

**DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP AND IDENTITY PERCEPTIONS:
IMMIGRANT TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN NORTHERN CYPRUS**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

BY

ELİZ İSMAİL TEFİK

**IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
EURASIAN STUDIES**

DECEMBER 2007

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer AYATA
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oktay Tanrısever
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur (METU, HIST) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu (METU, SOC) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Aydıngün (METU, SOC) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date:

Name, Last name: Eliz İSMAİL TEFİK

Signature:

ABSTRACT

DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP AND IDENTITY PERCEPTIONS: IMMIGRANT TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN NORTHERN CYPRUS

İsmail Tefik, Eliz

M.S., Eurasian Studies

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu

December 2007, 200 pages

The aim of this research thesis is to analyze comparatively migration experiences in reference to changing citizenship rights of Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus. Out-migrations in Bulgaria occurred in various historical chronologies out of different motivation for migration factors, and to places of different destinations. Despite the fact that mass migration flows of Turks from Bulgaria happen to be directed to Turkey, northern Cyprus was selected as a special case for this thesis, where Turks from Bulgaria immigrated during 1990's in great numbers.

For the fieldwork, conducted in northern Cyprus in 2006, a research sample of 30-immigrant households of Turks from Bulgaria was interviewed with a qualitative in-depth and face-to-face interaction interview technique. The interview questionnaire was directed either towards one female or male member from each household. During the interviews, lived experiences of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in both the countries of origin and also destination were asked. Therefore, a comparative before and after migration analyses was aimed. In the light of this,

specified socio-economic and socio-cultural research themes referred to the overall interpretations of whether citizenship status of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria was inclusive or exclusive of both into the Bulgarian and northern Cypriot societies.

The thesis draws a conclusion of notably revealed relationship between citizenship experiences and the shifting identity perceptions as a result of migration. Interview findings indicate that related to the conditions of their socio-economic and cultural environments in both Bulgaria and northern Cyprus, they were either included or excluded from social citizenship status. Immigrant respondents perceived themselves as excluded in the areas of employment and educational opportunities, cultural activities and in establishing associations in Bulgaria. On the other hand, in northern Cyprus they have perceived themselves as excluded in terms of work life and finding an occupation, high-income opportunities, finding decent accommodation and neighborhood relations. Besides, in the former they perceived themselves as discriminated because of their Muslim-Turkish identity and in the latter because they have been accepted as migrants and a marginally subordinate group in the social hierarchy.

Keywords: Turkey, [Northern] Cyprus, Social Citizenship, Migration, Identity, Social Exclusion-Inclusion, Turks of Bulgaria

ÖZ

SOSYAL YURTTAŞLIK DİNAMİKLERİ VE KİMLİK ALGILARI: BULGARİSTAN'DAN KUZEY KIBRIS'A GÖÇ EDEN TÜRKLER

İsmail Tefik, Eliz

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Avrasya Çalışmaları
Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu

Aralık 2007, 200 sayfa

Bu tez çalışmasının amacı Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta yaşayan Bulgaristan Türk göçmenlerinin, göç tecrübelerini değişen yurttaşlık haklarını esas alarak karşılaştırmalı bir şekilde analiz etmektir. Bulgaristan'dan dış-göçler, belli tarihsel dönemlerde ve çeşitli göç etkenleriyle, farklı yerlere yapılmıştır. Bu kitlesel göçlerin asıl odağı Türkiye olmasına rağmen 1990'lı yıllarda Bulgaristan Türklerinin yoğun olarak göç ettiği Kuzey Kıbrıs bu tez için özel olarak seçilmiştir.

Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta 2006 yılında gerçekleşen alan çalışmasında, hane halkından seçilmiş 30 Bulgaristan Türk göçmeniyle derinlemesine, yüzyüze mulakat yöntemiyle gerçekleşen detaylı nitel görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Mülakat kapsamındaki sorular her bir haneden erkek veya kadın bireylere yöneltilmiştir. Görüşmeler süresinde seçilen bireylere geldikleri ve göç ettikleri yerlerdeki tecrübeleriyle ilgili sorular yöneltilmiştir. Böylece karşılaştırmalı göç öncesi ve sonrası durum analizi amaçlanmıştır. Bunların ışığında belirlenen sosyo-ekonomik ve sosto-kültürel

arařtırma alanları yurttařlık statüsünün Bulgaristan ve Kuzey Kıbrıs toplumlarında içerici mi yoksa dıřlayıcı mı olduđuna yönelik genel yorumlar yapmamıza olanak sađlayacaktır.

Bu tez, yurttařlık tecrübeleri ve göçten kaynaklanan deđiřken kimlik algıları arasındaki belirgin iliřkinin tespit deđerlendirmesini ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Mülakat bulgularına göre, göçmenler hem Bulgaristan'daki hem de Kuzey Kıbrıs'taki sosyo-ekonomik ve kültürel çevrelerindeki kořullara bađlı olarak sosyal yurttařlık statüsünden ya dıřlanmış yada içerilmişlerdir. Görüřülen göçmenler Bulgaristan'da kendilerini iř, eđitim, meslek, kültürel etkinliklerde ve dernek oluřturmada dıřlanmış olarak algılamaktadırlar. Diđer yandan ise, Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta çalıřma yařantısı ve meslek edinme, yüksek gelir fırsatları, düzgün yařanacak konut bulabilme ve komřuluk iliřkileri alanlarında kendilerini dıřlanmış hissetmektedirler. Bařka bir deđiřle, Bulgaristan'da göç öncesi buldukları çevrelerde Müslüman-Türk kimliklerinden dolayı, göç sonrası Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta ise verili toplumsal hiyerarři içinde göçmen ve marjinal bir ikincil grup olmalarından dolayı ayrı tutuldukları konusunda bir fikir birliđi vardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türkiye, [Kuzey] Kıbrıs, Sosyal Yurttařlık, Göç, Kimlik, Toplumsal Dıřlanma- İçerme, Bulgaristan Türkleri

*To my precious family: my mother
NURTEN, my father ISMAIL and my “little”
brother EMIN. I am always overwhelmed with
gratitude for your inspiring essence which at all
times makes me go one step forward in this
“binary oppositional” life experience...*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel KALAYCIOĞLU, my thesis supervisor, for her guidance, contribution and moral support throughout the entire work of my thesis. It was an ineffable experience to work with her.

I am indebted to my jury members; Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül AYDINGÜN and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep BOZTEMUR, for their considerable advises and comments, which also contribute to my thesis discussions.

I want to restate my gratitude to my family, whom has taught me the meaning of a family “team soul” at which love, trust and respect has been spontaneously mutual, and the sacrifice and devotion endless and free of requisites. I am thankful for their patience, moral and material support during my study.

I wish also to convey my special gratitude to special to me person, Memduh ERİŞMEN. I am appreciative for his assistance as a (thesis) “co-advisor”, for his invaluable patience, exhausted at times, and for his continual motivational support, especially during the hardest times in focusing on my thesis. I am always grateful for his being the “perfect stranger” alike and nearby me.

I am obliged to Gülten KARAOĞLAN, who is near and dear to me. The life instances of sadness and gladness keeping our memories of togetherness alive have been very vital to me. She has had everlasting moral support on me since the very beginning of my METU adventure and during the preparations of my thesis. I owe her a thankful smile for being more than a friend to me and for her appreciation to my lifelong efforts in this entire life. I want to regard my best wishes for the presence of numerous especial friends likewise nearby me during my study. It is impossible to name them all, but still greatly worthy always to appreciate for their never giving up

believing in me and for their latent spirit endowing me to refresh my moral sense throughout the different stages of my thesis concentrations.

Sociology department also deserves thanks, since it made me pile up never ending invaluable knowledge that I believe will be prospective still for my future. Additionally, I am thankful to the research assistant friends and under/graduate friends of mine from the department of Sociology, Eurasian Studies, and the Black Sea and Central Asia Research Center at METU for their support when I was in trouble.

Finally, thanks deserve the interview respondents, comprising the research sample of my thesis work. I appreciate their being very sincere and openhearted to me while sharing their life world perceptions depended on their prosperously comparative lived instances.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	12
2.1 Introduction.....	12
2.2 The Research Sample and the Research Setting.....	15
2.3 Data Collection Procedure.....	22
2.4 Research Limitations and the Problems Encountered.....	26
2.5 Conclusion.....	31
3. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF CITIZENSHIP AND MIGRATION	33
3.1 Introduction.....	33
3.2 General Approaches to Citizenship.....	34
3.3 Classical Citizenship Conceptualizations of T.H. Marshall and Different Dimensions of Citizenship.....	41
3.4 Understanding the Socially Enhanced Citizenship.....	47
3.5 Changing Citizenship Dimensions as a consequence of Migration Factor.....	53
3.6 Different Types and Classifications of Migration.....	61
3.7 Citizenship and Identity Perceptions as a Result of Migration.....	66
3.8 Conclusion.....	73
4. ANALYSIS OF SOCIO-POLITICAL CULTURE AND CITIZENSHIP STATUS OF TURKS IN BULGARIA	74
4.1 Introduction.....	74
4.2 The Presence of Turks in Bulgaria and their Socio-Demographic Characteristics.....	74
4.3 The Socio-Political Culture and the Status of Turks in Bulgaria before 1990's.....	79
4.4 The Changing Status of Turks in Bulgaria after 1990's.....	85
4.5 General Discussions in relation to the Transformation process in Bulgaria.....	89

4.6	Conclusion.....	95
5.	SOCIOLOGICAL PROFILE OF IMMIGRANT TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN NORTHERN CYPRUS.....	97
5.1	Introduction.....	97
5.2	Socio-Demographic Profile of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in Northern Cyprus.....	98
5.3	Different Motivations of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria to Northern Cyprus within Three Different Paths of Emigration.....	105
5.3.1	Motivations and Experiences of Migrants to Turkey before Northern Cyprus.....	106
5.3.2	Motivations and Experiences of Migrants to a Western country before Northern Cyprus.....	110
5.3.3	Motivations and Experiences of Migrants directly to Northern Cyprus.....	118
5.4	Conclusion.....	122
6.	EXPERIENCES OF IMMIGRANT TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN TERMS OF SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP DYNAMICS IN THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION.....	127
6.1	Introduction.....	127
6.2	Socio-Economic Conditions among Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria.....	127
6.2.1	Labor Market Participation.....	128
6.2.2	Social Security Services.....	135
6.2.3	Property Ownership.....	140
6.3	Future Prospects of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria.....	145
6.4	Conclusion.....	149
7.	SOCIO-CULTURAL RELATIONS AND IDENTITY PERCEPTIONS OF IMMIGRANT TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION.....	153
7.1	Introduction.....	153
7.2	Socio-Cultural Relations among Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria.....	153
7.2.1	Social Networks and Neighborhood Relations.....	153
7.2.2	Cultural Activity Performances.....	158
7.2.3	Associations and Participation.....	162
7.3	Conclusion.....	165
8.	CONCLUSION: INTERPRETING THE RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	167
	REFERENCES.....	178

APPENDICES

A. IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE (both English and Turkish versions respectively).....186

B. TABLE OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS (25 immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing in northern Cyprus).....198

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to study consequences of lived experiences of a migration process with a special emphasis on [social] citizenship in the case of Turks who migrated from Bulgaria¹ and residing at present in northern Cyprus.² The thesis will be basically a comparison of before/after migration practices of this immigrant group. Specific themes of [social] citizenship will be analyzed both for the place of origin, namely Bulgaria and the place of destination in northern Cyprus.

The fall of the Communist regime and the decline of the Soviet Union have brought new local and global conjectural developments that started to prevail in the end of 1980's, especially prominent in Central and Southeastern European countries. In the course of manifold interrelated socio-historical events overriding in these

¹ In the general exploratory and descriptive academic literature discussions, Turks in Bulgaria are named usually as "Turks or Turkish minority in/of Bulgaria" (Eminov, 2000; Boteva&Warhola, 2003; Kymlicka, 2000; Roger, 2003), and "Bulgarian Turks" (Ragaru, 2001; Zhelyazkova, 2001). Namings about Turks in Bulgaria differ depending on the content of the study analysis. Still, the reference in all is to the [Bulgarian citizenship holding] community in Bulgaria from an ethnic background of a Muslim Turkish origin, which comprises the largest minority group after the dominant majority of Bulgarians.

² Explanations on Cyprus are in limited content throughout this thesis, since this thesis aims partially to understand northern Cyprus as place of destination. This partial understanding is to help define the place of migration destination of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria only. Yet, still very briefly, Cyprus is a member of European Union since 2004, yet the constituted state in the northern part of Cyprus is not recognized internationally for various reasons and the political negotiations still continue. Politics shaped the domestic and international relations on the island and search for satisfying socio-political accord between the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. Thus, the conciliations verified diplomacy of plans and programs presented by the international agents of UN or EU try to resolve the governmental separateness in Cyprus. For this, reasonable general outlook lies in the historical events, which form the fundamentals of this political atmosphere in Cyprus. The state active in Cyprus is comprised of Greek Orthodox population in majority and the total population is about 1.000.000. On the other hand, mostly Turkish Muslim population populates in the northern part of the island, with its state named Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC) and its total census is 264.172 (2006 Census Report). The state in the northern Cyprus has its independent administrative bureaucracy in terms of civil, political and the social services. For detailed researches on socio-historical events on Cyprus and the native communities see Kızılyürek (2002; 2005) and Cockburn (2005). In reference to political and civil rights country reports on Cyprus or North (Turkish) Cyprus [Cyprus] visit www.freedomhouse.org, 20.08.07

localities, one of the most striking social phenomena happen to be the migration matters as a consequence of the new democratic liberalization laws and regulations adopted in the years following 1990's after the decline of communist regimes. Prominent free move across borders has been allowed and the intense migration flows have been realized in different contents. These have been the various immigration forms that the Central and Southeastern European country citizens have been involved in, such as labor migration and family migration, legal and illegal, temporary, seasonal and frontier migration, refugees and asylum-seeker migrant statuses usually because of social unrest and political persecution.³ Still, it is noteworthy that the various ethno-cultural, religious or national minority groups, who have been native in their home country-states, in the case with post-communist Central and Southeastern European country localities, have tended usually to experience such immigration types. To put it differently, the culturally different native communities, despite being citizens within the territories of a nation-state have been prone to being involved more often than not in a migration process. This is an outcome because of their being predisposed in certain citizenship conditions due to perplexed state-society relations. For all these reasons, in conditional instances international agreements become intact to be negotiated under different regulations and laws between or among countries in reference to the international concerns of monitoring, reporting and controlling the population flows to different directions and their consequences.

In this thesis, Bulgaria, which is the country of origin of immigrant Turks, was solely one of the Southeastern European (or Balkan region) countries, once under the direct ideological influence of communism. In addition to, Bulgaria was known as the most loyal to the Soviet Union between the years of 1944-1989, even so being outside the Soviet umbrella (Agh, 1998:180, Giatzidis, 2002:18). This proximate period in particular space and time was marked with periodical migration issues of Turkish inhabitants within the Bulgarian territories.⁴ The emigration flows

³ OECD, *Trends in International Migration*, Annual Report of 1993, 1995, 2001, 2002 Editions.

⁴ Additionally, before that during the five-century Ottoman domination in the Balkans (ended in 1878), the Turks in the Balkans and more specifically in Bulgarian lands had experienced involuntary

of Turks since the Bulgarian independence history and throughout the Communist regime indicate that the deportations and population displacements had been based on certain minority policies and systematic in content. In fact, throughout the Communist regime in Bulgaria the presence of a single (authoritarian) Communist Party rule and its communist state ideology between the years of 1944-1989 had displayed tendencies of reproducing political attitudes and behaviors similar to the Soviet socialist state ideology particularly in terms of treatments towards ethno-cultural communities.⁵ Such policy reflected that Bulgaria followed official assimilation towards its (Muslim) Turkish native, or indigenous community, which has been the largest in size and thus having direct influence on the Bulgarian (national) state policies.

In terms of socio-demographic profile of Bulgaria it can be said that it has been a diversified socio-culturally composite society. In the 1992, socio-demographic census report, which is available as the most recent and publicly announced thus frequently cited in the academic works, it is evident that Bulgarian citizens of (Muslim) Turkish origin are a considerable ethno-cultural community in size, which comprises about %10 of the total population (8.000.000) in Bulgaria. The major dominant ethnic group is comprised of the Bulgarians (Orthodox Christians) with the highest population percentage of %85.7. The Gypsies or Roma people, identifying themselves as being either from a Muslim or Christian denomination with the % 3.7 of the population share, constitute another significant ethnic minority group in Bulgaria. The total portion indicating the other remaining ethnic groups in Bulgaria is %1.3, which includes Armenians, Jews, Pomaks (Bulgarian speaking

or voluntary migration outflows, which continued for more than a century after the Ottoman decline. These historical past events and reasons beneath are pointed out in debates on the migrations still prevalent in different manner even today (Turan, 1998:134-145; Dayıođlu, 2005:47).

⁵ The Soviet socialist state ideology was founded basically on the notion of creating a homogeneous single nation-state by officially assimilating the communities of a different culture (Ramet, 1978). Consequently, such state-society relations prevalent also in Bulgaria following the assimilation policies actually created a social environment of reluctant attitudes and behaviors among the culturally different communities and all kinds of official punitive acts were practiced until the end of 1980's. In many academic works these assimilation campaigns in Bulgaria are marked as suppressive state policies, announced by the state as a "national revival" process to create a single Bulgarian (speaking) nation. Yet, the sum of all these events resulted in voluntary or involuntary outflow mass migrations to diverse destinations.

Muslims), Karakachans (a group of Greek pastoral tribe locating in the Southern Balkans), Vlachs (term usually used for Romanians living outside Romania mixed with the neighboring populations such as Slavs, Greeks, Albanians and the others), and Russians. Muslim population locates in the Northeastern and Southwestern parts in Bulgaria. In addition to this, Turkish population particularly comprises the rural population with its %68 percentages, which is residing in the district villages while the urban Turkish population is only %32 living in the cities. These rural-urban percentages are respectively %28 and %72 for Bulgarians (Genov and Krasteva, 2005:72-73, 84). This ethno-demographic estimation shows the three significant communities in Bulgaria such as the Bulgarians, the Turks and the Gypsy or Roma people, which is the prevalent situation still today. These have been worthwhile momentum events in terms of their unintended consequences, which have been distinguished by motivations for migration among the Turks in Bulgaria (Darina, 1992:344).

This socio-demographic profile of Bulgaria started to change especially with the emigration of the Turkish population in Bulgaria with different motivation factors and to different destinations. While emigrations continue, small numbers of returning back at times occurred to the Bulgarian lands again. In fact, Turkish mass migration in the Bulgarian history and the Europe after the Second World War was marked with the 1989 events following the decline of the Communist regime and the defeat of the Communist leader Todor Jivkov, when more than 300.000 Turks were either forced or impelled to cross the Bulgarian border. These resulted as an outcome of the unpleasant assimilation policies that caused fear and socio-political unrest, which were prevalent especially among the Turkish population. As an outcome of all, domestic state policies took the decision to deport Turks from Bulgaria, which led to mass migration in the end of 1980. The destination place of this mass migration was mainly Turkey but also there were immigrant Turks of Bulgaria migrating to different Western countries under the status of refugees or asylum seekers as a result of the social unrest and the political persecution. Right after the change of the political regime and with the establishment of more tolerable conditions in Bulgaria

for minorities, half of these emigrants to Turkey, about 150.000 Turks of Bulgaria, returned to their places of origin in the Bulgarian territories in 1989.

Tolerable conditions for minorities in Bulgaria depended on changing nature of state-society relations during the post-communist transition practices after 1980's in most of the localities of Central Europe, Southeastern Europe or the Balkans, and USSR (Agh, 1998:15; Bova, 1991:113,114). The fall of Communist regime and the Communist Party rule brought new socio-political developments also in Bulgaria since the 1990s. These developments have been comprised of substantial policies in reference to the abolishment of one-party (authoritarian) state rule and the harassments towards minorities, which put Bulgaria in a gradual transformation experiencing democratic attitudes and regulations. Today, Bulgaria tries to achieve the democratic political stability both within the domestic and international sphere. The noteworthy post-communist transition reformations include liberalizing and democratizing the monopolized political structures, stabilizing economy and improving minority and human rights practices. In comparison with the previous state rule "discrepancies" and socio-political unrest, Bulgaria is rated as "democratically free" because of being precise to perform its duties to certain extents in the path on democratization by proving this with the highly expected candidacy to EU membership since 2007.

Though these favorable developments, as a result of abandonment of the so-called authoritarian regime, the social unrest has taken different appearance at present in Bulgaria. It is important to note that the migration flows have not ended after 1989 and the Turks of Bulgaria continued to migrate in the following years of the 1990's. While the gradual and continuous migration flows have been still prevalent up until at present, in certain instances there have been situational and reasonable returns back to Bulgaria again. The restricted and prohibited regulations on migration moves to abroad during the Communist regime resulted in great numerous migration flows to different destinations.⁶ One of the main reasons for

⁶ While this was the case relevant for the Bulgarian citizens from a different ethno-cultural background, say the Turks, the Bulgarians also have tended to escape the unpleasant conditions as a

continuous migrations was the effort of adapting to the free market economic structure while the institutional basis for this was absent. As a result of all these, the unpleasant conditions in Bulgaria at present include economic crisis, higher inflation rates, high rates of unemployment and difficulty in the living conditions. Bulgarian citizens as a result of these unexpected consequences have started to search for better living standards abroad. Since the Turkish population is mostly residing in the rural regions, they have been influenced considerably more negatively. In the case with this thesis, it is important to comprehend with some partial concrete reasoning that what “pushed” particularly Turks still to migrate from Bulgaria even after the cease of suppressive assimilation policies directed towards them during the communist regime.

In the above respects, Turks in Bulgaria have been studied within different theoretical frames and various perspectives, which have created a diversified bulk of studies on their political and social status in Bulgaria before and after the communist transition. These are studies, which are usually focused on the political behaviors before and after the communist regime political behaviors, and the direct or indirect impact on the society. Of course, it is important not to disregard the conjectural changes in general in the in/after communist world. Since the state-society relations are of great importance in Bulgarian socio-historical transformation process, the consequences of emigration flows and the lived migration experiences and social citizenship practices were given limited attention in the sociological inquiry. Hence, I argue that to study the migration experiences of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in the country of origin and destination; can make significant contribution to understand the course of events, the actual social citizenship conditions and the impact of migration process in present day Bulgaria. Study of social citizenship will involve the nature of socio-economic conditions and socio- cultural relations within the context of changing state-society relations. This research will also discuss the social

result of the political regime change and the difficulties in stabilizing the new system regulations. The prominent emigration flows of Bulgarian citizenship holders have happened to be mostly to the destinations such as Turkey and Germany. For the relevant evaluations see, OECD, *Trends in International Migration*, Annual Report of 1993, 1995, 2001, 2002 Editions.

citizenship dynamics as means for social inclusion and/or exclusion in both Bulgarian and northern Cypriot societies.

