural areas of the region. For example, the first mayor of Kuşadası was a Mora immigrant, while the first headman of the Kızılsaray Neighborhood in Antalya was also a Mora immigrant. Similarly, there are often names belonging to the Mora immigrant generation among the politicians in the parliament. It is known that the immigrants undertook important duties in the defense of the homeland during the National Struggle.

Ultimately, a migration movement, regardless of the reason, is not just a movement of displacement. However, migrants are not just numerical data in the regions they are in or leave. Because migrants take their own identities, cultures and many other social elements with them to the regions they migrate to. This situation deeply affects both the social structure of the region they leave and the social structure of the region where they establish a new life.

REFERENCES

Archival Documents

Unpublished Documents

AŞS. Antalya Şer'iyye Sicilleri/Antalya Court Records. Vols.19

BOA. T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi / Turkish Presidency State Archives of the Republic of Turkey Department of Ottoman Archives

BOA. NFS.d., (Nüfus Defteri)

BOA, İ. MVL, (İrade Meclis-i Vala)

BOA., HAT. (Hatt-ı Hümayun)

Modern Works

Akıncı B. Nergiz, A., Gedik, E. (2015). "Uyum Süreci Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme: Göç ve Toplumsal Kabul", *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi* I(2). 58-83.

Balcıoğlu, İ. (2007). *Sosyal ve Psikolojik Açından Göç*. İstanbul: Elit Kültür Yayınları.

Beaufort, T.S.F. (2002). *Karamanya*. Ali Neyzi), D. Türker (Trans.). Antalya: Suna-İnan Kıraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü.

Beden, A. (2004). *1854-1859 yılları arasında Antalya (8 No'lu Antalya Şer'iyye Sicilleri Defterine göre)* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tarih Anabilim Dalı.

- Belen, N. (2004). *1900-1973 yılları arasında Kuşadası'nın sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik tarihi* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Anabilim Dalı.
- Cevdet, A. (1966). *Tarih-i Cevdet XI*, İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat.
- Çelik, Y. (2013). *Şeyhül-Vüzerâ Koca Hüsrev Paşa II. Mahmud Devrinin Perde Arkası*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Çimrin, H. (2012). *Bir Zamanlar Antalya -Tarih, Gözlem ve Anılar I*. Antalya: Antalya Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Kültür Yayınları.
- Dağaşan E., Aydın, S. (2017). "Göçün Sosyal Hayata Yansımaları: 93 Harbi Döneminde Oltu'dan Tokat'a Bir Göç Hikâyesi", O. Köse (Ed.). *Geçmişten Günümüze Göç II*, Samsun: Canik Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları. 737-744.
- Danieloğlu, D.E. (2010). *1850 Yılında Bir Pamphlia Seyahati*, Antalya: Suna-İnan Kırac Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- Dayar, E. (2018). "19. Yüzyıl Antalya'sında Mora Göçmeni Bir Aile: Moraviler", *Toplumsal Tarih*, (292). 24-33.
- Dayar, E. (2019). "Antalya'da Mehmet Ali Paşa'nın Arapları Hacı Ömer Ağa ve Süleyman Efendi" *Antalya Kitabı Antalya'da Türk-İslam Medeniyetinin İzleri II*. Antalya: Palet Yayınları. 117-156.
- Howarth, D. (1976). *The Greek Adventure Lord Byron and other Eccentrics in the War of Independence*. London.
- İpek, N. (2005). Yunanistan'ın Nüfus Siyaseti ve Mora'dan Batı Trakya'ya Kadar Türkler. *Yakın Tarihimizde Türklere Karşı İşlenen Katliam ve Sürgünler*. Mustafa Kahramanyol (Ed.). 95-107.
- İpek, N. (2006) "Rum İsyanı ve Sonrasında Türk-Yunan Nüfusu Meselesi", *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*. Trabzon: Serander Yayınları. 471-486.
- İpek, N. (2022). *Memalik-i Şahane Muhaceret*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Karal, E. Z. (1995). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İlk Nüfus Sayımı 1831*. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.
- Karal, E. Z. (1995). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İlk Nüfus Sayımı 1831*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.
- Karal, E.Z. (1970). *Osmanlı Tarihi V*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Karpat, K. (2015). "Önsöz", *Türkiye'nin Göç Tarihi 14. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye'ye Göçler*, M. M. Erdoğan, A. Kaya (Eds.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Kaya A. & Erdoğan M.M. (2015). "Giriş Kısmı". *Türkiye'nin Göç Tarihi, 14. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye'ye Göçler*. M. Murat Erdoğan & Ayhan Kaya (Eds.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Mazower, M. (2021). *The Greek Revolution 1821 and the Making of Modern Europe*, Penguin Books.