For this aim, northern Cyprus, where the Turks of Bulgaria have started to immigrate mainly after 1990s, is selected as a special destination case.⁷ The thesis is a comparative analysis of social citizenship practices in terms of socio-economic conditions and socio-cultural relations in both the places of origin in Bulgaria and in northern Cyprus. The study is a qualitative study based on recorded in-depth interviews with the migrant Turks of Bulgaria living in northern Cyprus. During the interviews mainly issues related to their migration decisions, voluntary and involuntary aspects of these decisions, living and working conditions and social relations and networks in the place of origin and place of destination are questioned.

At this point it is important to note that, this thesis does not include constitutional citizenship analysis in regards with the entire legislative citizenship practices in reference to the constitutional law regulation and declarations including Turks in their places of origin Bulgaria or northern Cyprus. This is not to deny the importance of legal and political dimensions of citizenship analysis in the case of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in (northern) Cyprus theoretically but the thesis research is limited to social citizenship analysis only. There have been two foremost reasons for this. The first one is that the citizenship status of the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in northern Cyprus does not matter overtly in legal and political terms since their basic recognition and the representation is not restricted constitutionally in the issued decrees of Bulgaria and northern Cyprus. Secondly, local and the international ongoing recent debates on (northern) Cyprus in terms of multiple legal and political issues, discussed within constitutional controversies, would make it difficult to put

⁷ According to the 1996 Residence and Population Census Report, published by State Planning Organization in northern Cyprus, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria comprised only %0.7 of the total population in the northern Cyprus. In number this is 1370 immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, out of which 655 persons reside in Girne (Kyrenia), 673 persons in Lefkoşa (Nicosia) and 78 persons in Gazimağusa (Famagusta). These were the three main big cities in northern Cyprus considered in detail in the census report and, which were the densely populated areas by the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. However, their number changes according to different information sources. There are claims, stated in an author interview with the former president of Turkish Cypriot state (TRNC) of Rauf R. Denктаş also that the population size of the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria might be around 5000 since the beginning of 1990s.

emphasis on the legislative citizenship membership status of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria. The analysis of such legally overriding disputes over Cyprus is not within the scope of this thesis. Thus, the legal and the political aspects of citizenship will not be reliable and easy to comprehend while the social aspects of citizenship can be studied comparatively among the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria living both in Bulgaria and in northern Cyprus. There might be only brief anecdotes on these with partial explanations depending on the in-depth interview transcripts to be quoted throughout the thesis. Instead of all, the primary emphasis will be on the theoretical discussions to understand citizenship as a consequence of migration mostly with its social aspects. Mainly, these social aspects will include membership and belonging to a *societal cultural*⁸ environment that the citizenship usually delineates. Consequently, these will be theoretically relevant social citizenship connotations to touch on the *inclusiveness* versus *exclusiveness* of members into the given wider political or cultural community also when considering the migration effects. In the theory chapter there will be discussions to understand the principal and universal legal *contract relation* or ‘negotiation’ between the citizens and the (nation-) state as well, which would be impractical if undermined. These theoretical discussions will be still relevant in the sake of the theoretical frame of this thesis only to comprehend the basic perspectives of citizenship as a conception. Additionally, within such a theoretical frame there must be a reference to (nation-) state and governmental attitudes defining the social and its ‘community’ members.

The chapter topics and their discussion contents are as follows:

In Chapter One chapter general introduction of the research topic of the thesis is introduced, while stating the aim as well.

⁸ This term is used in the similar lines that Kymlicka (2000) puts emphasis. He defines the *societal culture* in regards with the Western democracy examples, still with exceptional cases, as how they tend to invent single societal culture depending on the dominant majority’s cultural characteristics on a given territory, instead of multicultural (or differentiated) societal cultural type. Also, to him, this societal culture is based on a common dominant language used in both the public and the private spheres (schools, media, law, economy, government, and other societal cultural institutions). For this, the citizens are expected to participate in this dominant societal culture to be actual members of a community functioning with the language of the dominant majority. For his further discussions, see Kymlicka (2000:185).

The Chapter Two is comprised of detailed description of the research methodology followed by the research conduct. It explains why the qualitative research methodology techniques are purposefully appropriated in this thesis. In this chapter there are descriptions of the research sample, the research settings and the data collection procedure. The two research settings in northern Cyprus are described such as several neighborhoods of the capital city Lefkoşa (Nicosia), and the village of Esentepe (Ay Kurus), which is a district of the coastal city Girne (Kyrenia). Finally, the limitations and the problems encountered throughout this thesis research will be mentioned in the methodology chapter.

In Chapter Three discussions within a theoretical frame remain, which are piled up in close relevance with the thesis research topic. It includes the classical citizenship and the changing citizenship approaches, which are explained in relation to the migration factor. Since, citizenship is a wider theoretical area with multidimensional philosophical, political, and social analysis objectives, this chapter aims to include social citizenship with some of its aspects, in a very limited extend to interpret and support the research data. Social citizenship generally is dealt with in terms of its membership status in a given society and different dimensions of basic citizenship rights supposed to be met by this membership. However, social citizenship is dealt particularly with its relation to the migration experiences and the migrant self-identifications in this thesis. This will be the analysis of social citizenship, which fits well with the research data to understand its practices roughly according to the socio-economic and socio-cultural themes. Besides, all the social citizenship approaches and the theoretical discussions are bound to the partial migration conceptualizations due to the research topic being based on an immigrant group background profile.

The Chapter Four elaborates the discussions about status of Turks in Bulgaria. This chapter aims to pinpoint the socio-political culture and citizenship status of Muslim Turks in Bulgaria and historically explains their presence in Bulgaria. Socio-political culture is divided into two chronologies in Bulgaria. These are before and after 1990's, which are explained and exemplified in terms of

contracted citizenship relation between the state and the members of it, particularly the Turks. Lastly, there is a heading, which tries to conceptualize the transformation from authoritarian to democratic liberal type of state regime in general in the Bulgarian case. This chapter partially covers the state-society relations in reference to Muslim Turkish community in Bulgaria, which is of great significance in the case of this thesis in order to understand the social environment and the motivation for migration factors among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus.

The Chapter Five focuses on the Turks in northern Cyprus this time, while giving the general socio-demographic descriptive profile of migrants and the process of migration. Later, the migration experiences are explored in terms of “push-pull” factors to emigrate from Bulgaria to northern Cyprus. This chapter is comprised of a descriptive analysis based on the migration narratives obtained through the in-depth interviews conducted with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus.

The Chapter Six explains the socio-economic conditions of Turks from Bulgaria depending on the research data. Three themes are specified for this reason. These are *labor market participation*, *social security assurance*, and *the property ownership*. These are dealt with comparatively while taking into consideration these conditions both in Bulgaria and at present in northern Cyprus. The analyses specified on these areas are all subject matters related with social citizenship that will help to clarify social citizenship membership status and the practices while pointing the welfare state provisions in both countries of origin and destination. All these in totality will comprise the social citizenship analysis in reference to state-society relations in the one hand as it is aimed.

The Chapter Seven on the other hand gives the explanations and the data transcriptions similarly as in the case with the Chapter Six, focusing on the socio-cultural relations of Turks from Bulgaria and their perceptions of self-identification. Three themes were integrated for this purpose, which are *social networks and neighborhood relations*, *cultural activity performances*, and *associations and*

participation degree. These themes were selected in order to understand the relation between the social citizenship dynamics and their reflections on the perceptions of self-identifications. In parallel discussions as the previous chapter themes, all these will be depended on the migration factor and the migrant experiences also.

The last Chapter Eight comprises the general conclusion and discussion part in an attempt to interpret the research finding depending on the theoretical frameworks and the research data. The general discussion in this chapter is how citizenship experiences as a result of migration process factor, results in the changing citizenship rights and how this in return shapes the immigrant perceptions of self-identification in certain circumstances. That is how this research sample flexible (dual) citizenship status meaningful in content, yet, immigrant respondents mostly sense themselves as “in between” home and host country/state territories. In this chapter the discussions of the hypotheses and the questions trying to find answer will be also integrated.

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

This thesis, as it was stated in the general introduction, is focused on migration experience and its consequences in terms of citizenship rights for immigrant Turks of Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus. For this purpose, different themes were specified in order to understand the socio-economic conditions, future prospects, socio-cultural relations, and perception of self-identifications of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. The data was comprised of two-dimensional comparative social environments (Bulgaria-northern Cyprus), which induced discourse analysis on before/after migration interpretations. However, it is important to state that before to step in the research field as a researcher, and conduct face-to-face interviews, citizenship sensible theoretical analysis was not directly relied upon at first. Instead, the research question was designed to understand migration experiences at first, and to fulfill comparative descriptive discourse analysis among the Turks from Bulgaria, who migrated to northern Cyprus. As a result, the migration narrative interviews of the respondents have led interview data analysis to integrate citizenship theoretical discussion to certain extends as well.

The research methodology techniques in this thesis were grounded on a sociological inquiry designated for understanding everyday lived immigrant (experiences) narratives of before/after migration. Sociology as a discipline might include contain controversial debates towards its research methodology or critiques on its abstract conceptual analytical thinking but simply “sociology is the science which aims at the interpretative understanding of social behavior, in order to gain an explanation of its causes, its course and its effects” (Weber, 1962:29). Besides, Weber believes that, since the human beings own a “free will”, they could perform it rationally and not randomly and unpredictably. Thus, human action would be

possible to being predicted in a society by understanding the rational action itself (ibid, 1962:29).

The idea of understanding society or/and particular social event needed firstly the right decision of which research design technique priority should be given, that later would be the most opportune for a research question analysis. In the case with this thesis, qualitative research techniques that sociology usually benefits from were purposefully determined to be more appropriate than the quantitative methods for the analysis of migration experience of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus. The intensive in-depth interview conduct and the participant observation were used, accepted as prominent tools in qualitative social research techniques. These gave the chance to understand partially but in details the peculiarities among immigrant Turks from Bulgaria experienced in Bulgaria and in northern Cypriot societies, and to communicate with them and thus interpret their individual actions in their right social spaces.

The thesis and its research-based investigations tried to find answers to certain questions and evaluate some hypotheses formulations, which are stated as in below. While posing some explicit assumptions to be tested and evaluated, it was determined also that it would be better to pose certain questions to be interpreted within the multidimensional aspects in relevance with the research question. This was mainly because not to limit the study around only the hypotheses but comprehensively to interpret the research data and its themes with comparatively asked questions. All in all, the aim was not to ensure a reader with empirical statements directly and proofs but to support the research findings with relevant theoretical discussions and give the meaning to the individual actions and perceptions of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in the social constructions they had involved within.

The questions below were some of the questions to seek answers depending on the research data. Indeed, these eight questions, which of all comprised the initial

conditions for this thesis and served as starting points, sought if not complete but partial explanations and understanding throughout this thesis.

1. What were the state-society relations and their direct impact on Turks in Bulgaria?
2. What were the motivations for migration factors for Turks in Bulgaria?
3. What were/are the self-identification perceptions of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria before/after their migration?
4. Turks of whom in Bulgaria and why chose northern Cyprus as a place of destination to migration?
5. What were/are the future prospects among immigrant Turks from Bulgaria and their children before/after migration to northern Cyprus?
6. Whether state and/or society membership of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria is inclusive or exclusive before/after migration?
7. What are the gains and losses from the immigrant point of views in the migration process they get involved?
8. Whether immigrants Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus, as a special research case group, are “exploited” or “exploiters” in state-society relationships before/after migration?

The hypotheses formulations are also listed below that apart from the questions which served as initials, the hypotheses helped to support the discussions of this thesis overall.

1. Turkish inhabitants in the rural areas of Bulgaria are highly prone to migrate rather than those living in the urban areas.
2. There is a high expectation of Turks of Bulgaria for improvement in living conditions, as one of the major factors of their emigration from Bulgaria, and aspirations for economic welfare and upward mobility through migration.
3. Immigrant Turks of Bulgaria are differentiated from the natives in access to education, health, employment and social security in both the place of origin and also in the place of destination.
4. Different social citizenship practices in the place of origin and in the place of destination may affect self - identity perceptions among Turks of Bulgaria. Hence, it is expected that they will develop different social networks, cultural relations and self-definitions in the places of origin and destination.
5. The freedom of expression among immigrant Turks of Bulgaria may be more felt in their destination place in northern Cyprus compared to place of origin.

6. Solidaristic relations among immigrant Turks of Bulgaria are expected to be more dense in northern Cyprus rather than in Bulgaria as a survival strategy in a new social environment.
7. The relations of migrant Turks of Bulgaria with their place of origin and feelings of commonality are expected to continue even after a long period of emigration from Bulgaria.
8. The migrant Turks of Bulgaria will experience social exclusion, in both the place of origin and in the place of destination, depending on their ethno-cultural identities.
9. Immigrant Turks of Bulgaria will feel that they are in an advantageous position due to their dual citizenship rights.

In this methodology chapter there are three important headings to understand the research part of this thesis. Research design process and qualitative research techniques, which were followed, are explained within two titles. These will be respectively *the research sample and the setting*, and *the data collection procedure*. Besides the subjects of whom to study and how to study, *research limitations and problems encountered* will comprise the last part in the methodology chapter. As a result this chapter will explain the qualitative research techniques for the scope of this thesis, and answer the questions of whom, how, and where was/were investigated.

2.2 The Research Sample and the Research Setting

In order to make a reader get acquainted with the initial research steps in the research design process, the research sample and the research setting were defined in this part. As it was mentioned earlier this thesis research is based on the qualitative research techniques, one of which is the in-depth interview determined to be more reliable for this research conduct. This was because the research sample was comprised of an immigrant group and the investigation of their detailed migration experience narratives were of great importance and possible only through in-depth interviews. To be more specific, the thesis was focused on migration experiences and the changing citizenship rights of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus. To put it differently, the thesis discussion was based on two-sided

comparative data, meaning that the interview respondents were requested to answer interview items for their living conditions both in Bulgaria and after migration in northern Cyprus.

Then, the research sample of this thesis is based on the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who migrated to northern Cyprus, after 1990's and more specifically between the years of 1990 and 1996. Totally 30 in-depth interviews, comprised of about 100 open-ended items, were conducted with the only one of the family household members of the first generation immigrant Turk from Bulgaria. However, only 25 of them were reliable with their detailed informative content, which were consideration in the data analysis. The interview immigrant respondents were determined specifically to be from the first generation immigrants, who were between the ages of 40-55. Of course, there were several interview samples with respondents younger than this age range as well. It was paid great attention that the male and female respondents should be almost equal in number, from different education backgrounds, and from various occupations. There were 14 female interview respondents and 11 male respondents, all of whom were from different education background, occupation and jobs. For the discourse analysis research sample variations were significant in order to see whether responses differ considerably or slightly and in reference to which variable(s) or conditions. In this respect, since the research sample was an immigrant group and thesis research was based on before/after migration analysis, it was paid significant attention to reach immigrant interview respondents from different district places from Bulgaria.⁹ The research sample of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were usually selected from rural areas and villages of district cities¹⁰ such as Hacıoğlu Pazarcık (Dobrich), Silistre

⁹ The Muslim Turkish population in Bulgaria is residing mostly in the Northeastern and the Southwestern rural regions (Eminov, 2001:139; Genov and Krasteva, 2005:84). That is why in the in-depth interview conduct there are interview respondents from different rural regions of intense Turkish population living in Bulgaria.

¹⁰ Research sample that has been defined on immigrant Turks of Bulgaria residing in northern Cyprus, were all from rural areas and villages of district cities as mentioned. All the district names are specified both in their Turkish namings, titled during the Ottoman rule in the Balkans and the Bulgarian namings (in the parantheses), which of all are used in both terms among the Turks in Bulgaria. The Turkish names are derived from Turan (1998:Appendix 6. The Other Versions of Place Names), and the both versions of Turkish and Bulgarian district names will be used throughout the

(Silistra), Razgrad (Razgrad), Eski Cuma (Targovishte), Kızanlık (Kazanlık), Hasköy (Haskovo) and Kırcaali (Kurdzhali). The same sensitivity was regarded in the purpose of the same research sample to be also from different district places and neighborhoods in northern Cyprus. For this reason the research sample included interview respondents from the capital city Lefkoşa (Nicosia) and its neighborhoods and the village of Esentepe (Ay Kurus), which is a district of the coastal city Girne (Kyrenia).

The characteristics of the research sample were explained, who were determined as interview respondents as well. This research sample in general was relied upon for its composition of veriform backgrounds and lived migration experiences in Bulgaria and northern Cyprus. The research technique on the other hand, by means of which this research sample was defined was the “snowball sampling”. It is one of among varieties sampling constructions also called as “chain referral sampling”, which is usually appropriated by observational research and community studies in qualitative research methodology. It also has a process on its own and an initial step, that is in first hand several persons are tried to be detected, who possess the characteristics of the specified research sample at the very beginning. These persons are supposed to be familiarized with and interviewed with the questionnaire items, which is prepared. Later, these interview respondents are requested as informants to give names and addresses of other persons, who are essential because of their characteristics for the research sample. The newly found interview respondents are interviewed in the same manner, and this process continues until reaching the reliable size decided by the researcher. The research sample size might be controlled in this way and become extended according to the researcher wish (Bailey, 1987:95).

That is how by means of the snowball sampling research technique immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were detected in the district of capital city Lefkoşa (Nicosia) and village of Esentepe (Ay Kurus), which is in the district of Girne (Kyrenia) in

thesis in the relevant chapter discussions. The same will be relevant for the village and district neighbouring names in the case of northern Cyprus that they will be used in their Turkish and Greek versions.

northern Cyprus. The first starting stage was to find the Turkish immigrant families from Bulgaria living in Lefkoşa (Nicosia). Since my parents were living in Lefkoşa (Nicosia), I benefited firstly from their social network channels to search for an informant immigrant family from Bulgaria. I tried to control purposefully chosen interview respondents to be from different districts and neighborhoods both before migration in Bulgaria and after migration in northern Cyprus. Thank to the reference of my parents who were familiarized with the immigrant residence environments and some of the Turks from Bulgaria, I was able to find the first interview respondents for the snowball sampling and to reach the other immigrant families. I appreciated the willingness of most of the immigrant families who accepted the interview and become enthusiastic to answer every item. It was an in-depth interview comprised of 100 open-ended items, which lasted about three to four hours. I had to introduce my research objectives and conduct the interview with the respondents towards evening, when they were out of work and after having rested. Some of the interviews were conducted in the weekends with an appointment. As a result, the interview respondents were glad to share their life histories and migration experiences, and they were attentive enough towards the interview. I was sincerely and usually welcomed as an interviewer apart from some exceptional immigrant respondent cases. The reason for this will be explained in the last heading of this chapter, which is the research limitations and the problems encountered.

As it is obvious from the above definition of the research sample, the research settings in northern Cyprus were determined as the capital city Lefkoşa (Nicosia) and its neighborhoods and the village of Esentepe (Ay Kirus) (a district of coastal city Girne/Kyrenia). The reason why these two residence places were chosen as the research settings was because immigrant Turks from Bulgaria was mostly residing in these areas. Firstly, the capital city of Lefkoşa (Nicosia) was individually decided as a research setting because of my close acquaintance with this city and its neighborhoods. Also, Lefkoşa (Nicosia) purposefully was thought to be the right district, where to find the (snowball) interview informants and respectively the respondents. Secondly, the district of Lefkoşa (Nicosia) being a capital city that even at present shelters majority of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in the workforce, after

the district of coastal city Girne (Kyrenia) with a slight numerical difference. On the other hand, interview respondent immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing in Lefkoşa (Nicosia) informed me and mentioned about the village of Esentepe (Au Kurus) within the boundaries of Girne (Kyrenia). It was decided later on this second additional research setting of Esentepe (Ay Kurus) as well. Now, the two research settings will be described below briefly with some additional environmental and cultural details.

The neighborhoods in the capital city Lefkoşa (Nicosia), which were visited for the sake of this thesis to reach the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, were *Surlar içi-Çağlayan*,¹¹ *Çağlayan*, *Köşkücüftlik*, *Küçük Kaymaklı*, *Yenişehir*, and *Marmara* region neighborhoods. The *Surlar içi-Çağlayan* neighborhood is near to the buffer zone protected by the UN peacekeeping force.¹² House constructions in this area were the oldest and damaged, but they were still onetime historical and traditional houses of Lefkoşa (Nicosia). There were restoration houses by the Lefkoşa (Nicosia) state municipality, which were visually attractive for the tourists. Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in this region were mostly neighboring¹³ with Turkish immigrants

¹¹ One of the neighborhood chiefs in Lefkoşa, that of *Surlar-içi Çağlayan* (walled city of Nicosia) district was interviewed about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in this region. Explanations were as following that they have been residing temporarily in this neighborhood right after their migration. Also, it was said that, it was during 1995 when the new comers of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria prefer to stay in this region on their own in the cheaper rented houses or boarding houses until they found better and suitable living residences for their families in the other neighborhoods. The chief added also that this region is preoccupied with the Turkish immigrants from the eastern region of Turkey, who brought their conservative distinct traditional cultures in this region of Lefkoşa and were living as in isolated ghettos, marginalized also by the rest of the society. For further discussions also see, Hatay (2005:8-9).

¹² For further research works on the establishment of UN peacekeeping forces in Cyprus and the other discussions, see Kizilyürek (2002); Cockburn (2005). The following World Wide Web source on North (Turkish) Cyprus [Cyprus] may be also useful for general state-society profile; www.freedomhouse.org, 20.08.2007. UN peacekeeping forces were mentioned without any explanations because emphasis was put only on describing the physical environment of the neighborhoods in northern Cyprus. The various domestic and international political debates and territorial divisions at present on Cyprus and its native communities (the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots) were not within the scope of this thesis.

¹³ The term of “neighboring” was used here only to describe briefly the physical, cultural and economic resident types in the northern Cypriot districts where immigrants Turks from Bulgaria reside nearby. Neighborhood, socio-cultural relations, and interactions of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria will not be mentioned until the Chapter Seven of this thesis.

from Turkey.¹⁴ The residents in this district were usually occupied with people doing low-skilled jobs and were from lower-income group. *Çağlayan* is neighborhood district nearby to *Surlar içi-Çağlayan*, but these districts were comparatively different from each other in terms of its residents, and building constructions. In *Çağlayan* immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were neighboring both with immigrant Turks from Turkey, and the native Turkish Cypriots. On the other hand, one commonality of these districts was that they were near to the traditional downtown where tradesmen, general shopping district center and banks were locating in Lefkoşa (Nicosia). Contrary to these residence areas in Lefkoşa, *Köşküçiftlik*, *Küçük Kaymaklı*, *Yenişehir*, and *Marmara Bölgesi* were comprised of well-organized new constructions such as, apartment blocks, independent detached houses, or prosperous, showy two-story detached houses, which were also away from the traditional city center. In these four resident areas immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were mostly neighboring with Turkish Cypriots, and barely with 1974 Turkish immigrants from Turkey. Turkish Cypriots occupying these residence areas were mostly higher educated, working in their own businesses or seniors in the civil state offices and usually higher-income owners.

Esentepe (Ay Kuruş) village on the other hand become a special research setting after Lefkoşa (Nicosia) in terms of its relevance with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. Esentepe (Ay Kuruş) deserved special consideration because the first immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who migrated between the years of 1989 and 1992, were mostly placed in Esentepe (Ay Kuruş) by official state arrangements in northern Cyprus. The first immigrant groups of Turks, who migrated from Bulgaria, were the mere ones being supported by the North Cypriot [Turkish] state [or Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC)] in the presidency of Rauf R. Denktaş.¹⁵ This support and “welcome” attitude then was because Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria were seeking shelter in northern Cyprus other than Turkey as a result of the social unrest in Bulgaria right after the fall of Communist regime. The types of support

¹⁴ Those are the Turkish immigrants from Turkey migrated to northern Cyprus after 1974.

¹⁵ The interview was done for the sake of this thesis about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus. Interview date was on 24.05.2006.

were usually based on accommodation as housing, job opportunities as civil servants in state or military offices, naturalization and financial aids provided by the northern Cypriot [Turkish] state and by the other various private or state institutions.¹⁶ Besides, the commission board office of the Republic of Turkey (TC Yardım Heyeti) in the northern Cyprus financially supported this group of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria living in Esentepe (Ay Kurus). As stated before this was peculiar to the period right after when Turkish mass migration flows were directed from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1989. Some of the interview respondents explained how financial charity was collected by the institutional associations from Turkey in the name of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who migrated then either to Turkey or to the northern Cyprus. According to them, commission board office of the Republic of Turkey in the northern Cyprus served as a mediator agent to allocate the financial charity to those who migrated to northern Cyprus. Interview respondents explained that this allocation was realized with financial aid to repair the houses they were appointed by the northern Cypriot [Turkish] state because these houses were in bad damaged conditions. However, the same interview respondents added that the financial aid was still in limited amounts and they had to rebuild the houses depending on their own family budget as well. Since they rebuilt their houses with modifications they desired, they happened to own showy, two-story detached houses in the village of Esentepe (Ay Kurus). Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, living in this village, have been neighboring both with the Turkish immigrants from northern Black sea regions of Turkey and the native Turkish Cypriots also.

Finally, some clarifications were appropriated in relation to the conceptual naming of the research sample in order to eliminate possible misunderstandings throughout this thesis. In before migration analysis and discussions the research sample was named/mentioned mostly as “Turks in/of Bulgaria” or “Turkish or Muslim Turkish minorities” in/of Bulgaria” and very rarely as “Bulgarian Turks” in this thesis. In the after migration analysis and discussions relying especially on the

¹⁶ For further information in the publicly announced news about the first comer immigrants Turks from Bulgaria, look into the features of the daily newspapers of northern Cypriot such as *Kıbrıs* [Cyprus] between the years of 1989-1990.

data, research sample was named/mentioned as “immigrant Turks/Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria (in northern Cyprus)”, or “(immigrant) interview respondents (from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus)”. These conceptualizations and naming were developed as a result of the prevalent self-identifications among immigrant interview respondents as well. In before migration experiences they usually tended to identify themselves as “Turks and Muslims” and after their migration they identify themselves as “Bulgarian Turks”, or as “Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria”.

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

The thesis aimed to collect and pile up adequate data information on immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, residing in northern Cyprus in order to understand the course of their migration decision and the results. Data collection procedure was based mainly on the 25 interview life-history (migration) transcripts, and the participant observation, which enabled face-to-face interactions with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. Participant observation was one of the important qualitative research techniques, which enabled the observation in terms of the social and the physical environment of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. Particularly, differentiations in life-styles, incomes, job activities and their residence environments made great sense to understand the reasons behind when the fieldwork was performed in the prevalence of direct participant observation. As a researcher to collect the relevant data for this thesis research, I participated in the fieldwork (northern Cyprus) for two months period (April-May) in 2006, and for three months (March-April-May) in 2007.

The general name of this qualitative field-based research is also conceptualized as ethnography in the qualitative research methodology literature. The ethnographic study includes participant observation, writing field notes or note taking, in-depth interview and face-to-face interactions. These techniques are realized through the direct involvement of the researcher and the interviewee/respondent/subject. As a result, the discourse analysis stems out, which

is an attempt to understand the concrete lived experiences and the abstract perceptual social worlds of the respondents/or research subjects. This becomes finalized with an attempt to give meaning to these “social worlds” of an interviewee/ a respondent/ a subject in the combination with a research data at hand and the theoretical groundings (Spencer, 1994; Wolfinger, 2002).

Since it was decided that the intensive in-depth interviews were going to be reflecting the lived experience reality among immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, the questionnaire construction was one of the significant preparations in this thesis research design process. For this aim, about 100 open-ended and semi-structured interview items were constructed, which were determined under definite nine themes.¹⁷ These noteworthy themes respectively were as following:

- A. Socio-demographic information
- B. General indication on Bulgaria as a place of origin
- C. General indication on northern Cyprus as a place of destination
- D. Occupation and job activity in Bulgaria/ northern Cyprus
- E. Everyday social life and activities in Bulgaria/ northern Cyprus
- F. Perception of self-identifications in Bulgaria/ northern Cyprus
- G. Property ownership in Bulgaria/ northern Cyprus
- H. Association and participation degree in Bulgaria/ northern Cyprus
- I. Concluding general comments on migration experiences

Except for part A (Socio-demographic information), all the other themes in the in-depth interview questionnaire were divided into two parts, that is the same questions were asked both for the conditions in Bulgaria and northern Cyprus. Interview questionnaire items in parts B-C aimed the general review of *push-pull* factors to migrate from Bulgaria (push factors) to northern Cyprus (pull factors). On the other hand, all themes and items were aimed to indicate the socio-economic conditions and the socio-cultural relations in Bulgaria and at present in northern Cyprus among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. To put in another way, Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria were interviewed about their lived experiences, which made their citizenship experiences come into question and their perceptions on these experiences as a result of migration. Afterwards, by means of this comprehensive item construction, all these themes were expected to give the interpretation between

¹⁷ For detailed questionnaire overview in terms of its themes and items see Appendix A (at the end of the thesis).

the relationship of *micro* lived migration experience and the background information of the *macro* socio-historical developments in Bulgaria. Only then this interpretative relationship was to be combined with the living conditions of Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria living in northern Cyprus. This comparison have become meaningful for the discourse analysis among immigrants Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus, while detecting overall existing and/or changing inclusions or exclusions in citizenship practices and the self-identification perceptions in return. Importantly to note, there will be narratives of migration experiences among immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in northern Cyprus cited and benefited from them for the discussions in the Chapters Five, Six and Seven. These narratives have been translated from Turkish to English (both versions will be included in the relevant chapters), paying particular attention not to lose their content meaning. It is noteworthy also that the interview respondent names of the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus, whose quotes will be integrated, will remain anonymous. For this, italics of pseudo-names and not of the real names will be incorporated throughout the relevant chapter parts of this thesis.¹⁸

Qualitative research techniques based on in-depth face-to-face interview and participant observation, which were decided upon at the very beginning, remarkably convenience the thesis analysis. However, it was made use of some additional present statistical data collection in relevance with immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who migrated to northern Cyprus. These were the two statistical population census reports on northern Cyprus present in 1996 and in 2006. The State Planning Organization-Statistics Research Planning Department prepared these census reports, which was a state institution related to the Prime Ministry of northern Cypriot [Turkish] state. These statistical works were comprised of socio-economic and socio-cultural themes about northern Cypriot population. There was beneficial numerical information about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria as well. I benefited from the numerical data about the approximate number of immigrant Turks born in Bulgaria,

¹⁸ For the general socio-demographic Turkish immigrant interview respondents profile, see also Appendix B.

their residence locations in northern Cypriot, and age groups of these immigrants, type of migration and the years, and their nationality type of citizenship possessions.

I benefited from second hand documents as well, such as looking into the features of newspaper archives in the North Cypriot press, which were accessed from the National Library in Lefkoşa (Nicosia). It was aimed to found additional explanatory information about the first Turkish immigrant comers from Bulgaria. Besides, this qualitative second-hand research technique enabled to catch the general indication of the northern Cypriot state/public opinion, or the general discourse about the first Turkish immigrant comers from Bulgaria (between the years of 1989 and 1990). For these reasons northern Cypriot newspaper archives of the two daily newspapers of *Kıbrıs* [Cyprus] and *Yeni Düzen* [The New Order] were looked into between the years of 1989-1990.¹⁹ Also, since this was the period of when the first immigrants came in northern Cyprus, it was decided on to conduct an interview with the former President of Rauf R. Denктаş as well, who was in power then. He accepted to take into consideration and answer some questions about the first arrivals of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, which were mentioned in the relevant discussions in Chapter Five.

There were still limited statistical or written documents about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who migrated to northern Cyprus. For this reason meetings were arranged with an appointment with the state officials in the relevant state posts who were supposed to enlighten the research investigation on Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria. There was an institution established in 1995 by a group of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, named as *Cultural and Solidarity Association of Bulgarian Turks*. Interview with the head of this institution was conducted, which was helpful to learn the community cohesion among immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus, and some approximate numerical data was obtained as well. Nonetheless,

¹⁹ These two newspapers primarily were decided upon because of their two different political standpoints, and also because they were the two well-known daily newspapers in northern Cyprus. “Kıbrıs” was known as a newspaper with a rightist standpoint supported by the state in power then (National Unity Party /*Ulusal Birlik Partisi*/ founded by the former president of Rauf R. Denктаş), while “Yeni Düzen” was with a leftist oppositional standpoint to the state (supported by the Republican Turkish Party /*Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi*/) between the years of 1989–1990.

the numerical data on the right population census and their socio-economic conditions were not available about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. Thus, various meetings were arranged with the state administrative officials, holding posts in the northern [Turkish] Cypriot state institutions. Institutions were visited such as the Deputy Prime Ministry and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Internal Affairs, State Planning Organization-Statistics Research Planning Department, Migration State Department, Population Registration State Department and the Commission board office of the Republic of Turkey (TC Yardım Heyeti). Appointments and the meetings were beneficial in guiding me which state institution or department was the right place to obtain verbal or written information about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, however even this was the case, I was able to pile up inadequate information as the reverse case was anticipated. In the next and last heading in the methodology chapter the possible reasons for this were explained to some extent.

In the data collection procedure for such a before/after migration analysis the most beneficial collected data still was comprised of the in-depth interviews with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. Since the aim was to collect as much as possible data about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, all the possible relevant state institutions were applied to in the northern Cyprus in Lefkoşa (Nicosia). All kinds of piled up data information from various sources were useful and benefited in combination with the interview findings. Statistical data, which was obtained from the published census reports, was used in Chapter Five under the heading of socio-demographic profile of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who were living in northern Cyprus.

2.4 Research Limitations and the Problems Encountered

In this part the limitations relevant with the research methodology were mentioned. In addition to these the problems, which were encountered during the research design process of this thesis were important to notify. At the very beginning, when the research and the thesis statement was overall set and designed, the primary aim of all was to meet the expectation of contributing to further future academic

researches on immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. For this reason, in the methodology chapter it was integrated descriptions of limitations and the prevalent problems with the possible reasons behind. These were important to being paid attention, for the possible anticipated researches in the migration studies as in the case with this thesis.

Firstly, it was all explained through the research design process that discourse analysis was partially achieved with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria as it was aimed. However, one of the major implications in this thesis is that its interpretative discussions were focused on the research data obtained about before/after migration experience and analyzed only on research sample of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. In the migration research studies as in this thesis case it would be of great importance to accomplish in-depth interview conduct with the native community in the place of destination. This thought to be important because it was noticed in the data analysis that after migration immigrant Turks from Bulgaria showed the tendency to take as reference and stress mostly the difference or resemblance with the native Turkish Cypriot community. In this way they tend to define their everyday social, economic, cultural, work life in northern Cyprus in comparison with their lived experiences in Bulgaria. Therefore, it would make sense to analyze the general socio-economic, and cultural conditions of Turkish Cypriots, and directly to focus on their perceptions on immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, residing in northern Cyprus. In this sense the thesis might be said to be limited in its content, since it was lacking such a comparative dimension from the native Turkish Cypriot points of view.

Since the importance of such a comparative dimension was noticed during the first in-depth interviews with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, an attempt was made actually to integrate in-depth interview conduct with the Turkish Cypriots as well. The initial research technique was to follow pilot-sample interviews with the randomly selected native Turkish Cypriot respondents and later to comprise the second research sample of Turkish Cypriots. However, this became impossible since in the randomly selected neighborhoods in Lefkoşa (Nicosia) Turkish Cypriots' responses were either as that they were not acquainted with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria or they tended to mention about them simply that they were

hardworking, kind, civilized and clean people. Thus, it became hard to find the Turkish Cypriots who were closely acquainted with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in order to answer in some detail. My thesis advisor instead offered another way to interview with the native Turkish Cypriots about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. It was to reach Turkish Cypriot people in their workplaces and to find who were familiar and within interaction with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria on everyday regular basis. After the Turkish Cypriot research sample revision, instead of trying to find ordinary Turkish Cypriots, the officials or working native people in the public sphere mostly encountering the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria become the new research target sample. This research sample comprised of Turkish Cypriot officials in the public sphere such as bureaucratic state officials and the ordinary service sector-working people.

Even so, handicaps were not removed altogether again in the new revised research sample comprised of Turkish Cypriots, and there were three basic ones. Firstly, this time it was mainly because the interview subjects were at work. Thus, both the respondent and the interviewer were not freely comfortable in conducting interview because of the interruptions of the people, customers or others and time limitations.

Secondly, the time-shared for the in-depth face-to-face interviews and the relevant research studies in the fieldwork (northern Cyprus) was the period between the months of April and June in 2006. However, during this period in the northern Cyprus there were campaigns for “General Elections of Local Institutions and By-Elections of Ministry State Bodies” held on 25th of June 2006. At first, this was not estimated as a problem for the research preparations, but later it was realized that this election campaigns impeded the thesis research and the interviews to be conducted with the officials in the public sphere. How these elections affected the research was that the attempts for coming together with Turkish Cypriot state officials and conduct an interview with them were all rejected somehow politely after explaining that he or she was busy with the election campaign procedural preparations. On the other hand, why Turkish Cypriot officials in the public sphere and service sector rejected the

interview for this thesis was different. They refrained from giving information because randomly again selected service sector officials were susceptible about the real aim of my research conduct about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing in northern Cyprus. Besides, they were not sure to share any information because they were wondering whether the research is conducted for left wing or right wing political party objectives. Thus, the Turkish Cypriot service sector officials or citizens hesitated to conduct the interview because of not being deciphered out of their interviews and being accused of about their statements for the future prospects. This was an outcome because of the interrelated patronage social relations intervened in the politics and the social everyday relations in northern Cyprus. This might be observed in every society yet; due to the smaller population size of northern Cyprus and territory these patronage relations are more explicitly and commonly observed. Since, it is very important and prominent to know with which political party ordinary people attachments with have and then people in northern Cyprus (disregarding their nationalities) have high tendencies to behave accordingly within the social interactions. This was more apparent especially in the village of Esentepe (Ay Kurus), since it was a small village, where the social relations were more in a face-to-face manner where the people in the village knew each other personally. For a researcher it would not be difficult to observe these relations, and during the research and interview requests, both Turkish Cypriots and immigrant Turks from Bulgaria emphasized how settlers in Esentepe (Ay Kurus) are strongly standing by the political party sights. Thus, almost everybody in the village of Esentepe (Ay Kurus) was recognized according to his or her political party stands view and even was evaluated accordingly.

Thirdly, the reason why the in-depth interview was not possible with the native Turkish Cypriots was because when requested for an interview with the Turkish Cypriot state officials or the employees in the public sphere some of them were digressing from the topics about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. This happened when asked specific questions about their attitudes about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. The Turkish Cypriots somehow were directing their responses and conversations to their relations either with the Turkish immigrants from Turkey

(migrated after 1974 to northern Cyprus) or the Greek Cypriot population residing in the Southern part of Cyprus. The reason why this happens, for the former group it might be because of the higher population of Turkish settlers from Turkey living in northern Cyprus after the intervention of Turkish military operations to the island in 1974. If it is evaluated in numbers, the total population in northern Cyprus in 1996 population census was 200.587 and out of this total population size 54.650 (%27.20) are the people born in and migrated from Turkey. While 23.924 of them are citizens of TRNC, 30.702 are citizens of Turkey, including the age interval between 00-04 and 65-+. Apart from exceptional cases, about %27.20 of the total population were comprised of the Turkish so-called “settlers” migrated to northern Cyprus from different parts of Turkey (usually from North-Eastern regions of Turkey). When asked about immigrant Turks of Bulgaria, then the Turkish Cypriots also tend to compare them with the Turkish immigrants or settlers coming from Turkey to northern Cyprus. The second group, which becomes sensitive alternative to shift the main idea of the interview, was the Greek Cypriots. This was because Turkish Cypriots were mostly concerned with the “Cyprus issue”, meaning the political and the territorial conflicting divisions between these two native societies. This causes difficulty in keeping following the arguments on the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria.

After several interview trials it was witnessed that there was not any general familiarity with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in the northern Cypriot society. The lower population of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in the northern Cyprus might be the basic reason for this. This made justifiable why the perceptions or opinions of the Turkish Cypriots remained weak about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, since the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria comprised only 0.7 % of the total population share in northern Cyprus (1996 Population Census Report).

Finally, there were problems during the in-depth interview conduct with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, which should be mentioned as well. I was usually welcomed because of my parents’ background of being immigrant from Bulgaria as well. This led the interview respondents to trust to the research itself and the interviewer. Even so, the interview was not accepted at first as much comfortable

task because immigrant Turks from Bulgaria mentioned that they were interviewed many times and especially questioned about their national consciousness during the Communist regime by the state officials in Bulgaria. Thus, they hesitated on answering at first, as rightfully, but later they become so sincere and openhearted in their thoughts that shared in detail with the interviewer. On the other hand, there were exceptional cases, which were mentioned under *the research sample* heading, which did not accept and welcome the interview. These were immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who rejected the interview because they were not willing to share their life histories with the interviewer especially those experiences relating to Bulgaria. For example, one of the women said that everything in the past is already past and there was no need to question it. Another example with an immigrant from a different neighborhood rejected again the interview because of being not willing to talk about experiences in Bulgaria, even to remember about them and complain the research that if I am so willing to learn about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria I had better search books instead of interviewing people. In return, I tried to explain the aim of this study, and that the research was misunderstood, also that all the interviewees personally were going to be secretly covert, however my efforts become fruitless. Then, I thanked to these immigrant women, who rejected the interview and explained that they would not be forced for this interview and that they might of course have justified reasons for their attitudes.

2.5 Conclusion

To sum up, in this methodology chapter the qualitative research techniques were explained, which were used in this research based thesis work. It was explained that the qualitative research techniques were rather appropriate than the quantitative techniques. This was because vital details for the thesis were supposed to be caught through the in-depth interviews, participant observation and the face-to-face interactions, which were providing comprehensive qualitative data material unlike the quantitative research techniques for such a migration study in this thesis. While the relevant adequate data was collected for the sake of the thesis about immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, the only limitation which prevent the analysis to be more

comprehensive was the absent data collection on the native Turkish Cypriots. Despite several short samples, effective time-sharing with the Turkish Cypriot state officials, or the service sector officials in the public sphere, to conduct an interview was not thoroughly achieved as expected. On the other hand, the focus on immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who were the main reference group of this thesis, was partially fulfilled. In addition to the implications and the problems encountered especially during the research data collection procedure that were mentioned with the reasons behind it was of course also matter of time limitations and financial aid allotted to this research thesis fieldwork in northern Cyprus.

Now, theoretical explanations will be explained in the next chapter, which were determined as relevant arguments depending on the data narratives. These are the classical and recent citizenship approaches. Besides, there are conceptualizations on migration types, which are included in the theoretical chapter. These two broad fields of citizenship and migration were narrowed in their content explanations in order to articulate only with the research data findings.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF CITIZENSHIP AND MIGRATION

3.1 Introduction

This research thesis work aims to focus basically on the consequences of migration experiences in terms of citizenship practices among the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in northern Cyprus. Thus, in the sake of this thesis considering the data at hand citizenship will become reliable with its theoretical analyses. However, there have been developing extensively comprehensible theoretical formulations in this field in terms of understanding *citizenship* within *philosophical, legal, political, social* and other relevant domains and their manifold aspects. For this reason, a theoretical sum of evolutionary base of citizenship will be displayed to the elongation of its basic, *status, membership* and *belonging* approaches (referring to the *self-identification* also), also in connection with the changing citizenship approaches out of *global* (and *trans-national*) modifications and the *(im)migration* factor.

These will be discussed respectively in certain interrelated headings integrated in this chapter. Firstly, general approaches to citizenship will be explained in terms of its logic as a legal approval to membership status in a nation-state, or a political community. This will be the part, which will touch partly on the legal and political aspects of citizenship, since citizenship as a concept is approached with the state-bounded interpretations by perforce of its traditional discourse. In the part coming next, the classical citizenship theory of T.H. Marshall with its basic dimensions of political, legal and social citizenship rights will be explicated and reviewed. In the subsequent heading, *social citizenship* will be of particular importance for separate elaboration since it will be relevant directly with the social aspects and every day life practices of citizenship. Actually, all these will assist to

interpret social citizenship themes specified in this thesis Chapters of Six and Seven, which hold socio-economically and socio-culturally inscribed aspects.

The theoretical approaches will be explanations in one hand taking citizenship into consideration as a status, membership or belonging within a formally engaged (contracted) mutual state-society relation in a conditioned territory. On the other hand, all these will be theoretically articulated at issue to understand the changing citizenship dimensions in presence of the *(im)migration* factor, or the ‘free’ flow of people across borders in today’s world. In this way, citizenship matters in accordance with the societal pinpoints of inclusiveness/exclusiveness as a consequence of immigration will be remarked in general theoretical standpoints. In the final consequence, the issue of *identity* formations and maintenance will be theoretically under consideration through the citizenship practices determined within given territory, or territories. This will help to interpret the relevant research data on identity and perceptions within a reliable socio-cultural comprehension related with the citizenship matters as a consequence of migration. Overall, citizenship dimensions will be exemplified not only in accordance with a given nation-state boundaries or society but how these are expected or tend to function in terms of continuity and/or change in a migration process also.