- Menekşe, M. (2020). “Mora Müslümanlarının Hazin Hikayesi: İsyân, Zorunlu Göç ve İskân (1821-1832) Sürecine Genel Bir Bakış”, *Journal of History School*. XIV. 784-832.
- Menekşe, M. (2021). “Mora İsyânı Sonrasında İzmir (Sığla) Sancağı'na Gelen İlk Türk Muhacirlerinin Nüfus Bilgileri (H.1246/M.1830-31-H. 1259/1843-44 Yıllarına Ait Nüfus Kayıtlarına Göre)”. *Mora Katliamı ve Anadolu'da Yunan Mezalimi Sempozyumu (15-16 Kasım 2021) Bildiriler Kitabı*. 229-280.
- Mnekeşe, M. (2024). Mora Türklerinin Kuşadası'na Zorunlu Göçü ve Nüfus Bilgileri (H.1246/M.1830-1831 ve H. 1259/1843-1844 Yılları Nüfus Kayıtlarına Göre). *Türklerin Balkanları*. Ş. Ulusan, N.N Kara (Ed.). Muğla: Berikan Yayınevi. 213-252.
- Oğuz, B. & Menekşe, M. (2024). “Avrupalı Tanıklar Gözünden 1821 Mora İsyânı: Sadece Bağımsızlık Mücadelesi mi? Yoksa Bir Katliam mı?”, *Türklerin Balkanları*, Ş. Ulusan, N.N. Kara (Eds.), Muğla: Berikan Yayınevi. 253-288.
- Oğuz, B. (2025). *Mora Türklerinin Antalya Kazası'na zorunlu göçü: İskân ve Entegrasyon* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tarih Anabilim Dalı.
- Örenç, A.F. (2020). *Balkanlarda İlk Dram ve Eyaletten Bağımsızlığa Yunanistan: Unuttuğumuz Mora Türkleri*. İstanbul: Babıali Kültür Yayıncılık.
- Phillips, W. A. (1897). *The War of Greek Independence 1821 to 1833*. Smith Elder & Co. London.
- Seyyid Mehmed Es'ad Efendi. (2000). *Vak'a-nüvis Es'ad Efendi Tarihi (Bâhir Efendi'nin Zeyl ve İlâveleriyle) 1237-1241/1821-1826*, Z. Yilmazer (Ed.). İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Sezer, H. (1999) “Mora İsyânı ve Yunanistan'ın Bağımsızlığı (1821-1829)”. *Osmanlı II*, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları. 87-93.
- Sperling, E. (n.d.). *Gezginlerin Gözüyle Antalya*. Koç Üniversitesi AKMED. <https://akmed.ku.edu.tr/kaleici-muzesi/sergiler/gezginlerin-gozuyle-antalya/e-sperling/>
- Şimşir, B. N. (2017). *Balkan Savaşlarında Rumeli Türkleri Kıyımlar-Kıyımlar-Göçler 1821-1913*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Taştan, Y.K. (2006). “Balkanlarda Ulusçuluk Hareketleri”. *Balkanlar El Kitabı*. O. Karatay, B. A. Gökdağ (Eds.) Ankara: Vadi Yayınları.
- Tekeli, İ. (1991). “Osmanlı İmparatorluğundan Günümüze Nüfusun Zorunlu Yer Değiştirmesi ve İskân Sorunu”, *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi* (50). 49-71.
- Toprak, S. (2019). *19.Yüzyılda Balkanlarda Ulusçuluk Hareketleri ve Avrupalı Devletlerin Balkanlar Politikası*, Ankara: Gece Akademi.
- Toynbee, A. (1999). *Türkiye Bir Devletin Yeniden Doğuşu*. K. Yargıcı (Trans.). Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık.
- Walsh, R. (2021). *İrlandalı Bir Vaizin Gözüyle II. Mahmud İstanbul'u*. Z. Rona (Trans.), İstanbul: Kitapçıyayınevi.
- Yalçın, C. (2004). *Göç Sosyolojisi*, Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.