3.2 General Approaches to Citizenship

Citizenship in content evolutionarily has tended to change as a *status*, *membership* and *belonging* depending on the *shifting/transforming* world socio-political order as a result of different historical contexts including varying dynamics of political, social, economic and cultural bounded society relations. To understand some of the determinants apparent with the citizenship cause determinants, firstly, it is necessary to mention that citizenship has appeared as a *dynamically evolving* concept to define its members as citizens within a politically determined *territory*. To Skinner, modern conceptions and approaches to citizenship are linked with the development of the liberal state formations commenced in the end of 16th century, when also the steady replacement had been realized in associating the citizenship

with *membership* and *belonging* (defined by citizenship *status*) to a political community as *nation-state* instead of a *city*, once structured as a fortified defensive territory (cited in Faulks, 2000:21). In the following centuries nation-state or the national and political boundary formations started to gain overriding influence in parallelism with the evolutionary construction of citizenship status and redefinitions. Secondly, another characteristic of citizenship is also that its development is related with diversified bulk of approaches, which reveal that citizenship contains both *individualistic* and *collectivist* rudiments in general. This means that up until today the evolution or development of the citizenship tended to be a concern of certain individuals or minority groups pronouncing the limitations of citizenship ensued in unequal treatment under law. For instance, such minority groups could be anti-slavery movement, gay or lesbian activists, women's movements, racial and ethnic minority or immigrant movements and others who have been taking part in the social sphere as the subordinate. The occurrences of various interrelated social relational discomfort related with certain groups might motivate the state to reconsider and redefine the citizenship in terms of *legal, political, economic, social* or *cultural* resource distribution. Thirdly, the need to redefine citizenship in content and practice might be relevant with social variables shaping the social relations in a society such as *self-interest, power or conflict, or social struggle*. The fourth and last determinant relevant with the basic evolutionary dynamic of citizenship and its taking different shapes, besides the previous ones, is its being *universally* recognized conception within a prescribed *set of rights and duties*.²⁰ They are accepted as well known mutual/reciprocal (or contract) relation defining expectations between the legislative state regulations and a citizen. Nonetheless, there are various socially contentious relations in which the egalitarian and universal nature of citizenship is always in question with these practices. Accordingly, the citizenship all over again needs elaborations may be not always through social struggle, but because of socially intense necessity resulted in inequality about class, gender or ethnic differences when considered with the contract relational connotations (Faulks, 2000:7, Janoski, 1998:7; Giddens, 1985). Then, needless to say, questioning the capacity/capability of

²⁰ For different types and categories of defined and exemplified set of citizenship rights and duties and obligations, which are outlined also in tables, see Janoski (1998: 31, 55).

citizenship in the course of past, present and the future times becomes more complex also because of global world developments having impact in different localities. For this, many dimensions have become prominent to be reconsidered and articulated for the fulfillment of gaps (exclusiveness) that citizenship tends to create and making inevitable its extension.

Having explained briefly the cause essentials that make the concept of citizenship comprehensible at first glance, the citizenship and the state-society contract relation will be described. This is essential to understand expectations between the state and its society members just because citizenship, as mentioned previously, is a conception closely tied to the state government attitudes and behaviors. Thus, this *contract relation* is maintained by the modern and universal ideal of citizenship, which attaches a meaning to this relation and approves citizenship either as a means for status or membership to a state, or a political community. To put it differently, what citizenship roughly does is to define the status or membership of an individual within a political community in reference to the mutual understanding appropriated in a set of rights and duties. In this sense, citizenship by nature is a *dynamic, essential, and mutually* constructive ideal between the agreeable citizen members and the state. As a result, individuals as members within a political community are also able to basically guarantee their legal, political (and social) *recognition*. Furthermore, through the citizenship state contract community members are tended to being accepted homogeneously equally on the same grounds of rights and duties routine. On the whole, to Faulks, the citizenship attaches a status (out of a contract) of autonomy also, which allows a citizen's *recognition* and the *participation* in the political sphere. He explains this as follows:

The status of citizen implies a sense of inclusion into the wider community. It recognizes the contribution a particular individual makes to that community, while at the same time granting him or her individual autonomy. This autonomy is reflected in a set of rights, which, though varying in content enormously over time and space, always imply recognition of political agency on the part of the bearer of those rights (Faulks, 2000:4).

In these respects citizenship is a study area, usually in the liberal doctrines, tending to be examined in a twofold systematic, which serves in necessity of rights

and also obligations. This in a way defines the performance of governance between the state and the members belonging to it. In its basic content the emphasis is made again that citizenship is a mutual construct in terms of rights and obligations negotiated between the state and the members of it. The citizenship is prevalent with an expectation that a citizen is up to standard if the right performances of duties and obligations are served in accordance with state regulations. In return, the state regulations are expected to being reorganized in providing community members with the equitable rights for all as well (Faulks, 2000:5; Janoski, 1998:52-74; Marshall, 1964:123). This is to ensure the legitimate and egalitarian deal within the social order among the citizen participants themselves and between the citizen and the state. Accordingly, it is expected then the mechanisms of citizenship in a way to maintain and sustain the relations between the state and society, both of them being supervised interchangeably through the dynamics of each other.

This interdependent contract relation in supervision, prescribed with rights and duties is emphasized in relation to its being checkable by the citizens themselves, either in an individually based or collective manner to negotiate democratically with state-bounded institutional agencies. This is termed as *active* versus *passive citizenship* stand defining the democratically again behavioral membership of a citizen. In the light of this, for the proper operation and functionality of the reciprocal citizenship relation, a citizen is idealized within the active citizenship status (Faulks, 2000:4, Janoski, 1998:9). As mentioned in the beginning as a result of various probable social conflicting relations, the capabilities of citizenship are questioned and necessity of its expansion is raised. The definition of an active citizenship in this sense is rational in conception but it is also argued that the status of behaving as an active citizen has altered its meaning in time and passive citizenship attitude become prevalent.²¹ To Yeğen, the reason for this is that while the rise of modern outset of citizenship was associated with its practice and membership in the antiquity simply to a city, formation of nation-states necessitates the membership of a citizen to its borderlines in today's contemporary world where nation, culture, or ethnicity based

²¹ For detailed and diversified discussions about the active and passive membership to a society as citizen, also within historical frames, see Manville (1994), Riesenberg (1992), Clarke (1994).

relations become more complex. Thus, in the course of time this dynamically evolutionary citizenship structure between the state and the society reveals the transition from an active citizenship to the passive one. This means also that the transition is apprehended in terms of associating the active membership with the transparency in the sake of citizenship capabilities and negotiations for improvements between a citizen and state regulation attitudes. Yet, this systematic of relations has indicated shifts to passive citizenship behaviors while citizen has started to become both a member of a political community within a local nation-state boundaries and the other wider global localities (Yeğen, 2005:69-70; van Gunsteren, 1998:14,16).

Discussions so far indicate that the evolutionary process and interpretations of citizenship depends firmly on the state bounded attitudes likewise how members regulate their formal relations by means of again the state. That is, all these when are taken into consideration from the point of legally subjected entities gathered within a defined nation-state or political community territories it becomes that they create their space for recognition and representation. On the other hand, in the citizenship literature, this processed formal citizenship, from the point of state, is explained as such that citizenship is uniting all members within a given territory, and to Brubaker, aiming to keep them in *social closure* as well (Brubaker cited in Faulks, 2000:29; Hoffman, 2004:18-19). In this social closure a citizen, involved in the legally defined and predetermined reproduction system of rights and duties is expected to be a member of a political community, who is granted with citizenship (or contract relation) in order to belong to certain territories on *equal* basis. These are accordingly allocated, of course, by a systematic of state-bounded agents again such as, bureaucratic procedures and governance through the courts, Parliament and welfare institutions (Crossley, 2001:33). Faulks defines the mutual relation between the legislative state bureaucracies and the state members, or citizens with the term of 'dialectic of control'. He derives this analogy from Giddens (1985) to explain the *negotiation* as how the democratic state is to be and tends to be more tolerable and seeking for proper *consensus* with those demanding for rights (Faulks, 2000:25). Overall, citizenship in general is exploratory in its interconnected contract analysis

about membership to a given state, and thus it is basically a political and legal subject.

Taking the preceding discussions on one hand, the fact is that, in the general meaning of citizenship explained up until here its evolutionary process has focused on contract relation of citizens with mainly the state-bounded structures. On the other hand, what is important is that in understanding citizenship capabilities in continuity and change, it is argued to contradict in content for challenging the idea of emancipating its members only within certain given boundaries under the *loyalty* to a *nation*, the dominant majority of the state. Although citizenship is associated with its egalitarian and universal dimensions, the rise of nation-state boundary formations entail different historical processes and grounds at which both the state building and the nation building serve in the formation of a political community and having influence on citizenship.²² The emphasis here is that despite the fact that the notion of nation-state discussions are not separable in its twofold formation and appears as in a *homogeneous* totality, the nation-state in its content is said to be *particularistic* and *exclusive* because the motto of ‘one nation one state’ has by no means fitted in the real contexts. In fact, the idea of *nation* is argued to harden the progress of citizenship, rather than to facilitate it especially since the 19th century onwards. This was when the *Volk*-centered, or *nationhood* (descend bounded) based political boundary formations become significant in the wider world localities during the inter war or post-war periods (Faulks, 2000:42; Brubaker, 1992:178).

Certainly, there are manifold discussion standpoints on nation building, state building, or nation-state formation processes, which will not be elaborated because they are out of this thesis scope. Still, these explanations are important for brief notifications since they are impulses also reflecting on the definition of citizenship in different emphases. What is important then is that these discussions are bringing about arguments in relation to the conception of citizenship, in which it is pinpointed that *state* keeps being primarily legal and political idea, while *nation* tends to be a cultural and socially agreed upon (Ma, 1992:294). Depending on these, the

²² For further and relevant summary debates in reference to state and nation building, see Linz (1993).

nationality issue becomes problematic for citizenship. This is apparent with the arguments prevalent on how the state *differentiates* and *advantages* its members by and large on *nationhood*, grounded on descend relationship of the dominant majority. As a consequence, critiques on the potentials of citizenship remain at issue in between the controversial duality of *exclusiveness* (about *limits*) versus *inclusiveness* (about *extensions*) of its content (Oommen, 1997:202).

Having a general outlook to the overall discussions on the citizenship conception as an agreement-like membership in a given political community, Hammar could be complementary in the similar lines. To him, there are significant distinctions that are to make citizenship more comprehensive and inclusive as a whole in the membership terms. These are *legal*, *political*, *social*, *cultural* and *psychological*. The legal aspect is the formal meaning of citizenship in terms of its membership credit in a state, which allows an individual to demand and supply certain set of rights and duties. The political aspect is also relevant with the political status attributed to a citizen to take its place in the political arena and to pronounce opinions. In the cultural and social aspect terms of citizenship membership that Hammar mentions are referring to the membership to a nation rather than to the state. Lastly, the psychological sides of membership that citizenship provides are subject matters of an individual's psychological expression and way of identification. The explanations in general relevant with the last dimension in the Hammar's arguments are more significant in terms of the relationship between the citizenship and the identity rather than the legal aspects of citizenship (Hammar cited in İçduygu, Çolak and Soyarık, 1999: 189). Actually, the citizenship and its relation with identity in terms of belonging, rather than membership aspect will be integrated in the discussion parts under the last heading about identity formations and maintenance in this theory chapter.

Having said all these, to understand the origins of where *convertible* meaning of citizenship actually comes from, or its emergence as an essential *regulatory practice* the work of T.H. Marshall (1950) is preliminary and groundwork in the citizenship literature discourse, impossible to skip also in this theory chapter. His

analysis has inspired many theoreticians in this field, some of whom have been mentioned and others to be integrated in this theory chapter with their discussions on the idea of citizenship. Taking Marshall as a reference, it will give opportunity to grasp all the developed discussions pinpointing the arguments including the evolutionary and the necessarily expansionist nature of citizenship out of social conflict, or struggle and also the projected relation between the state and the citizen. For this, in the next chapter heading, Marshall will be explicated in relation with his basic approaches to citizenship. Subsequently, some of the basic critical standpoints highlighting the inadequacy of Marshall's citizenship theory will be added as well.

3.3 Classical Citizenship Conceptualizations of T. H. Marshall and Different Dimensions of Citizenship

T.H. Marshall is well-known social scientist that tries to interpret the citizenship phenomena in his classical work of "*Citizenship and Social Class*" (1950) put in a sociological inquire. Marshall with its citizenship analysis is criticized from various perspectives, but his work is still taken into accounts and articulated even within today's contemporary citizenship studies. He defines citizenship within three broaden categories and tries to analyze them accordingly to the evolutionary developmental chain. He puts emphasize on the egalitarianism within a society and how the citizenship rights and obligations redefine it. He also argues that the egalitarian structure to be constructed and maintained depends on the reciprocal relations between the state and the society shared on citizenship basis. In his merely specific analysis of England, Marshall argues that the citizenship as what it had become until the 20th century was a development resulting from the reformations out of the social needs that emerged within a historical context. In his view of that, the social needs provide the possibility to be checked, regulated and maintained by means of an active membership status to a society. To Marshall, definition of citizenship is evaluated as follows:

Citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed. There is no universal principle that determines what those rights and duties shall be, but societies in which citizenship is a developing institution create an image of an ideal

citizenship against which achievement can be measured and towards which aspiration can be directed (Marshall, 1950:18).

The statement above shows that Marshall minds the duties and obligations connectedly with the subject matter of rights, yet, the development, or extension of citizenship is explained primarily by citizenship dimensions defined by Marshall in terms of *civil*, *political*, and the *social rights*. In fact, the articulated definitions of citizenship rights are outcomes of a gradual process aiming the egalitarian membership of an individual in a liberal democratic social order. As it is stated in different analysis works in reference to Marshall, the practicalities of these citizenship rights are basically the protection and recognition of the basic human rights and obligations. Different social dynamics initiated the need of redefining citizenship. To Marshall, citizenship has developed its meaning in functionality through historical developmental stages independently from each other. That is the civic rights emerged and gained importance in the 18th century, the political rights formation in the 19th century, and social events in the 20th century necessitate the development of the social rights as well (Marshall/Bottomore, 1950/92:14).

The meaning of citizenship rights in terms of legal, political and the social components are granted as *universal*, *democratic* and *egalitarian* social needs.²³ Still, these are inadequate in defining the ultimate practice of citizenship and the need of additional conceptualizations is unavoidable. However, these three processes of rights deserve special attention at a standstill. Thus, briefly to mention about

²³ Also, there is a general theoretical classification of citizenship rights developed from Marshall and outlined in a more detailed way by Janoski (1998) also. He extends his study while dividing firstly, legal rights into five types, and explaining them in other sub-titles as well. The five main *legal rights* classifications are the procedural rights, expressive rights, bodily control rights, property and service rights and the organizational rights. For *political rights* he classifies as personal rights, organizational rights, naturalizations rights and the oppositional rights. Political rights, to Janoski, allow citizen to have the right of access in the political bureaucratic sphere and negotiate the necessary requirements for better recognition politically. He also reminds that the political rights are efficient and crucial not only for the natives but also for the refugees, immigrants and the minorities residing in a given society. Additionally, to Janoski, *social rights* are the enabling and preventive rights, opportunity rights, distributive rights and the compensatory rights, which are the basic public services, especially emphasizing the allowances in the areas of health, education, and pensions to the old, disabled, unemployed, work insurances and so forth. These right opportunities are of course supplied by the contract of citizenship. For the relevant classifications and discussions about citizenship rights as expecting to promote equality and liberties under the state laws, see Janoski (1998:30, 32).

citizenship and the three sets of rights in particular reference to Marshall, which are developed and defined by him will be explained in the separate parts below.

Firstly, *legal citizenship* (and the *rights*) basically is based on individual rights, such as freedom of expression/ speech, and religion, property and service rights, right to contract and the right to court and counsel. It is stated also that this type of rights is different from the political and the social rights, because the civil rights tempted to have direct attachment to the institutions of law and practice on equal basis. In the Marshallian explanations, the evolutionary development of legal rights in the case of England is transitory in nature. He gives the example of how the individual rights based on Monarchical tradition left its place to the legal rights defined by the national based state arrangements. To Marshall, these developments in the case of England, at least, are witnessed during the 18th century. This is referring to the period between the English industrial revolution and the reformations with new capitalist law adoptions and boundary formations for resource distribution.

Secondly, *political citizenship* (and the *rights*) is also significant in motivating and negotiating the notion of citizenship in a society related with the state and the members of that society. To Marshall, the development of political rights is relevant with the socio-historical developments taking place in the 19th century. One of the basic features for the political rights is the right to participate in the political sphere and take a place in a decision making process. This participation is realized through the right to vote and take active role in performing the citizenship duties. To Marshallian understanding the political rights were contradicting in different time periods in the 18th century England, but gained significance and the necessary reformations in the 19th century.

Thirdly, the final set of rights is concerned with the *social citizenship* (*rights*), accepted as the last component of the citizenship rights become apparent in the 20th century in England in the analysis of Marshall. In fact, different events necessitate the social order based on social rights, as it is the case with the civil and the political rights, which entail basically the economic well-being and the social security rights.

These are to be performed and maintained throughout the whole life of an individual and guarantee its membership to a society in the protection of these social rights. Marshall pays also special attention to the institution of education. This is because it is accepted as one of the primary motivations of the state services promoting to acquire the consciousness of knowledge, which makes an individual recognize the aspects of social rights for an active citizenship membership. Another argument is that social rights guarantee the safety of an individual to be well protected in the society through its attendance in the public sphere. The pre-condition of this is to be a citizen of course. That is the reciprocal relation of rights and obligations are more explicit in this set of rights on integrating the duties and the obligations in a parallel way with the recognition of rights.²⁴

In point of fact, what Marshall investigates is the development of *citizenship rights* and the relevance with the *social inequality*. He accepts that the idea of citizenship ensures individual with membership status in a society. However, while this status promotes equality for all members, then how still social class is based on an unequal hierarchy is his primary concern. Significant argument of Marshall is that the development of citizenship, in terms of civil, political and the social rights, especially maintained the parallel development of the inequalities integrated by the *capitalist system*. That is the citizenship, to Marshall, promises equality out of the free usage of rights, but at the same time sustain the capitalist unequal developments. In this respect, Marshall's analysis is interpreted in a way that citizenship is even identifiable as an ideology. By this it is meant that by recognizing the particular rights and duties it is aimed to keep the relevant community members closer to the ruling centralized capitalist agents (Kaya, 2006:101).

Especially, the civic citizenship rights are stated as the major in maintaining the social inequality and the hierarchy of social classes. This is also argued as that the *capitalist system* is based on the development of civil rights, which also developed the *individuality*, *self-interestedness* and *competition* among members in

²⁴ For further discussions on the interconnected relation between the rights and duties and obligations, see Marshall (1949/92), Janovitz (1980), and Janoski (1998).

return (Marshall/Bottomore, 1950/92:46). Besides, the reciprocal relations between the state and the socially constrained individuals are based on the legislative membership status in a society yet, in the accord with unequally sustained positions in the social hierarchy. For Marshall:

For modern contract is essentially an agreement between men who are free and equal in status, though not necessarily in power. Status was not eliminated from the social system. Differential status, associated with class, function and family, was replaced by the single uniform status of citizenship, which provided the foundation of equality on which the structure of inequality could be built (Marshall/Bottomore, 1950/1992:21).

In other words, citizenship entails the *membership ideal* to a society based on *status* condition, which is *divisive* in the *power relations* of decision maker positions. Depending on the citizenship examination by Marshall, the members of a society might be *equal* in their *membership*, but *unequal* in *status*. For these explanations, Bottomore exemplifies that the ownership of private property depends on the status of an individual and its social class. Thus, citizen might be free with the citizenship rights to extents that the social status actually allows (ibid, 1950/92:23).

Despite its limitations, Marshall has been important in regards with his discussions and the attention paid to the citizenship rights placed also in the point of a special interest of sociology. However, his citizenship accounts are limited as exemplified on the case of England only. Of course, his findings still carry meaning may be not fully that shape even today's citizenship conceptualizations according to the contemporary legal, political and social world necessities. The basic three dimensions of citizenship based on particular rights that Marshall clarifies, have been accepted as the primary principles of citizenship and even the components of human rights as preconditions to all societies and the members. On the other hand, there have been recent debates on citizenship and Marshall's dimensional citizenship rights, which become intensely argued on in the way that citizenship should be extended in its components and functional performances in accord with the global state-society relations at present. All these will be handled in the discussion parts in this theory chapter relevant with changing citizenship aspects and approaches as a consequence of migration. Now, *social citizenship* will be explored placing arguments with the socially constructed aspects in reference to the welfare practices,

at which the mutual welfare state, this time, society member relations are pertaining.

3.4 Understanding the Socially Enhanced Citizenship

In this part of the chapter *social citizenship* will be explored with its relevant aspects to the conceptions of citizenship, since it has been determined respectively as a crucial integral part to the general and contemporary theoretical discussions of citizenship. This has been because besides the *legal* and the *political* connotations somehow being notified theoretically in the discussions on mutual *contract* relation, in the case of this thesis *social citizenship aspects* have been decided separately to be added and specifically to be complementary also for this theory chapter. Overall, the social citizenship explanations in this sense will be vital in pinpointing significant standpoint notifications of citizenship in terms of *duality of structure* (or the contract relation mentioned as such so far) again.²⁵ This means that social citizenship approaches will display the *mutual relations* between the *state* and *society members* also with respect to the *welfare* constructions and *social status* of citizenship. After all, it is aimed to reach also a comprehensive understanding about the practices of citizenship in a more apparent way so as to grasp the state-society relational order remarked so far. To put in another way, *enhancement* of citizenship related with the *membership* to the *welfare practices* represented within a political community, which is admitting the *various social relations* will be handled.

There are outstanding debates that the social citizenship is neglected in study matters of citizenship and conversely the legal and the political aspects are overriding the citizenship discourse in profound ways. This general theoretical outlook leads to undermine the inequalities and unjust treatments in the varying social contexts, at which social aspects of citizenship are tried to be understood and social or welfare rights to be extended and applied for the enhancement or inclusiveness of citizenship also. It is argued that if certain aspects of social citizenship aspects are not paid attention then the legal and the political aspects of citizenship might be unable to function properly because of lack of knowledge on social citizenship practices. Thus, all the citizenship aspects but basically the social

²⁵ The concept of *duality of structure* is coined by Giddens (1984:25), which is cited and discussed in Faulks (2000:5).

ones (equal right access to education, health and the other status guarantying social and economic provisions) are expected to be paid attention, which is to disintegrate the subordination within societies of certain individuals or groups and the various inequalities in return. Additionally, this is to bring as an outcome reasonable citizens to act in the welfare sphere and use properly and if necessary the legal channels for unequal treatment.²⁶

In these regards, it is important to understand how citizenship defines its status through the socially dynamic aspects of it. To Dwyer, social citizenship is:

It has the potential to provide a benchmark against which it is possible to assess the status of certain individuals or groups in relation to access to the agreed welfare rights and resources that are generally available to all those who are regarded as citizens within a specific community. Social citizenship, therefore, offers the capacity for an exploration of the dynamics of social divisions/exclusion to take in a number of important dimensions (for example, class, gender, race, disability, age) when assessing both the levels and causes of inequality within a society (Dwyer, 2004:6).

Social citizenship then, is significant with its analysis investigations on the representation of individuals or groups within the wider society. This is *regulatory relation* closely bounded to state provisions again, undertaking the allocation of the universal basic human privileges established on equal, right and just treatments towards its members, or citizens. The allocation is provided through the welfare state regulating various social, economic, cultural and other *resource distributions*. This is also a relevant discussion with the *social policies*, which are also contributions with partial explanations to citizenship in terms of its *effective*, or *engaged* characteristics for the entire community members in a society paying mind even to *the poorer* and *marginalized* (Dwyer, 2004).

What is central as notified above is that social citizenship brings direct involvement into the examination of state-society relations in terms of *social inequality*, or *social stratification* stemming from competing for resources capitalist mode of economic production and consumption. This contemporarily widespread

²⁶ For relevant discussions on the subordination of social and welfare rights and thus, social citizenship, see Dean (2001); Dwyer (2004). For partly relevant with different connotations questioning the state capabilities and the question of citizenship, see also Hoffman (2004).

structure in world localities leads to various types of subordinate group *marginalization* prevalent in their wider societies. This unequal social relational structure maintained in the society is argued to being concealed behind the citizenship as a state ideal promising universal equality. To put it differently, social dimensions of citizenship, unlike the legal and political dimensions insist on perceiving the various social inequality forms within society among the citizens. Although the promised equality of citizenship, the community members according to their *social positions* and *backgrounds* may determine actually their access degree to benefit from the various officially determined rights (Dweyer, 2004; Hoffman, 2004). As mentioned in the preceding chapter heading, Marshall (1950/1992:23) is, whose arguments have been profoundly based in the same lines. Yet, he focuses his citizenship understanding on three-dimensional display of legal, political and social aspects of equal citizenship rights²⁷ and created social inequalities out of occupied capitalism and free-market economy. In addition to his way of looking to the notions of citizenship, it may be inferred that evolutionary nature of citizenship has been converting into benevolent search reaching to the final stage development of social rights. All in all, the inequality determined by the social stratification continue to persists, which the matter of social citizenship question is trying to disintegrate inequalities by underpinning the means of equal welfare state provisions.

Having pinpointed the general outlook of social citizenship, it is important to emphasize that it is still a citizenship subjects bound to the state attitudes and behaviors. Similarly, debates are still questionable about the citizenship inclusiveness or exclusiveness, persistent with the social aspects in a given society. At this point what is the contract relation still occupying structural order among society members and between the state and the society have gained significance. This is how actually the social citizenship formulates the welfare rights and resources to be distributed and defines overall the expectation relation between the state and citizens. Welfare or

²⁷ According to this three-dimensional right distinctions, they are mentioned also as *negative rights* and the *positive (social) rights*. Negative rights refer to the civil and political dimensions of rights based on legal and political recognition and participation into the wider political community, or society. On the other hand, positive rights are defined as the state-provided/guaranteed benefits and other social assurances and economic provisions (Dwyer, 2004:8).

social rights appear within a fundamental stand throughout the human live, which try to establish the place of an individual with the basic *state-guaranteed social assurance* and promised *economic supplies*. Following these, the formation and maintenance of the *enhanced/engaged citizenship*, or ‘effective citizenship’ is to be fulfilled, which is to instruct political or social community members to search on right ways to progress for better living conditions and creating opportunity spaces. Since this is the case, in the course of life span, an individual firstly learn the socially constructed still legalized citizenship practices and how to cooperate later within the contract relation. Thus, political community membership realizes its merits under the socially constructed basic needs also necessary for an individual to *survive* and *sustain* his or her life in this societal environment. As a result of all, social citizenship have become of a particular interest to comprehend citizenship especially in terms of ‘who gets what, how they get it and why they are seen as being entitled to it’ (Dwyer, 2004:9).

It is necessary to briefly include several essentials relevant with the function and expectation of welfare state provisions and the inclusive stand of social citizenship. First, it is important to note that *universal* basis is prominent in providing and supplying the welfare or social rights equally and rightly proper access to all community citizens. These could be of varying extensive degrees depending on the strong *state infrastructure* and *sustainability* of governing the economic prosperity, stable systematic of taxation, and the public opinion altogether. On the other hand, this universality entails *selective modality* also. This means that state benefits and welfare support services tend to be selective according to the income level of an individual or groups so that to be profitable only for those, who need the right provisions. While the real aim of welfare rights or provisions is to reach even the poor people, it is expected from community members to meet the certain state criteria in order to deserve right to certain welfare right guarantees and assurances provided by the state. That is, in order to benefit from certain state-guaranteed social rights, a community member, or citizen is expected to make certain contributions in return to the wider society where he/she earns his/her life. For example, this could be citizens who are working actively in the paid labor market and expected or obligated

to invest their national insurance, through which later that citizen could benefit (ibid, 2004:8). This is one way how; the contract relation or the negotiation relation is set between the state and the society members again. Social citizenship includes the *conditionality* between the state and the society, which means the rights and necessarily obligations are expected in certain conditions. This is for regulating the right redistribution of wealth and the other provisions, or providing the basic opportunities for better *life chances* to be of citizens' value, which later are expected to prosper on their opportunities that are once gained. Since the degree of 'universal' expectations on *needs* and *deserves* may vary according to the different state-society dynamics and institutional structures, there are specified several universal-to be *intermediate needs* corresponding with the basic human needs to be secured and guaranteed under the umbrella of state provisions for better living standards. To Doyal and Gough these intermediate needs are:

nutritional food and clean water; a non-hazardous work environment; appropriate healthcare; significant primary relationships; economic security; safe birth control and child rearing; protective housing; a non-hazardous physical environment; security in childhood; physical security; appropriate education (Doyal and Gough, 1991:157, 158).

Taking into consideration these intermediate universal necessities, it is evident that the satisfying conditions of citizenship providing social welfare rights to the political community members, or citizens in the wider society could be based mainly on *properties of goods and ownerships, service activities, and the agreeable relationships*. These all could result in providing freedom from worry and fulfilling the requirements or expectations of reciprocated regulatory relation between the state and its members.

Having explained what is the essential expectation relation in terms of the welfare state provisions; finally it is important still to display the limitations of social citizenship aspects specifying who actually deserve, or have a need for state provisions and on what conditions. At this point again it becomes crucial to base the questions on inclusiveness and the exclusive aspects of citizenship with its social aspects. All in all, social citizenship tries to engage citizens into equal and right treatment out of the welfare state provisional rights and to make

engaged/effective/enhanced citizenship possible. This after all aims to educate and train the citizens how to supply proper needs on deserve condition and become ‘clever and knowledgeable’ enough to open space for their life chance opportunities in the public welfare. Although this is the, the problematic about and limitations of social citizenship are still prominent, which tend to make citizenship exclusive in certain conditions. They are relevant with the *meeting the criteria* of the state instituted on a contracted relation with its members, who only then become worthy to deserve opportunities for social rights. According to the social citizenship arguments, mentioned in Dwyer (2004) and also by Marshall (1950/1992), Janoski (1998), Faulks (2000), in order to have a right through citizenship based on welfare rights, a citizen is expected to contribute into the wider society in reference to duties and obligations. This conditional expectation of social rights and social citizenship, on the other hand, are argued to be ‘conditional opportunities’ provided only when the necessary conditions are intact rather than classified as universally based rights to participate in the legislative public sphere. Yet, social rights only ease and smooth the progress of a citizen to participate properly in the wider society and actually provide to have a right to citizenship itself. Also, above-mentioned needs based on social rights or welfare provisions are argued to be divisive in practice (Faulks, 2000:106-131) as:

Social rights, as constituent in the welfare state, fail to build bridges between citizens. Instead, they create divisions between active citizens, who are able to exercise their market rights through employment, and ‘passive’ citizens who are constantly labeled as ‘undeserving’ or members of an ‘underclass’ (Faulks, 2000:117).

As a result, the expectation relation between the state and the society based on rights and the duties and responsibilities needs rethinking and reevaluation of including different individuals from various social-categorizations, who share a common interest through citizenship and form a sense of attachment and harmony under the state-guaranteed umbrella. As a final standpoint on social citizenship and the diverse people’s needs, the *im(migration) factors* also should be taken into consideration for the extension or rethinking of citizenship in terms of its social, or welfare aspects. This also express the need for “engaged citizenship” again, which aims including *all*, without excluding *some*. In this regards, the mutual expectation

prevalent between state and the political community members (or once society members on permanence) of different cultural, ethnic, class or gender divisions entails sensitive connotations, when it becomes to be questioned across borders. This necessitates rethinking of citizenship as membership and belonging on *dual* structures of *time/space* and *rights/responsibilities*, *majority/minority* in both *home/host* localities. These interrelated and even more complicated discussions will be mentioned in the next part of this chapter.

3.5 Changing Citizenship Dimensions as a consequence of Migration Factor

Up until here, general approaches to citizenship have been explained in regards with what a citizenship is about and what are the main role players *shaping* and *influencing* its content definition in a given socio-political context. It has been mentioned also how citizenship, unlike previous centuries when it first emerged as an idea, in the near past it becomes prominent to be argued how citizenship shelters both *exclusive* and *inclusive* characteristics. This conclusion actually has been reached and developed through the primary *dichotomy* of *homogeneous* nation-state formations and the *differences* of ethnic, national or cultural fundamentals inherent within a society. Thus, the primary meaning of citizenship, which is being bound to the nation-state and its territories become tendentious in its exclusionary remarks about the full legitimate political and social membership to a community at present (Jacobson, 1997:76). Since a nation-state is highly possibly to be comprised of a *multi-cultural*, or *heterogeneous socio-cultural make up* then, limitations of citizenship on behalf of citizenship expectations are argued for being some degree of inadequate and requiring an extension. What is more, within most of the multicultural society cases, the interconnected relation discussion of rights and duties and obligations indicates overall that the citizenship in its inclusiveness is still problematic, and so thus the performances of certain basic *protection* and *recognition*, or *membership* and *belonging*. In fact, mostly rights, but also responsibilities in such cases out of the influential effect of *(im)migration* turn out to be directly referring to the recognition of community members in *multicultural* societies, who are likely to participate into the wider host ‘community’ and intervene

within the social relations in harmony. This is aimed to be a desirable realization on equal and universal terms, since the culturally different immigrant community members seek to occupy a room in the ‘engaged citizenship’ looking for better living standards insufficient in the home ‘community’. In the continuation of these, citizenship matters have taken different shapes about the inclusiveness/exclusiveness of citizenship as a status, or membership in the multicultural societies and in the presence of various not only local but global domains as well.

Today, what is central still within all these discussions is the role and effects of worldwide *globalization* phenomenon, according to which every social, economic, political and cultural dynamic has become even more complicated and as if unable for *essential check* within a given nation-state boundaries. By means of developed and fostered in a way easy flow of communication networking and transportation, all associated with the globalization, have brought the *distant cultures*, nation-states, international organizations and corporations, international economy and money-capital flow *rather closer* without minding the territorial borders. These are either affirmatives or negatives of globalization epoch captured almost in all possible world localities, at which actual meanings of *time and space* has changed (*time/space compression*) and created transnational beginning within an accelerated dynamic domain.²⁸ Thus, the events underpinning in a globalize scale are discussed in a manifold, with multidimensional references, as such that the bringing together the distant entities have intensified also the interdependence amongst nation-state politics, cultures, or economies. All these entail either *impediments* or *confirmatory progress* in interacting relations within the international scale. These, and the globalization in particular will be discussed neither in theory nor in the thesis discussions but actually these will remain in notifications to see how the meaning of citizenship has been influenced and is dealt with today, depending on developments in the global era.

To Beck (2000), ‘globalization’, or the new structural modernity formations, points the trans-national beginning as a rupture with the prevalent priority

²⁸ See, Giddens (1990) in his work of the *Consequences of Modernity*.

endowments associated with/in the nation-state territories. Besides, escalation of a 'world society' has been on progress, which has been abstracted from a 'world government' (Beck cited in Morris, 2002:2; Stevenson, 2001:5). Morris also adds that the arguments, pointing out the evolvement of such a global configuration bring into question the necessity of a global negotiation between the nation-state and the international organizations besides with the trans-national social and political claims (ibid, 2002). In addition to the aftermaths of modernity in such a ruptured transformation process, the previously discussed general approaches to citizenship conception have taken different shapes and reconsiderations consequently. Citizenship and a citizen have also started to being debated with its challenging the nation-state boundaries as a consequence of (im)migration factor also prominent in the global specialty. All these have contributed to research works on the international migrations and diversified population flows and migrant residents in the host societies, which have become contemporary concerns all over the world. Actually, the issues related with the population moves have appeared even more complex to define the migrants, migration type and the consequences out of them, one as citizenship in terms of membership status, and belonging.

Unlike the evolutionary developmental chain stated formerly about the citizenship dimensions, for what Marshall was a reference as justifying his explanations on civil, political and social rights, the citizenship arguments at present are based on non-sequential designation of addressing citizenship for all. Still, the newly developed approaches to citizenship put emphasis on the extension of citizenship dimensions considering this as a necessity out of the multicultural *societal* fragments calling, or struggling for recognition. As a main constituent to all the new citizenship conceptions this time nation-state boundaries are mentioned with being enclosed not only to domestic state-society-citizenship notifications but also firmly to the surrounding international and even transnational global environment. The new conceptualizations relevant to present-day concerns try to fulfill putting into question the extension of the citizenship, also articulated with the previous theoretical groundings. Then, the mostly prominent citizenship approaches include the notions and reconsiderations of *cultural rights* (Turner, 1994), *human rights*

(Soysal, 1994), and *identity rights* (Isin and Wood, 1999). Besides, the matters with the engaged citizenship in pluralist societies is to be outstripped and solved through the promise of new optional citizenship types such as, *radical-democratic citizenship* (Mouffe), *differentiated citizenship* (Young, 1994), *global citizenship* (Falk, 1994), *ecological citizenship* (van Steenbergen, 1994), *neo-republican citizenship* (van Gunsteren, 1994), *European citizenship* (Habermas, 1994), *multicultural citizenship* (Kymlicka, 1998) and so forth.

All these new citizenship conceptualizations are articulations to extend specifically the rights in the multicultural societies as a result of the ongoing migration influxes across international borders. While this has been the case, a given nation-state is in a status to be aware of and bounded to the international global affairs in dealing with its own domestic state-society interactions today, nation-state in practice still tends to stand strongly in guarding its national sentiments to keep its own political community in cohesiveness. This is argued how in the case with the international migration trends, besides other dimensions compressed in ‘time and space’, national elements continue to be even more significant in the globalize state system while reduction of nation-state sovereignty is pinpointed in regards with citizenship approaches in reference to migration in the global era (Morris, 2002:2-3). In the similar lines, Morris (2002) develops her discussions depending on the explanations of Hall (1991) as follows:

[...] A related cultural crisis whereby-in response to the erosion of the nation-state, national economies and national cultures adopt a defensive and regressive exclusionism, most apparent in policies and attitudes concerned with immigration. Despite the supposed transcendence of the nation state, and the growth in institutions for the trans-national assertion of rights, we have seen pockets of racial violence, selective tightening of immigration controls and the demonisation of the asylum seekers (Morris, 2002:3).

Now, in order to pinpoint how the legal, political and social rights, as stated in Marshall (1950/1992) and Janoski (1998), basically are dealt with in general will be briefly explained according to Castles (2000), who makes statements about the present citizenship conditions and in relation to (im)migration factor. Firstly, all the legal rights have become primary for citizenship to negotiate the relations between an individual and the state. In fact, what has gained importance is that the legal

citizenship rights practices have been discussed both in a national and international basis in the globalize context. This is because the basic rights and freedoms are expected to be conditions promoting and recognizing the individual and groups who are suppressed and prone to discrimination in an international level at present. These could be the various ethnic minorities, immigrants of a different kind and others. This discussion is based on how the specific groups might be excluded may be not from citizenship but from the practice of basic legal rights. In that case, this is argued to violate the democratic requirements, and the state is expected to provide the protection of civil rights, which is still relevant discussion with the citizenship practices as well. Secondly, the political rights are crucial in this respect that the unavoidable globalize flow of people, capital and labor need the reconsideration of these rights in their prevalence. This is because since people may be out of their birthplaces or from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds they should be integrated into the wider society on the idea of enhanced citizenship for the proper stable relations of state-society. Otherwise, these groups may not have the right to make their social status be politically recognized. Additionally, the division of being citizen and non-citizen is relevant discussion with all these political rights. This is pinpointing the definitions of the socio-political recognition of the members in a society and their well-being altogether (Castles, 2000:24-25). It is important to state that, even the citizenship has taken its place as a term in viability; the political rights are emphasizing specifically the elections and right in voting performances showing variations in different societies. For example, specific privileged minorities were suitable to have the right to vote, later it become the reverse case that specific minority groups might be ignored in the political right. Those might be the women, asylum seekers, and the immigrants of different kinds. However, social rights are seen as not properly working in the society, since to many arguments, they do not promote equality. Thirdly, social rights are expected to be as the right to work; equality of opportunity, access to the health services, education, welfare and the other social security services in the general sense. Thus, in the competitive strategies that the capitalist system promote and maintain do not lead to complete practice of the social rights. The reason for this ignorance might be the individual owners of the means of production, who maintain the inequalities and lead to the social

stratification out of the unequal income share. This is not only local national concern but it is more than complex since it is the issue of global inclusion and the exclusion to a national or international society. The discussions on inclusion and exclusions are the problems of social security among the immigrant groups in the global arena. More specifically Castles argues that together with the post-war (1945) migration flows all over the world actually led to the non-reversible problematic developments:

The forms of societal inclusion varied considerably. In the economy, the overall pattern for most immigrant groups was of inclusion at low levels in labor markets segmented according to ethnic origins and gender. This was linked to processes of spatial segregation based both on economic factors and on racialization of immigrants. Minorities became concentrated in certain neighborhoods, marked by poor housing, social facilities and educational opportunities. Upward social mobility was very limited for the immigrant generation, though opportunities were better for their children. Many achieved better educational credential and jobs than the parent generation, but on average they remained disadvantaged compared with the majority populations (Castles, 2000:27).

Following these discussions citizenship in theory is pushed for more inclusive multicultural content at a standstill within the culturally mixed *societal* contexts then, but this theoretical intention remains weak in its universal practice. This is because as stated above, the a nation-state takes a new form to keep its national community members in closure and define its territorial and social borders through citizenship because of the international migrations and flow of different cultures and nationalities. All in all, arguments stressing the vitality of *multiculturalism* or the co-existence of different cultures in a society on equal individual or group rights basics and the recognition have gained outstanding insights. Thus, critiques on the necessity to abolish citizenship “exclusionism” because of national sentiments still persist in today’s world dynamism because of the fact that everyone is asserting to share equal rights. Importantly, immigration types and flows to different nation-state localities are argued as motor forces for multicultural societal environment. At present, confirmatory multiculturalism is illustrated with the Western countries of Austria, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden and usually is explained as:

In countries where immigration has been significant and long-lived and has attracted a critical number of persons from societies with very different cultural, religious, and social mores and traditions, one is likely to find significant pressures for *multiculturalism*, specifically multicultural public policies. Although a highly contested concept, multiculturalism generally implies the near equal coexistence of different cultures within a

given society. It inspired by the insight that different cultures represent different interpretations of the good life that are equally deserving of community-wide respect. The central political claim of multiculturalism is that minority groups can be successfully incorporated within the host society only when governments acknowledge through their public policies that the culture of each minority group has a value equal to that of the so-called majority group (Messina and Lahav, 2006:13).

In order to deal with the consequences of migration developments as some of the new citizenship approaches and concepts, *multicultural citizenship* for example, defined by Kymlicka, aims to extend the minority rights of culturally heterogeneous community members in one nation-state under equal multicultural citizenship contract. Besides all, to mention briefly as an illustrative approach in close relevance to immigration and the sheltering to various host country locations in today's world, Kymlicka's liberal approach is viable in understanding the necessity of *multicultural citizenship* in regards with respect towards cultural differences in pluralist societies. To him, citizenship should entail group rights of minorities with different cultural expectations, who are to have rights to claim for in a consensus alongside all the other cultural traits socially interactive in a society. He states that citizenship in theory and practice actually tends to ignore significant social differences and thus unequal rights and opportunities become prevalent among the members. These social differences are based, to him, on the cultural differences out of ethnic and the national ideological influence of the state. Kymlicka focuses his study on the notion of multiculturalism exemplified in the case of multicultural country of Canada (and the Quebecian minority). He also disapproves suppressive and assimilative state attitudes, which ignore the differences and the heterogeneous structure of the society and instead of creating peaceful environments; these state regulations even cause social unrest. This is because of, his claims again, that national or cultural minority groups will not eliminate their cultural sentiments they associate themselves with, even though new ones are adopted and articulated in the dynamically changing contemporary world. Thus, Kymlicka insists on a centralized state policy to provide equal and universally regular opportunities for group rights with different ethno-cultural and national backgrounds, an aim to be achieved only through a *multicultural citizenship*.

While this has been one of the general liberal affirmative tendentious approaches towards inclusive understanding of citizenship in the culturally heterogeneous societies, it is criticized also with its latent weaknesses. These are pinpoints of how actually multicultural society with its members holding multicultural citizenship, which is recognizing their cultural rights depending on the group's ethnic or national background, may cause particularistic behaviors and fragmentations among the culturally different groups. This is believed to disintegrate sovereignty of the nation-state or to motivate for discrepancies between the majority and the minority groups in societies where national ideology responses could be more apparent. All in all, it has been explained how the *multicultural citizenship* is discussed today in the part of expanding citizenship content meaning in a fruitful manner. In content multicultural citizenship of Kymlicka and the like²⁹, is expecting the best for integrating the membership of all in regards with different cultural profiles, which deserve legal, political and social recognition, representation and protection. Nonetheless, whereas the nation-state toleration degree to the *multicultural citizenship* ideal is debatable, the group or individual cultural right interests of varying degrees may also be problematic depending on this citizenship model conceptualized in consideration to today's world. As mentioned, Kymlicka has been explained only one of the examples displaying how because of the (im)migration factor societies become complex in their diversified structures with differing claims and demands. Thus, in the present day these claims and demands have been closely associated with citizenship and its contracted relation, thus involvement of the state, since its undeniable agent role in citizenship matters. Hence, putting into question the necessity to expand citizenship in meaning and include all its representative members within the domestic and the international spheres based on also socially enhanced citizenship dimensions, on behalf of which higher expectation might be undeniable to benefit from the other legal and political gained citizenship engagements.

²⁹ See also, Young (1995) with her conception of *differentiated citizenship* in (almost) similar (liberal) lines to extend the notion of citizenship, which otherwise promotes social inequalities and the group rights are presented for politics of difference. Kymlicka (1995) and Young (1989, 1990) are discussed comparatively in Faulks (2002:84-98).

3.6 Different Types and Classifications of Migration

In this thesis work, since the research question has been constructed on a research sample comprised of an immigrant group of Turks from Bulgaria, then the specified characteristics of the process of migration will deserve some additional explanation. In fact, trying to theorize wholly the ‘phenomenon’ of migration will not be possible and also is not within the scope of this thesis. However, in order to define briefly the research sample of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in northern Cyprus, simply in terms of their “push” and “pull” factors to migrate³⁰, the relevant migration concepts and discussions were significant. In order to analyze the micro experience cases of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria, then some general analysis is significant in order to see the different perspectives and dimensions on process of migration, which will help to define their migration type as well.³¹ These conceptualizations will be benefited in Chapter Five.

The migration typologies or classifications according to the nature of migration that occurs usually are determined by the interpretations of *distance*, *space*, *residence*, *duration* and *the causes* and *the activity changes* and others.³² Yet,

³⁰ Lee (1966) was the scholar who conceptualized the terms of “push” and “pull”, which are used often in the migration studies. By this type of conceptualization, he becomes able to put into question varieties of migration cases and to explain them in summary by defining them as “push” and “pull” factors to migrate. These terms simply are to define the “pushing” (negative) aspects, through which the potential migrant is likely to migrate from his place of origin, and the “pulling” (positive) factors of the anticipated place of destination. Thus, such a kind of interpretation is helpful to analyze the social, political, economic and the cultural dynamics in a given place of origin according to which the rural or urban native could possibly decide on being involved into the process of migration. The same analysis is relevant for the place of destination where the migrants decide on to migrate. Lee and his conceptual approaches to the migration could give ways to formulize systematic sociological interpretations on migration (Standing, 1984:15; Guinness, 2002:13).

³¹ In the general migration literature usually the distinction of the move is made in terms of whether it is an *internal* or *international* process. Thus, simply while the internal migration type refers to the moving within the borders of a given nation, the international one is the type, which makes people to move across the different international borders or nation-state localities. The *place of origin* and the *place of destination* will be used often throughout the thesis. These terms for instance, will be corresponding also to Bulgaria as a *home country/or state* and the northern Cyprus as a *host country/or state* of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria.

³² Migration types and categories listed in the discussions below in this part are benefited from the works on migration elaborated by Standing (in Oberai and Bilsborrow, 1984, Chp.3).

of course it is important to note that the generalizations still would be difficult in using the classifications, since the migration process is multidimensional and with varied forms of potential migrant motivational conditions (Standing, 1984:32; Guinness, 2002:4-7). Regarding this basic migration concepts they will be still useful to clarify partially the types to which the research sample of this thesis might possibly fit with its reasonable explanations behind. On the other hand, economic aspects, labor availability, (human) capital flow³³, significantly becomes primary subjects, being integrated into the migration process analysis by the Western scholars concentrating on the international migration.

There are some basic categorization types in the migration literature to define the people or communities who are to migrate in terms of their mobility conditions. The first group to define is *the permanent migrants* or *transilients*. This type of group includes the people, which are well organized to move usually annually where the labor is with varied opportunities. Also, these are migrants defined as not having actually place of origin, and they can adapt to new environments for the sake of their labor activities. On the other hand, there is the opposite group of migrant characteristics to this first group, which is *temporary migrants*, or *sojourners*. This migrant type is defined as *circular migrants* or, *short-term migrants*.³⁴ Thus, these types of migrants are defined according to their stay duration, in the place of destination, and with the intention to return back to the place of origin after enough to the migrant time. Standing (1984) depending on the above classifications and many others, argues that the stay duration is not very valid and reliable indicator to decide on whether the migrant is temporary or permanent one, but still significant for the migration studies. *Seasonal migrants* are within this category, which also

³³ To Sjaastad (1962), migration is defined as a positive social event. He puts emphasis on the costs and returns through the migration process that a migrant is to be involved in. As a result of which the potential migrant family or a person could make relevant with one another decisions for future chances of well-being, and accumulate human and cultural capital comparing to their previous conditions in the place of origin. For further discussions of the conception of “human capital flow” coined by Sjaastad, see Oberai and Bilborrow (1984:16); Massey (1999:35).

³⁴ Other concepts attributed to this classification are “transilient migrants” (Richmond, 1969), “turnover migrants” (Bose, 1980), “pendular migrants” (Skeldon, 1977), “target migrants”, and for many others see, Standing (1984).

organize their migration according to the work conditions and the opportunities where appropriate. Another group is the *long-term migrants*, which are important type of migrants who are moving out of their place of origin and shifting their social life wholly, at which all the economic and the cultural settings are previously performed in the place of origin before migration. After all, Standing (1984) defines this migrant type as important, since the long-term migrants are regarded as the “real” migrant types in migration analyses. This is because the duration of stay is crucial with this type of migrant that extends in a prolonged time period. Also, this type of migrants is defined within the terms of “semi-permanence” or “quasi-permanence” migration process.³⁵

The other basic classification in the migration studies, which is more recent to the migration cases in the post-war period prominent with the ethnic clashes, is *voluntary* or *involuntary migration* type of origin. This is one of the often-used types of migration argument, which is to decide on whether the nature of migration is willingly conducted, *forced* or *impelled*. Yet, it is difficult to define this since; the nature of migration contains various aspects of reluctance because leaving the place of origin is usually motivated by the impelled or forced conditions. Hence, it is possible to underlay the difference, that is the voluntary migrants are those who decide either to migrate on their own free will, or not, and have the opportunity to

³⁵ For further binary opposite classifications mentioned in the migration literature, see Standing (1984). Still, significant to mention in the sake of this thesis, some of them are, a) *the active* and *passive migrants*, meaningful definitions for the place of destination. These concepts are about specification of the first coming migrants to a given place of destination, who are the active migrants. This type of migrants become the new comers and first to investigate the place of destination environment and thus to adapt accordingly. On the contrary the passive migrants are the type, which are taking decision to migrate depending on the first-hand detailed information of the active migrants. It is important also to define the migrant according to the (social) activity space as what it was before migration and whether it changed or maintained after the migration process, and this is either b) *the innovative* and *the defensive migrants*. After migration while the innovative migrants are those who change their entire social everyday life and the economic means, even their social status, the defensive migrants tend to maintain their former social routine and the status as what it was in the place of origin. The defensive migrants also are to re-gain the habitual way of life may be lost in the place of origin and trying to supply it in the place of destination. It is worthy to comprehend in migration analyses the matter of who are c) *the reversible* or *non-reversible migrant* types. Both types are concentrated on the rural migrants who own land or not in their rural place of origin or in another place where this type of migrants might have plans to settle later. Thus, the reversible are those who might own land or such non-movable properties in places where they can arrange their return back from the migration place of destination, where they are to move for improving their economic conditions. The non-reversible migrants are those who have no such properties to make them return back from the places of destination.

organize the move in a systematic preparation. On the contrary, the involuntary migrants have no any option to decide on migration, because their move is forced by ecological, social, economic or political sanctions of persecution. Also, the involuntary migrants are analyzed according to their intent to migrate, that is if it is impelled or forced and according to which conditions. Impelled migration and migrants involved within are the people who have the will to make choices whether to move or not, and the term of “impelled” is slighter than being “forced” to move under certain suppressed circumstances. In these cases the issues of being forced to migrate integrate some involuntary migrant types, which are falling in this category. This are *allocates*, *indentured labor*, and *refugees*, who in most instances have no any decision-maker position in arranging the move, the type of it and its destination. Refugees are often stated type of forced migration and it is subdivided into specific categories. In its general sense, refugees are migrants who become forced to leave their place of origin or home country due to persecution or the terror of possible persecution, be it ethnical/political, fear of war, or ecological natural disasters. Thus, Standing believes that this refugee definition is to be clarified in some respects that are to him there are *political refugees*, *displaced persons*, *socially displaced* and *ecologically displaced* persons. Besides, the displacement duration of, or involvement within the forced migration of refugees is major detail to take into accounts. This analysis is meaningful one for the refugee or forced migrants in interpreting their perceptions of and the “free will” to decide in the course of time on whether they are temporary migrants, permanent migrants, or irreversible ones after their forced migration experience (Standing, 1984:42-45; Messina and Lahav, 2006:9-11).

There are supplementary to above definitions basic theories of migration explaining it as a social phenomenon composed of various aspects initiating the migration process. These various aspects could be age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, and economic factors such as income, occupation, and desire for high/better living standards, social-psychological factors, political persecution and so forth. The primary theoretical groundings are based actually on the economics and its positive and necessary developmental relation out of a migration. It is discussed in

the way that the migrants supply the “duality” of economic development and improving conditions through the labor transference and thus, the income or wage balances by moving from rural to the urban settings.³⁶ These are the affirmative liberal capitalist aspects of the analysis of specific rural to urban, or international global migrations emphasizing that the free flow of people moves are sustaining the equality between the two origin and destination residence places. These theories will not be explained but basic migration types and categories alternately have been mentioned so far and decided to be enough to remind the nature of migration and the possible conceptual categorization.

The type of analysis about (affirmative) liberal capitalist rudiments was evident in the post-war periods during 1950's and 1960's, however in the course of time this analysis when interpreted in an international level it was not favorable economically, socially and politically as it was perceived. Actually, in recent migration arguments the subordination of the immigrants in their new environments is heavily focused on (Massey, 1999:37:45). To Collinson (1994), actually it is agreeable that there are different motivations initiating the migration moves, and to her, the migration type contain prominent socio-political and economic combinations of factors such as, *strongly political and voluntary*, *strongly political and involuntary*, *strongly economic and voluntary* and finally *strongly economic and involuntary* (cited in Messina and Lahav, 2006:11). In this respect the citizenship approaches and rights were connected with the migration factor and the immigrant communities. Indeed, theoretical arguments, which have been discussed, are to combine questioning the proper immigrant citizenship engagements and whether they are inclusive or exclusive in practice considering the migration experiences. After all, identity based theoretical discussions will be included in the next part in relation with citizenship while considering migration factor as well.

³⁶ For such migration example discussions, see Todaro (1969, 1976), Lewis (1954), Ranis and Fei (1961), (Sjaastad, 1962), (Borjas, 1989, 1990) who are cited as some of the well-known neoclassical works to outline the economic model of development under the head of migration issue, which of all also cited and explained in Oberai and Bilsborrow (1984:14-19) and Massey (1999:34-52).

3.7 Citizenship and Identity Perceptions as a result of Migration

Having explained all the relevant basic aspects in reference to the notions of citizenship in terms of community membership, it is also inevitable to underpin the relationship between the *citizenship* and the *identity*. This part will include a theoretical examination of how citizenship and identity interchangeably are prone to reshape and redefine their formations and maintenances. Of course, these will be taken into consideration in regards with the local and the global scale influences and the (im)migration factor as the previous citizenship explanations.

First of all, putting aside the conception of citizenship as it has been mentioned in variform relational structures in this theory chapter, it is crucial to understand identity conceptions now and its relation with citizenship. Theories and different approaches focused on the identity constructions/formations/maintenances are all questions of different fields of mainly philosophy, sociology, psychology, politics, cultural studies, social anthropology the others. In fact, identity is a new conception in the sense that it has gained apparent significance as a social interpretation, to some, because of modernity (Bauman, 1996). Since it is a social interpretation, it is important to start with identifying the *social identity*. Social identity according to Jenkins (2004) is relevant with the ways in which individuals and collectivities comprised of individuals distinguish themselves according to the relationships of *similarities* and *differences*, which are accepted as dynamic principles of identity, which comprise the heart of social life. Also, social identity is an understanding and identifying of ‘who we are’ and ‘who are the other’ people, process which takes place reversibly as well. To him, it is impossible for human beings to exist in the social relations without the, still perplexed, status of identity:

Levels of concern about identity may wax and wane, but, whether individually or collectively, we can't live routine lives as humans without identification, without knowing-and sometimes puzzling about-who we are and who others are. This is true no matter where we are, or what the local way of life or language. Without repertoires of identification we would not be able to relate to each other meaningfully or consistently. We would not have that vital sense of who's who and what's what. Without identity there could be no human world (Jenkins, 2004:7).

The priority of identity being prevalent by no means is because even to identify ourselves or the others through the similarity and differences, identity gives the opportunity to define basic human traits. This is about to decide whether someone is male or female, younger or elder, liberal or conservative, Leftist or Rightist, Christian or Muslim and the other identity traits for, nationality (descent origins) based ones, identifying where someone comes from. All these could be matched differently in varying *social relational forms* and *interactions of duality of negotiations* rightly because of either similarities or differences that a certain identity could entail. As a result, social identity is referring to *social categorization*, at which *self-categorization* takes place. Social categorization of individuals into differentiated groupings possibly may generate inter-group behavior in which likeness of *in-group members* is to be associated with acts of kindness in a process where *out-group members* are to be related with unkindness. This could be a socio-psychological way of look to social identity also as how group members tend to self-categorize themselves according to their varying income levels or stratified status positions out of the consciousness about the high or low status which define the self-categorization in result. Thus, Turner makes an interpretation of self-categorization, social identity, self-identification according to in/out group identification, which could be prevalent from the social identities' point of view and their locations of stand in the wider social structure as:

[...] Depending on whether they perceived group boundaries as permeable or impermeable and status relationships as secure or insecure (stable and legitimate or unstable and illegitimate), low status group members might adopt a strategy of upward individual mobility or social creativity or a strategy of collective, ethnocentric, social competition. Similarly, high status group members might be highly discriminatory and ethnocentric under conditions where they saw their legitimate superiority as threatened by the low status group, but not where they perceived their superiority as illegitimate. Groups would adopt quite different strategies to achieve positive social identity (and ingroup bias or 'social competition' is only one of these strategies) as a function of an interaction between their status positions (high or low) their beliefs about the nature of group boundaries, the intensity of ingroup identification and their collective ideologies and shared beliefs about the nature of the social system and intergroup differences of status, power and wealth (Turner, 1999:8).

Having explained in general the social identity unavoidable prevalence in the wider society, now it is important to bring into question several integral notions to identity, which will make sense and give meaning to its formation and upholding its continuation. It has been mentioned that social identification out of the social categorization in terms of gender, class, distinction in life styles, urban segregation or other social distinctions take place as primarily obvious social identity forms in the *everyday life* practices where the social relations as insider/outsider are prevalent again. In these terms it will be evident also to grasp how identity may overlap with various identification forms and lead to more complex understandings to social relations and interactions.

For this, as it has been the aim of this chapter part to extend the identity comprehension, then it is important particularly to add basic theoretical discussions aiming to incorporate the closely relevant conceptions, which lead to other forms of identity and maintenance. It is, then, *culture* to incorporate with the relevant identity approaches. This is interdependent relational bound existing between identity and culture, which identifies *individuals* in *collectives* to rely apparently on a wider community they associate themselves with. Actions of individuals or groups thus, create their culture and the various cultural behavioral formations that they tend to behave and identify themselves accordingly around community sentiments in cohesiveness. Such experiences among individuals or groups are defined through the ongoing everyday life social relations and the interactions in terms of *commonalities* of cultural traits such as folklores of art and music, dressing styles, religious denomination, norms, beliefs, symbols, myths, customs and so forth. According to these, awareness and acts of defining in-group cultural identity behaviors and to differentiate the out-group ones in a given social relation or interaction become prevalent. In the identity studies, these ways of attitudes and behaviors based on particular contextual differences (exteriors) and similarities (interiors) are also defining the dichotomies of “us/them”, “we-ness/the others-ness”, “there/here” etc. Thus, culture is tightly commonly associated with a *community*³⁷ or group that is,

³⁷ To Jenkins, *community* is as in the following statements mentioned by him; “‘Community’ called up an imagined past in which horizons were local, the meaning of life was relatively consensual,

collectivities (having something in common) comprised of many individuals. To Nagel, this happens within certain cause of purposeful relations, in the way that:

Groups construct their cultures in many ways which involve mainly the *reconstruction* of historical culture, and the *construction* of new culture. Cultural reconstruction techniques include revivals and restorations of historical cultural practices and institutions; new cultural constructions include revisions of current culture and innovations-the creation of new cultural forms. Cultural construction and reconstruction are ongoing group tasks in which new and renovated cultural symbols, activities, and materials are continually being added to and removed from existing cultural repertoires (1994:162).

According to the consequent arguments of *cultural construction*, it is important to pinpoint that these are argued to be ‘symbolic constructions of community’³⁸, thus identity formations. This is the approach determined by Cohen (1985), who, to Jenkins, tries to explain how individuals construct actually their symbolic demarcations, which in returns form and maintain agreeable judgments of self-identifications and their community members alike (Cohen cited in Jenkins, 2004:110-111; Nagel, 1994:163). This also, fosters the identity sentiments of *belongingness* in a specified locality, space, or situational background of relationships and interactions shared in commonality with each other. This mode of acknowledging, “recognition of a ‘sense of us’ and community stems from the awareness that things are done differently *there*, and the sense of threat that poses for how things are done *here*”(Jenkins, 2004:111).

cooperation prevailed, and everybody knew everyone else and ‘knew their place’; it does not belong to intellectuals; it is a powerful everyday notion in terms of which people organize their lives and understand the places and settlements in which they live and the quality of their relationships; along with the idioms of kinship, friendship, ethnicity and faith, community is one way of talking about the everyday reality that the human world is, collectively, more than the sum of its parts” (Jenkins, 2004:109).

³⁸ Additional remarks could be made about the *cultural construction of community* by the conceptions of ‘imagined communities’ by Anderson (1991) in regards with *nation* that it is, to him, “an *imagined* political *community* and imagined as both inherently *limited* and *sovereign*” and also the ‘invention of tradition’ by Hobsbawm (1983). These include arguments on similar lines with the constructed/imagined/formed/created nature of identity and its membership to a community. Conversely, these authors direct their discussions on creating, or constructing culture on nationhood also, which is pinpointed by Nagel (1994) while summarizing three main deliberately functioning points out of Hobsbawm’s (1983:3) discussions on ‘inventing tradition’, and these are; a) to establish or symbolize social cohesion or group membership, b) to establish or legitimize institutions, status, and authority relations, and c) to socialize or inculcate beliefs, values, or behaviors (Hobsbawm cited in Nagel, 1994:163).

It is important to mention about *space* and *time* duality, through which identity attaches exceptional meanings of its maintenance besides taking different shapes also. This duality is relevant in the continuation of the previous identity arguments, which gives a general display of how social relations and interactions are defining identity by references to a particular time and attachments to a space, or locality. Conceptions of time and space are both generating the identity perceptions and expressions through making collectivities to locate their identities within certain territories and regions without being in a particular time and space actually. Even so, collective identities are argued to tend to self-identifying upon *imaginary* and *mythical* constructions on behalf of lived or to be lived social relational experiences in certain points of time and space. Example for such tendentious identifications could be the diaspora communities that associate themselves with a home space, localities, or geographical territory based on descent background profiles making them generate ‘mythical’ future expectations and perceptions to return back to.³⁹ This is defined as such by Jenkins (2004):

Apart from the inexorable *passage of time* during interaction, a sense of time is inherent within identification because of the *continuity* which, even if only logically, is entailed in a claim to, or an attribution of, identity. Continuity posits a meaningful past and a possible future, and, particularly with respect to identification, is part of the sense of order and predictability upon which the human world depends. The past is a particularly important resource upon which to draw in interpreting the here and now and forecasting the future. Individually, ‘the past’ is memory; collectively, it is history (although individuals do have histories and it isn’t absurd to talk about collective memory, even if it might be a potential reification). Neither, however, is necessarily ‘real’: both are human construct and both are massively implicated in identification (Jenkins, 2004:26).

Having explained integral formations to identity such as socially constructed identity, the cultural construction of community, or the symbolic constructions and the identity (associated with a community) bounded to a time and space duality, these may highlight three main notifications posed by Jenkins and developed by Cohen’s arguments. The three notifications are as follows; “a) symbols generate a sense of shared belonging, b) ‘community’ is itself a symbolic construct upon which people draw, rhetorically and strategically, c) community membership means sharing

³⁹ For further discussions on myths of homeland, returning back to and the diaspora communities, see Safran (1991).

with other community members a similar ‘sense of things’, participation in a common symbolic domain” (ibid). Taking into consideration these identity identifiable aspects of interconnected relations of community or culture constructions, then (symbolic belonging or not) all these are notions of identity in reference to being a part or member of a community with its *defined borders*.

Actually, it is at these boundaries where the social relations or the interactions take place and the differences or similarities are pinpointed and the sense of belonging become both redefined and reaffirmed in the various social settings. The social boundary terms is coined by Barth (1969), who actually defines them according to ethnic groups and their ethnic boundary formations and their continuation. To him, the actual differentiation in the wider society is between the ethnic groups, who at the boundaries tend to define themselves on similarities and differences whenever interaction is prevalent on the ethnically based categories. The issue of *ethnicity*⁴⁰ is also closely appropriate with identity formations and the

⁴⁰ For further elaborate and diversified ethnicity based discussions, it is important to mention about several scholars studying *ethnicity* and *ethnic group* formation, whose articles with argumentations are edited in Hutchinson and Smith (1996). For example, to Manning Nash ethnicity is composed of some elements, that is while talking about ethnicity and the relevant subjects we should note the *ethnic markers* of a group in order to call it actually to be ethnically different from other groups. What makes certain people exist within unitary groups and be ethnic, according to Nash is *common kinship*, that is the biological attachment among group members which make them come about of a similar ancestors. Another marker that Nash points out, which draws the ethnic boundary lines to differentiate groups from one another, is *commensality*, meaning the intimate relation among group members which keep them live in cohesion and solidarity due to commonality of customs and traditions. And finally the *religious sentiments* shared in a similar manner by the group members are also important which also make them ethnically different. Another scholar is Thomas H. Eriksen, who includes many other markers that are secondary in importance which define a group as an ethnically different such as *commonality in language, dressing, and historical past*. All these, to him, indicates the behaviors of groups as different and giving rise to the ethnic group formations as a result of such core ethnic markers. To Eriksen “ethnicity refers to the relationships between groups whose members consider themselves distinctive and these groups may be ranked hierarchically within a society”. In his arguments he wants to emphasize the relationship between the ethnicity and the social class, as people who belong to certain ethnic group also may belong to certain social classes. Yet, his discussion pinpoints the *domination* and the *subordination* of certain groups within a society, which is not directly relevant with the social stratification of income related class differentiations. Richard Schermerhorn, on the other hand, is a scholar, who focuses his arguments on ethnic membership within *hierarchies* in the society. To him, there exist two main (ethnically definable) groups in the society: the *majority* and *minority* groups in reference to inequalities, which the minority group faces under the domination of the majority group. The majority group to him is a ‘dominant group’ as “collectivity within society which has pre-eminent authority to function both as guardians and sustainers of the controlling value system and as prime allocators of rewards in the society”. According to this definition, Schermerhorn gives examples of a dominant group to be a restricted

relevant discussions but its broadening is out of scope of this thesis discussions. However, the study of Barth comprises underpinning analysis for the socially constructed boundaries among or between the ethnically defined groups and identities. Then to mention briefly in the light of his arguments, *ethnic group*⁴¹ as a form of social organization, to Barth, is comprised of people in groups, who are; “a) largely biologically self-perpetuating, b) shares fundamental cultural values, realized in overt unity in cultural forms, c) makes up a field of communication and interaction, d) has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order” (Barth, 1969:11). Another central standpoint of his discussions is that the ethnic boundaries he defines may be *changeable*, and the cultural features of the ethnic group members similarly may be *transformable*, and the organizational form of the group accordingly may be variable. However, all these, to Barth, actually indicate the end result of differentiated relations between members of a similar ethnic group and the outsider, others or strangers and the persistent in a way adjustable boundary formation in terms of changing cultural forms and contents. Additionally, the arguments of Barth are paid attention by the scholars studying ethnicity as an instrumental concept, meaning that the ethnic boundaries and the transformable cultural forms and contents depend on the changing circumstances of the social relations, but particularly political claims, responses and interests. To put it differently, to Vermeulen and Govers, “ethnicity is a product of the interaction between groups, not of isolation, and the *instrumentalism* is used to indicate a conception of ethnicity that emphasizes its instrumental role in politics and that conceives of ethnic groups as interest groups” (cited in Vermeulen and Govers, 1997:23).

elite, ruling government in the decision making process, a larger ethnic group, political parties in power and simply majority in a society. Reversibly, what turns out to be the minority group is the smaller in *size* group and which lack the power in the decision-making process or simply lack the power that the dominant group owns in the society.

⁴¹ According to the primordial scholar Anthony Smith there are six items inherent in the ethnic category formation and maintenance. He defines them as; a collective name, a common myth of descent, a shared history, a distinctive shared culture, which is comprising language and/or religion and/or institutions and/or other cultural features, an association with a specific territory and finally a sense of ethnic solidarity (cited in Fowkes, 2002).

3.8 Conclusion

Theoretical analysis has been kept in connection with the relevant thesis discussions established particular to citizenship and the relevant topics in general. To remind briefly again, the in-depth interview conduct has been comprised of relevant with one another socially oriented citizenship themes divided into two broad headings. These have been the socio-economic conditions and the socio-cultural relations aiming to explain comparatively the citizenship practices among the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in northern Cyprus. For this, Chapter Six and Chapter Seven will include the above themes and the theoretically relevant citizenship discussions.

It is important to state that citizenship includes the limitations in its analysis, whereby consenting/restricting the study on individuals or communities of mainly those who are already members necessarily of a state. This means that non-citizens are usually undermined in this analysis of recognition and the participation in the wider society. Thus, the citizenship has permitted possible discussions primarily in relevance with the presence of state and the citizenship conception bounded to it with its constitutional functionality. However, regarding the research group of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing in northern Cyprus and the data gained as a result of the conducted research, the thesis main discussions are focused heavily on understanding social aspects of citizenship experiences. Indeed, the in-depth interviews of historical-migratory life analysis will cover different types of social citizenship and the relevant discussions of its inclusiveness and exclusiveness on what respects.

One of the end results of this theory chapter for the sake of this thesis discussion is the expectation to grasp how citizenship becomes more complex in the inter-national, or inter-cultural or global context now as a result of migration processes, the mobility of citizen people and other relevant aspects. For this, the appropriate arguments have been integrated, which still partially aim to clarify citizenship practices in relevance with the research data.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF SOCIO-POLITICAL CULTURE AND CITIZENSHIP STATUS OF TURKS IN BULGARIA

4.1 Introduction

It is worth to explain the Turks and to grasp their status in their places of origin in Bulgaria. The main purpose of this thesis analysis will make it clear to interpret the dynamics of social citizenship as a consequence of migration among immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in the northern Cyprus. The Ottoman dominance in the Balkans and the interwar period will be cut short, and the aim in this chapter will be to focus on the post-war period after 1945. This is because of the explicit state-society relations in Bulgaria, which will be in relevance with this thesis to explain the status of Turks in Bulgaria. The period after 1945 is prominent with its Communist political regime culture, which was prevalent in Bulgaria, will be explained in terms of politics and its impact on the social environment. After that specifically the status of Turks and will be dealt with, while dividing chronologically into two separate headings. These headings will be accounts of state-society relations in reference to specific examples of the negative and positive social rights of Turks in Bulgaria before and after 1990's. The last heading of this chapter aimed to integrate different approaches to the transformation process in terms of political, social and economic aspects in the case with the status of countries like Bulgaria. This chapter finally will be beneficial to interpret the citizenship rights in Bulgaria, and combine the discussions with the in-depth interviews as well.

4.2 The Presence of Turks in Bulgaria and their Socio-Demographic Characteristics

The Bulgarian state and the Balkans in general were conquered by the Ottoman Empire during the 14th century and thus, Bulgaria was under the Ottoman rule until 1878. During this period the intense Turkish population inhabited different regions in the Balkans and also Bulgaria. Three main groups of people from Turkish

origin settled in the Bulgarian lands. They were a Turkomen group from Saruhan, refugee Crimean Tatars, and the Anatolian people. The Turkish settlement in Bulgaria started in the late 13th century and continued until the 16th century and the Turkish population gradually increased out of the persisting immigrations from Anatolia. This Turkish population is also from a Muslim religious background. The Muslim Turkish population increase was maintained in a parallel way with the Bulgarian Orthodox Christian population during the Ottoman occupation in Bulgaria as well. For this reason the Turkish Muslim population caused a prominent ethno-religious culture in Bulgaria and in the Balkans as well (Turan, 1998; Eminov, 2000:130-131; Zhelyazkova, 2001:284).

Since the period of Bulgarian independence in 1907 until 1944 when the Communist political regime was introduced, there were no outstanding tensions between Bulgarians and Turks, or between Christians and Muslims. To Zhelyazkova, Balkan scholars show the tendency to adopt subjective groundings to explain and misinterpret the prevalence of Islam in the Balkans, and the Turkish colonization. In fact, Muslim population inhabiting different regions in Bulgaria or in the Balkans in general should not be considered as “alien” but native in the regions where they have been living for generations. Religious tradition of Islam adopted by Turks in Bulgaria was as a result of the Ottoman conquest in the Balkans and the various migration flows of Muslims during this period. She states that this religious cultural marker of Muslim Turks was mostly persistent in accord with the other native population religious traditions as well. Actually, she refers to the general agreeable ethno-cultural relations among Bulgarians, Turks, Gypsies, Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Walachians and the other remaining communities within the Bulgarian territories. To her this was because;

Turks in Bulgaria, and to a lesser extent other representatives of the Bulgarian Muslim community, are bearers of a centuries-old tradition which incorporates distant and mere recent chronological and geographical layers. Today they see themselves as European Muslims, alien to religious fanaticism. They respect their traditional culture, and their distinct heritage of ritual and worship. Regrettably, national policy towards them over the last 120 years has been subject to extreme swings. These have led to moments of tension and to raptures in Bulgarian inter-religious and inter-ethnic relations (Zhelyazkova, 2001:285-286).

Despite the free and easy presence of the Muslim Turkish population in Bulgaria since centuries onward, it was exposed to gradual emigration flows from Bulgaria to Turkey during different historical periods and because of different motivation factors. Migration patterns among Muslim Turkish population led either to their increase or decrease in the total population share of Bulgaria. Yet, it is important to mention about the Turkish population locations after the independence of Bulgaria as an autonomous province within the Ottoman Empire guaranteed by the Congress of Berlin in 1878.

It is stated that since the Ottoman occupation in the Balkans or particularly in Bulgaria the Muslim Turkish population occupied usually the urban environments. Muslim Turks tended to crowd the administrative and bureaucratic job positions in the urban areas, and the Christian population on the contrary tended to reside in the urban periphery settlements. It was estimated that in 1887 the Turks in Bulgaria were 20%. Also, right before the emergence of Bulgaria, as we know it today as an independent sovereign state established in 1908, the Turkish population in 1905 became 12%. There was limited regular census data information on the Muslim Turks in Bulgaria, but Eminov states that it decreased gradually because of the emigration flows to Turkey. It decreased and fell below %10 in 1934, and only between the 1960's and 1970's the Turkish Muslim population started to increase again. According to Eminov, this increase caused the state authorities to take precautions towards Muslim Turkish minorities in Bulgaria, which as a result led to ethno-cultural and religious tensions between Orthodox Christians Bulgarians and Muslim Turks. These precautions were the official assimilation policies towards Muslim Turks, which were apparent and suppressive between the periods of 1984-1989. The aim of the Bulgarian state then, which was ruled by the Communist regime, was to create a single homogeneous Bulgarian nation-state (Eminov, 2000:130, 139).

Assimilation policies towards Turks in Bulgaria were relevant with the demographic estimation indeed. Because of the fact that higher Turkish population

rates in Bulgaria were announced with some negative inclinations as if threatening the Bulgarian national sentiments, before the big emigration flow in 1989 to Turkey rarely census research were done or reported in Bulgaria. This was also because not to figure out the presence of the Muslim Turks living as ethnically distinctive community in Bulgaria. This also could be verification of why Bulgarian policies were oriented towards assimilating the Turks and pronouncing the assumptions that they were threatening the Bulgarian country. Due to the higher Muslim Turkish rates, Bulgaria before focused on systematic assimilation state policies followed by a policy to send Turks to Turkey under different agreements with Turkey between 1878 end the end of 1960's. These were purposeful implementations to balance the Muslim Turkish and the Orthodox Christian Bulgarians. In addition, in the beginning of 1980's Bulgaria emerged to be the country with the minimum rate of birth comparing to the other remaining countries under Communist rule. Turks on the other hand, had steady growing birth rates when compared to the Bulgarians. That is why there was a fear of growing number of Turks in Bulgaria, and this was announced even publicly that they could outnumber the Bulgarians and invade Bulgaria. These were the Bulgarian politics, which were manipulating the demographics through which the hostility was tended to being spread against Turks, and the assimilation campaigns to being achieved (Vasileva, 1992:344, 346).

As a result of the assimilation suppressive campaigns towards Turks in Bulgaria, the disregard of the basic human rights and the social unrest, Communist Party state officials announced the free out-migration in the name of Muslim Turks. In this way, the big emigration flow was realized in 1989, which led 369.839 Muslim Turks to "escape" across Bulgarian border. This escape was directed mostly to Turkey, and happened in the way that Turks had to sell or leave their unmovable property and could only take their movable possessions with them. To Vasileva;

[...] we have to bear in mind that in terms of violence caused by violence (like persecution due to religious, languages and other differences specifying an ethnic group), the migration of 1989 seems to be a typical case of political migration. It follows that in such a case the emigrant Turks should be determined as refugees and asylum seekers (Vasileva, 1992:347).

After the fall of Communist regime and the Communist Party rule in 1989, one of the important (often cited) census reports about the Muslim Turkish population was the 1992 census report. It indicated that the Muslim Turkish population was living in the Northeastern and the Southeastern regions in Bulgaria. One of the Southeastern districts in Bulgaria, which is Kırcaali (Kurdzhali), was estimated with the most intense living Muslim Turkish population as %65.7, while in the Northeastern district it was Razgrad (Razgrad) with %47.4. The other districts in Bulgaria with their Muslim Turkish population percentages were as follows; %33.5 in Silistre (Silistra), %32.8 in Eski Cuma (Turgovishte), %30.3 in Sumnu (Shumen), %14.7 in Hacıoğlu Pazarcık (Dobrich), %13.8 in Burgaz (Burgas), %13.0 in Rusçuk (Ruse), %11.4 in Hasköy (Haskovo), and %11.3 in Cuma-i Bala (Blagoevgrad). However, it is important to note that in the same census report the majority of the Muslim Turkish population was residing in the rural areas, unlike their occupying areas during Ottoman domination, which is the case still even today. According to the 1992 census report, the population estimation above should be considered that the %68.5 of the Muslim Turkish community was living in the rural areas in villages and only %31.5 in the urban environments (Eminov, 2000:139; Dayıoğlu, 2002:23, Vasileva, 1992:344).

This part has been a general overview about the presence of Turks in Bulgaria, and their socio-demographic conditions. As it is obvious the demographic estimation has shown that the Turks have had various migration motivations to emigrate from Bulgaria. The politics especially after 1944 when the Communist regime was established influenced Muslim Turkish population patterns, which were under the direct considerations. Now, the reasons behind official assimilation campaigns will be explained in detail, and the situation of Turks will be pinpointed. This will be mostly in terms of highlighting the status of political and legal status of Turks in Bulgaria.

4.3 The Socio-Political Culture and the Status of Turks in Bulgaria before 1990's

Bulgaria after its independence as a sovereign state started to direct a political action towards ensuring the creation of a territorially, culturally and linguistically unified nation. The major great power behind the national revival of Bulgaria was the Soviet Union. In fact, the Communist state regime was prominent in Bulgaria since 1945 as having close relations in alliance with the Soviet Union. This was mostly because the Soviet Union after defeating the Nazi-Germany became the dominant power in the Balkan regions and the East Central Europe. In the case of Bulgaria, it had close relations with the Soviet Union and the Red Army, even as such that the Soviet state was allowed by and large with its intervention in the interior political and economic affairs of Bulgaria. This, on the other hand, inconvenienced the foreign relations with Bulgaria and the agreements signed among the Western allies (Crampton, 2002).

Bulgaria was only one of the Balkan region countries that was once under the direct influence of the Soviet legacy, but known to be the most loyal to the Soviet Union between 1944 and 1989. The intervention of Soviet Union into the internal affairs of Bulgaria was not to be undermined in this sense. This led to the development of close relations between the socialist leaders under the communist regime in Bulgaria and the Soviet Union. Coming to the Stalinist period of 1948-54, it is prominently observed that politics of Bulgaria gained an understanding of being the closest to the Soviet ideologies. This could be an inference for how various reforms had developed in Bulgaria, following the Soviet pattern, and even similar ones that of the *sovietization* policies prominent until the end of 1980's (Crampton, 2002; Agh, 1998:180, Giatzidis, 2002:18).

The period right after the 9 September Coup in 1944, the dominant Communist Party rule and leaders brought rigid interventions to remove the oppositions in all areas and eliminate their power in the urban and rural regions. Various were the restrictions during the pre-elections in 1945, at which Communist

Party state rule representatives showed initials of their having no any tolerance towards the remaining political parties and their supporters. For example, the party of agrarians, who aimed to develop and improve new conditions in the rural areas, resulted in sort of disturbing the trust of minorities due to continuous decrease in living standards. In the elections in 1945, the Communist leaders showed tendencies in manipulating the votes as undermining the votes coming from the rural areas and giving no voice to the oppositions of agrarians. It was how the Communist party leaders strategically developed oppositions and restrictions against the Peasants Party, or agrarians and the social democrats. Restrictions were brought and implemented in the press as banning the newspapers of the opposition parties or using them as publishing tendentious news to restrict the supports towards agrarians or the other oppositional political parties. This was interpreted as threatening the security of the ethno-culturally distinct communities as well. As a result of all these, the social unrest became inevitable in the post-war Bulgaria in terms of social, political and economic bases that effected the whole population including the Bulgarians, Muslim Turks and the others. All the prevalent restrictions made by the Communist Party were in the name of being only the mere governing body as a decision maker in the parliament. Owing to the Communist regime type of rule, the Bulgarian nation-state building process was associated as fascist political rule because there was rigid and harsh administration dominating in the society, and particularly on the minority groups (Crampton, 2002; Dayıođlu, 2002:22).

During one party communist rule, the preliminary regulations were based on the area of economics, aiming to improve the backwardness in the living standards in Bulgaria, which also directly affected the Muslim Turks. In 1947 out of all these the Bulgarian government adopted the public ownership in all areas. This means that many private enterprises were to be collected under the government ownership. The collectivization of agriculture and the measures on driving the peasants into collectives was prominent attempt to take under control the Muslim Turks. This led to the formation of homogeneous rural population that was active in the workforce and was comprised of peasant collectives belonging to the government. This development had direct (purposeful) impact in the rural areas and the Turkish

minorities, since they comprised the majority in the rural areas in Bulgaria. The actual intention of collectivization in rural areas was also to hold the private land ownerships of the peasants. Land cultivation for the government resulted in leaving the peasants, and here again referring to mostly the Muslim Turkish community, without land. This was interpreted as a systematic reformation in order to make the rural population leave the village settings and move to the urban areas. This was the main modernization objective of the first five-year plan implemented in 1949 by the Communist Party rule to create the urban proletariat, which was of great significance in creating and diversifying new workforce spaces in the newly developing industrial sector. Nonetheless, this expected objective as urbanization and industrialization could not be fully established because of the inadequacy of proper social and economic infrastructure (Crampton, 2002; Anagnostou, 2005:94).

The developments, which occurred during 1940, are led to many contradictions encountered by the peasants, who were mainly the Muslim Turks. This was apparent with examples of Kircaali (southeastern region) and Razgrad (northeastern Dobrudja region) districts in Bulgaria. Anagnostou, investigating these example areas in Bulgaria, states that the state regulations implemented in the name of modernization had direct impact on the rural population comprised of Muslim Turks. The collectivization of agriculture development program bounded the already residing Turkish population into the rural areas (in the villages, and smaller municipalities) of highly intensive labor mainly in terms of farming, gardening, and stockbreeding. Besides the occupations the service sector in the villages, the highly motivated labor was bound to agriculture and was still well paid in order to impress the rural population. While this was the case, unlike Muslim Turks, Bulgarians tended to inhabit central municipalities, big city districts and engaged in industry, manufacturing, and administrative positions. This as a result created palpable gaps in the ethnic regional differences and inequalities in terms of economic well-being, occupation choice and education, living standards, and the property ownership (Anagnostou, 2005:95).

It was mentioned in the previous discussions that the relationship between the demographics and the political actions towards Muslim Turks in Bulgaria caused mass emigration flows to Turkey in different time periods. In addition to this, according to Crampton, one of the political incentives in the very beginning of Communist regime rule was the collectivization reform in the rural areas which caused mass migration of Turkish minorities to leave Bulgaria and immigrate to Turkey as well. In this period in 1950-51 about 162.000 Turks emigrate from Bulgaria to Turkey. This also put the Turkish government in a difficult position due to these flows of migrations, which lasted until 1952 when finally the Turkey closed its borders. This threatened especially the living conditions of Muslim Turks and the other minorities. In the case with Turks, as a result of emigration flows the separation of the families became unavoidable. This started to create dissent against Bulgarian state and the communist party supporters. The prominent political leader of this period of 1948-54 was Vulko Chervenkov, who also was known as “Bulgaria’s little Stalin”. He was a leader insisting on to remove the “unwanted” in the politics and in the social life (Zhelyazkova, 2002:288; Crampton, 2002:170).⁴²

While these were the socio-political formations and developments in Bulgaria since the establishment of the Communist political regime, the Muslim Turkish minority group rights were constitutionally recognized and usually protected in Bulgaria. To Eminov, these developments were purposeful to create in the end the single unified Bulgarian (speaking) nation and to assimilate in a willing manner the Turkish identity roots. Since 1947 to exemplify the “doubtful” developments prominent in the Turkish-language teaching it was introduced as in the following statement cited from Eminov:

⁴² Since Bulgaria was in close contact with the Soviet socialist leaders, in 1953 when Stalin died in the new leadership of Khrushchev in the Soviet Union made Chervenkov to be replaced with the Todor Jivkov. Jivkov also was one of the prominent supporters of the Soviet Union and its regime that he was influenced and collaborating with the Soviet leader Khrushchev. In the beginning of 1954, by the arrival of Jivkov and the new political discourse when established, the conditions were as if improving in the economics and foreign affairs. Although these were favorable for Bulgaria, the name of Jivkov appeared as a leading figure in the “socialist deformations” until the fall of Communist regime in Bulgaria in 1989. It is meant that the state policies during the Communist political regime in the leadership of Jivkov, many state bounded mistakes were prevalent, which led to social unrest and flourish it especially among the (Muslim) Turks (Crampton, 2002:170).

In order to provide education for all school-age children, old schools were renovated, some religious schools were turned into secular schools, and scores of new schools were built. To meet the staffing needs of these schools Turkish teachers colleges (*pedagoji*) were established in Stara Zagora, Kurdzhali, Sofia and Razgrad, and a Department of Turkish Philology was established at the University of Sofia. A boarding high school for women was opened in Ruse. Within a few short years the number of Turkish-language elementary and middle schools, the number of students attending these schools, and the number of teachers teaching in these schools increased significantly. During the 1949-1950 school year the number of Turkish-language schools of all types in Bulgaria multiplied almost as three times more than the previous school years. The number of Turkish-language schools was 1199, with an attending student number of 105.376, and 3.037 teachers (Eminov, 2000:140).

Even so according to Eminov, during this period Bulgaria, with its Communist rule in power, showed tendencies to ensure the minorities with free civil rights that they could perform their cultural traditions by the formation of their Turkish cultural institutions not only in education area but in terms of allowing Turkish language based publications, Turkish-language radio broadcasts and other such cultural encouragements. However, the conditions of Turks in Bulgaria as their rights being protected in their places of origin did not last long. At the end of 1950's the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP), which remained in power as only one political party until 1989, took into elaborate consideration the status of the Muslim Turks in Bulgaria. Actually, the Bulgarian state communist leaders benefited from Bulgarian nationalist sentiments and in 1960's began to formulate the grounds of their ideologies of creating a nation-state with a single language and a homogenous culture. This was because of the fact that all these ethnically distinctive minorities were the reason to possibly detach the Bulgaria under the whole idea of nation-state. The cultural sentiments in the areas of education and religion, which were encouraged, started to be treated more explicitly as threats to the Bulgarian nationality and the ideology of Communist Party to create a single nation-state of Bulgarians. For these reasons the prohibitions were rigid in banning Turkish-language teaching schools, and all the other cultural events which were allowed were restricted gradually in the course of time until 1980's which ended with the assimilation campaigns prominent in 1984-1985 (Eminov, 2000:139, 141, 143; Zhelyazkova, 2001:288).

According to the Bulgarian nationalism, which gave priority to its major Orthodox Christian and Slavic speaking inhabitants of Bulgaria, the Turkish speaking inhabitants and the other Muslim minorities were to be excluded in the sense as assimilating their ethnic make up. The largest of all minorities were the Turks, usually having a 9.5% out of the approximately 10 million inhabitants of Bulgarian whole population. Yet, in the 1984-1985 name change assimilation campaign primarily Muslim Turks and other small amounts Muslim minorities of Tatars, Alevis and Gypsies were forced to take Bulgarian names. In the rural areas, police or military forced Turks to sign petitions to have Bulgarian names. In urban centers, the program was carried through work places and over 815,000 names were changed. The ones who did not sign the petition were excluded from the systems of pensions, housing and health services, which also mean exclusion from citizenship, or even more harsh practices that some, were sent to prison or exile. Not only names were changed but also the use of Turkish language in the public places and Muslim customs practiced in every day life were banned all together. In the late 1980's official assimilation campaigns were restrictive and suppressive versus the unwillingness of the Muslim Turks. This started to be announced even internationally which led to social unrest and made only then the Communist Party leader Jivkov to authorize the enormous migration wave between May and August 1989. To him this was sanctioned as a solution against the unbearable growing state-society tensions particularly in reference to Muslim Turkish minorities in Bulgaria. As a result, Turks had to migrate from their birthplaces in Bulgaria to Turkey involved in the migration wave known as the second largest emigration exodus after the Second World War (Demirtaş-Coşkun, 2001; Dimitrov, 2000).

What made the Bulgarian state to react from such a contrary position and to violate the basic human rights of Turks might be also because of their Muslim religious identity, besides the Turkic national one, seen as a barrier to the Bulgarian nation-building developments in terms of modernization, industrialization, and actually the communism ideology itself adopted from the Soviet (Eminov, 1997:132). The Bulgarian state shaped its policies around the minorities in the country who constituted "the others" with all their culturally distinctive features in

terms of language, religion, and other cultural determinants until the year of 1989. Bulgarian policies enforced Turks to change their ethnic identities or convert them into Bulgarian ones. Also, Bulgaria was in stand to be accepted as a successful cultural unified nation-state in the international arena labeled with the communist ideology. In this way, the prevalence of Muslim Turks in Bulgaria was seen as a threatening ethnic community with its territorial and national closeness to Turkey speaking Turkish language and practicing the religion of Islam. That is why it was more logical for Bulgarian state policies to assimilate Turks and the other Muslim minorities and keep them in the country by various assimilative policies rather than allowing them to develop intimate attachments with Turkey.

4.4 Changing Status of Turks in Bulgaria after 1990's

In order to understand the attempts in Bulgaria while consolidating and stabilizing democracy since 1990's, it is worth it to analyze the state-society relations in reference to minority groups in Bulgaria. This also aims to reveal the nature of transition specifically exemplifying the Turkish minority case in terms of their political and civil liberties, which were suppressed at the end of 1980's causing apparent social unrest. This unrest caused the big migration exodus in 1989 to Turkey that 350.000 Turks "escaped" from Bulgaria. While the great majority of these emigrants adapted to the new environment in the "motherland" Turkey, in the end of 1989 about 120.000 Muslim Turks returned back to Bulgaria. This was only to mention the large migration process, which will be discussed in the next chapter. In this part now, the discussions will focus on after 1990's condition and the changing status of Muslim Turks.

According to many scholars, nationalism remains as an essential tool for the post-communist world. According to Williams "nationalism is a double edged sword, meaning that while on the one hand national consciousness or national dissent was crucial to the demise of communism, before 1989, nationalism has also been used by many post-communist leaders in order to hold power" (Williams, 1999). In the same way the communist leader of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov actually used the minority

issue in order to create their own Bulgarian nationalism and more importantly in order to mask the pains of transformation and deficits of Bulgarian state. And again to Williams, he thinks that thus communists and nationalists legitimized their power and totalitarian way of rule, and “exploited the concepts of ‘nation’, ‘national identity’ as well as conflict over territory/borders, language and culture for their own ends” (Williams, 1999). In this case, the slogan as “Bulgaria for the Bulgarians” imposed the feelings of *us* versus *them*. To Michnik⁴³, nationalism allows intolerance, sets unbearable conditions of another person who is actually different and “the other” due to his language, religion and the other ethnic markers. As a result of all these issues of “otherness” implemented violation of human and minority rights. The process of recovering the basic human rights has been the case on progress in Bulgaria since 1990’s also for the sake of being an agreeable EU member state.

Since the fall of Communist regime and the abolishment of Communist Party leader Zhivkov in 1989, Bulgaria was involved in the process of democratization and the participation of free market economy. There occurred socio-political culture changes and developments, which had direct impact on the Muslim Turks in Bulgaria. When one focuses on the events after the tensions caused by the Bulgarian assimilation policies against Turks, it could be observed that Bulgaria has been as more democratic than before. This was not an inclination merely because of the end of authoritarian/totalitarian communist rule, but possibly because of the constant presence of the political party of Movements of Rights and Freedoms (MRF) in Bulgaria.

MRF appeared in the political scene in Bulgaria in the beginning of 1990’s, as a non-ethnically based party. Yet, it was run in the leadership of a Bulgarian Turkish intellectual Ahmet Doğan and mostly supported by the Turkish and other Muslim minorities in Bulgaria. The major impact of the assimilation policies brought about the creation of MRF (Movements of Rights and Freedoms), in a defense of Muslim Turkish identity and that of minorities in general. The political party of MRF

⁴³ For detailed discussions, see Williams (1999:45-71).

became one of the main forces behind the peaceful settlements of the Muslim Turks and the other minority problems in the transformation from authoritarian to democratic governance. It is possible to say that it normalized the relations between the minorities and the state in Bulgaria. During 1990's MRF balanced its status as the third largest political party as protecting rights and freedoms of group rights by being loyal to the Bulgarian nation-state and being against separatism. Unlike the political atmosphere in the most of former socialist countries in the Balkans, MRF had an outlook with pluralist and liberal objectives from the 1990's until the present (Anagnostou, 2005; Kanev, 1996:54).

With the immediate presence of MRF in the political arena, together with the newly established pluralist political parties, new developments were introduced in the name of democratic legislations. The previous restriction towards Muslim Turks was altogether abolished, and the regulations implemented by the former political Communist Party rule were to be corrected. Bulgarian names, which were forcibly attributed during the assimilation campaigns, were announced about their restoration with their already Turkish names again. Also, the Turkish-language classes, which were banned until the end of 1989, were introduced in the public schools again in 1990. In the new 1991 constitution, Bulgarian state did not recognize openly the Turkish minority or other ethnically specific minorities in its statements, yet stated in general that all Bulgarian citizens were welcome in the new legislations. For example, for the Turkish language based education it was mentioned that Bulgarian citizens possessing a mother tongue other than Bulgarian were allowed freely to use it and to study in their native language besides the compulsory Bulgarian education in the public school. Banned Islamic schools were introduced again by opening new religious school in 1990. Religious institutions were reopened during 1992. Mosques were examples for this new development, and the attendance was publicly allowed. In 1998 one of the religious traditions, which was the circumcision of Muslim Turkish young boys, was also publicly practiced after being banned during 1980's. All the religious and the ethno-cultural Turkish traditions were recovered and practiced after 1990's. Besides, these religious, cultural developments also the roles

of MRF were releasing the political and social unrest in some way (Eminov, 2002:142).

These developments served also to draw a general affirmative Bulgarian stand in the international arena. This was because Bulgaria had been within a transition on democracy at which followed intense domestic and international negotiations with the Euro-Atlantic transnational state agents. Democratic liberalization and the stabilization policies were dealt with heavily to renew post-communist Bulgaria in the period prevalent during 1997-1999. This transition was intensely to be stabilized due to the fact that Bulgaria was in preparation to join the European Union (EU) as well. In the threshold of entering the EU Bulgaria was to perform its duties laid down by the European Commissary. At this point it was prominent that one of the most crucial criteria of EU was to claim from the country of Bulgaria to protect and recognize the basic human rights of its minorities. This was one of the basic preconditions of the European Union Commission and the democratization process itself, which gave way for tolerable political representation. For the case of Turkish minorities since 1990s they are already well represented with the political party of MRF. Bulgaria did almost as well as expected while predominantly attempting to recorrect the violation of these basic rights especially during 1980's. Bulgarian democratic and pluralist political outlook turned to account the chance to evaluate the conditions of its ethno-cultural different communities. While this was the case, it is important to remember that the European Court of Human Rights and Minority Rights claims the rights of minorities or every human being only on an individual basis. That is the Court does not guarantee the rights specific to ethno-cultural minority communities in groups, but states as 'everyone'. To some arguments this might be the continuity of minority problems in the nation-states. As in the case with Bulgarian society, political interests showed tendencies to manipulate the fate of minorities within different socio-historical context and state-society relation formations (Dimitrov, 2001; Windischer, 2003:249).

These have been the favorable developments to certain extent relevant within the political tolerance towards the presence of different ethno-cultural and religious

communities in Bulgaria, in relieving social unrest caused by the politics before the fall of Communist regime. The social unrest turned out to have different connotations while Bulgaria was within steady evolutionary shift of socio-politically culture. The social unrest today in Bulgaria was because of the regional economic discrepancies not being able to be stabilized still. According to Turkeş (2003), the post-communist world or the “New Europe” face a deficient transition from communism to liberal democratic state by means of the role of foreign state bodies as EU which is “putting mere emphasis on the inter-regional integration, but failing to even address the significance of intra-regional aspects” (ibid, 2003). This also explains the continuous flows of migration from the East Central European or the Balkan countries to involve in migration process as labor migrants.

The nature of transition from authoritarian to democratic type of state regime calls for some explanations. It was a political transition at which the political regime change brought innovations into the societies through political system regulations. This type of transition aimed to adopt the democratic way of rule since 1990s right aftermath the decline of Communist regime and its ideology. This was the case usually with the most of the former socialist countries believing in the Communist ideology with their mere objective to build a unified and homogeneous single nation-state. This transition process since 1990’s in general and in the case with Bulgaria in particular is to be clarified in terms of the state regulations directly influencing the Muslim Turkish community. For this reason, in order to comprehend the transition to democracy and the decline of authoritarianism, the next part will aim to discuss in relevance with the arguments prevalent in this thesis chapter.

4.5 General Discussions in relation to the Transformation Process in Bulgaria

There are many scholars who specially study (South) Eastern Europe and the Balkan regions that are in transition to achieve democracy and free market economy. They are mostly concentrated on the social, political and the cultural aspects of transition and to its democratic content. For example according to Agh (1998) the year of 1989 was a remarkable one for the authoritarian ruled “socialist” countries, as

the communism as a political regime had collapsed. To him this also affected the paradigm of comparative politics and democracy and its theories:

The bipolar world until 1989 appeared also as a ‘bipolar’ concept in democratic theories: according to the former concepts of comparative politics, the democratic system was on one remote pole and the authoritarian (and/or totalitarian) systems on the other, that is, in this theory the two systems were completely separated from each other. Nowadays, comparative politics sees the relationship between democracy and authoritarianism in a completely different way, much more as a continuum of different political systems between the two poles (Agh, 1998:9).

To specify, Agh divides only the countries have been witnessing the “Great Transformation”, into two main geographical regions in the Eastern Europe, which he studies. These are the Eastern Central European countries (Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia, and Croatia) and the Balkan region countries (Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and the Eastern republics of the Former Yugoslavia-Serbia, Macedonia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina) that underwent social, political, and cultural change and process of transformation in the end of 1980’s. This long-lasting “Great Transformation”, having startling political and cultural diversified effects in the world political conjecture has been in an continual process since 1990’s in different stage developments by the different performed domestic and international tasks of the countries within transition (ibid, 1998:2, 7).

Closely relevant with the beginning of the transformation, the well-known Gorbachev’s ideals of *perestroika* and *glasnost* announced in 1985, and their effects known to being spread out to the Eastern Central European and Balkan countries usually mark the disintegration of the communist countries. According to these two ideals, it was aimed to use the potentials of modernity under the umbrella of Soviet Union in terms of adopting democracy, high standards of living, free market economy and freedom of rights and movements. Specially, the ideal of *glasnost* is considered to be influential one in disintegrating the communist regime in the Soviet Union leading afterwards the same to happen with the follower communist regimes practicing the communist system. Bova referring to *glasnost* as “initial decompression” of the revolutionist demonstrations in the countries of transition explains as:

It was under the banner of glasnost that the reformist spirit of Gorbachev era was first introduced. In its original and most narrow sense, “glasnost” referred to a policy aimed at increasing access to information, thereby reducing the veil of censorship and secrecy that had long smothered Soviet society. In short time, however, the “glasnost era” came to represent a larger package of liberalizing reforms that included greater protection of individuals from the coercive power of the state, expanded freedom of political expression and association, easing of some restrictions on travel and emigration, and a new tolerance toward religious activity (ibid, p.118).

On the other hand, it is criticized that indicating the Gorbachev’s ideals as mere factors in the collapse of Soviet socialist system is not reliable explanation in itself. For example, Agh states that not only Gorbachev’s factor but before his initials especially the external Soviet, meaning the Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland were the countries to stand for their revolutionary changes. These countries, which were near the Western European side, were first to question the Soviet state ideology and become more influenced from the Western democratic political state models and the global competitive economies. Thus, the East Central European and the Balkan regions through the ‘snowball effect’ were influenced by one another’s revolutionary actions and followed as well (Agh, 1998:24-27, 32).

Yet, nobody of the political “communist” leaders and Gorbachev himself could realize the departure in the Soviet history as a result of the attempts to benefit from democracy and to transform the Soviet world to a liberal and democratic one. To Bova, the details of *glasnost* are discussed differently as compared to the Western understanding of revolution, democratization and openness between the state and society. Yet, the important thing is that this ideal was an initiative to achieve to some extent to open the “closeness” of Communist leaders’ way of state rule. In the Soviet it was a fact that the totalitarian, authoritarian, and non-democratic ways of rule were permanent and many aspects of the civic (legal), political and social aspects were disregarded. That is, while the potentials of modernity, which were suppressed under the Soviet Union and led to its subversion, the ideologies of *perestroika* and the *glasnost* mostly turn out to become the ‘self-criticism’ towards/against the Soviet power itself. In fact, what can be inferred as the ‘self-criticism’ towards/against the Soviet power itself, was perhaps the misuse of communist ideology and the

suppressive sanctions of the Soviet leaders deteriorating the democratic interactions between the state and the society (Hardt and Negri, 2000:292).

The various cultural and religious nationalities under the Soviet umbrella and around it, also such as is the case with Bulgaria initiated reformations to benefit from the 'self-criticism' ideals to improve the prevalent state regime forwardly. Hence, there were many factors to consider why socialist Soviet structure collapsed and it was inescapable for the other socialist countries to announce actually their suppressed democratic traditions of free choice of political, legal, social and cultural thoughts and behaviors in general. For such an analysis it makes sense to summarize with specific details the Soviet Union leaders' sanctions and state policies especially towards the culturally different minorities. Discussion below will be to clarify how Bulgaria had tendencies to benefit intimately from the Soviet ideology on adopting similar political sanctions towards minorities during Bulgarian "national revival" process to "Bulgarize" the ethno-cultural composition before 1990.

The communist ideology in the Soviet socialist regime roughly was to create a proletariat class and therefore develop the industrial conditions and for a welfare state for all the citizens. Taking into consideration the population as being ethnically composite, the Soviet ideal was that all the ethnic identities would be melted through assimilation strategies. Then, the heterogeneous ethnic population would be converted into a homogeneous unitary Soviet state. As a result of these the only concern would be the egalitarian socialist society merely with its single proletariat and the ruling class. Yet, to realize the abolishment of the reactionary ideas in order to create scientific and socially useful labor there were systematic assimilation campaigns, which were aiming to assimilate all the ethnically different groups into the creation of a single Russian identity. The Soviet assimilation strategies could be mentioned as three-dimensional: Sovietization, Russianization, and Russification. To clarify, Sovietization, especially targeting the Central Asia, "involves not only the spread of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, but more specifically, Westernization (the adoption of Russian table manners), modernization (the spread of education of literacy), and secularization (the undercut support for Islam)". Secondly,

Russianization was the promotion of the Russian language as a primary one and its being embedded into the all-national republics, serving as a tool to create single Soviet identity. Finally, Russification was defining the whole process of assimilation and the conversion of non-Russians into Russians and thus manipulating the society members to think and behave as such. These three dimensional assimilation strategies were followed by other strategies to create inter-republican migrations (from rural to urban and vice a versa), inter-ethnic marriage and linguistic assimilation (Ramet, 1978:89).

Since the fact that Bulgarian history is marked by its attachment to the communist rule and affection to the Former Soviet Union, almost the same regulations took place as in the Soviet Union. As such that “communist rule held elections that had no choice of candidate or party, and it was dominated by communist parties that operated on the basis of ‘democratic centralism’, it denied any autonomy to what came to be known as civil society: the parties, churches, trade unions and other bodies that allowed citizens to associate with each other outside the direct control of the state, and mass media regulated by the censorship system” (White, 2003:419). These were authoritarian sanctions, which were characterizing the nature of Communist Party rule in the former USSR and East Central European countries prominent after 1945. The mentioned explicit Soviet state regulations implemented by the Communist Party rule in Bulgaria likewise reached its peak in during 1980’s when the systematic assimilation campaigns were initiated towards Turks and other Muslim minorities.

Today, it is apparent for Bulgaria that there is an obvious break off, or transition from the authoritarian rule motivated by the communist leaders who in somehow manipulated and misused the Communist ideology for their own ideologies, to the consolidation of democratic rule. This transition process event is also questioned as if it was real revolutionary development demarcating the line between before and after 1990 Communist world experiences. Scholars who study this transition process claim that the changes of political regime could be marked as classic revolutions of the past. This was because certain revolutionary characteristics

were encountered in the post-communist world and in Bulgaria as ‘crisis of the state’, ‘a deep fragmentation of society’ and a ‘full-scale redistribution of property’. Thus, these became demarcations of a completely new social environment in all aspects. Also, this was different from the former one labeled as the ‘transition’ from authoritarian to democratic regime. Contrary to this, there are arguments claiming that it is doubtful to comprehend in content and form the revolution Communist countries experienced, for, it was ‘top down’ revolution weakened with the role of the mass public and intellectuals (White, 2003).

It is important to understand the nature of transition in terms of complete or incomplete consolidation of democracy. This is an understanding of also how quitting the former political regime and replacing it with a contradictory one promises a more stable functioning government because of the state monopoly abolishment as in the case with Bulgaria. It is for sure that transition process is referring to a long lasting gradual time span studies and argued by (Ralf) Dahrendorf. To him, various reform regulations need different durations of months, years, and decades, respectively regulations of constitution in adopting democratic view as its characteristics are mentioned above, economic reforms on free market economy, and finally the necessary basis for changing the social environment(s) in general that the society is to benefit from (Dahrendorf cited in Henderson and Robinson, 1997:164). As a result of such implications it is obvious that the process of transition will not be easy to complete and that it will be composed of a ‘triple transition’. According to Offe, there are three types of decisions ranked according to their importance, which defines the operation of the political system; first one is the decision on identity, citizenship and the territorial boundaries both in social and cultural terms for building the nation-state; second, institutional make-up of procedures, rights and liberties of the ruling state; and finally the most significant one, as ‘who gets what, when and how’, meaning the economic and political-distribution of positive rights and resources through legislatures and executives - demands of the society and the supply policies of the state in power (Offe, 1991:32-33).

The current general situation in the post-communist countries is that they encounter multiple problems in the path of democracy after the break off communist regime seen as impediments influencing the society. These could be summarized in four standpoints:

a) Creation of democratic institutions- parties, elections, constitutions, b) Introduction of a market economy- privatization, the removal of state subsidies and price controls, and the establishment of the economic institutions of a free market, c) Social problems- unemployment, inequality, crime, c) Ethnic problems, d) Coming to terms with the past- dealing with the crimes of the former communist regimes (Henderson and Robinson, 1997:164).

In the case with Bulgaria, it faced the same problems to some extent as mentioned by Henderson and Robinson. These problems are dealt with the collaboration of foreign international support. Bulgaria since 1990's up until today shows progress for building democracy. In fact, comparing to many other East Central European countries it displays stability in progress and abandoning almost completely the old political regime by the stated new regulations. The role of the foreign interventions was seen as precondition to recover from the old regime and to stabilize its politics, economy, and social problems encountered. This was as mere choice of Bulgaria to collaborate with the Western allies and demand support specifically from the European Union and attain the chance for unification to the community. EU membership was promised with the date of 1st of January in 2007 to Bulgaria if all the requirements were fulfilled, since the EU partnership was functioning to assure on support while pointing out the urgent problems and their resolutions.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter explained the presence of Muslim Turks in Bulgaria. The headings integrated into this chapter show the membership status of Muslim Turks in the Bulgarian society as well. Discussions in this chapter are relevant with the citizenship in Bulgarian society. The prevalence of the discussions on human rights protection referred to the citizenship rights practices enabled by the Bulgarian citizenship. Additionally, the protection and recognition of the basic political and

civil liberties of ethno-cultural and religious communities in Bulgaria is the matter of extension for citizenship engagement into the Bulgarian society. It can be seen that the Bulgarian politics shaped the state-society relations in Bulgaria directly influencing the Muslim Turkish population. This was more apparent during the Communist regime prevalent until 1989. The social unrest turned out to be in different form after 1990's. This was because even though the suppressive policies on the ethno-cultural communities were ceased; the Muslim Turks continue to migrate because of different motivations that the contracted relation between the Bulgarian state and the citizen members of it created "pushing" factors in different forms.

CHAPTER 5

SOCIOLOGICAL PROFILE OF IMMIGRANT TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN NORTHERN CYPRUS

5.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the status of Turks has been explained within particular historical frames while considering the prominent state-society relations in Bulgaria. There have been ‘momentum’ events in regards with the motivations for migration among Turks in Bulgaria and with a particular reference to those immigrated to northern Cyprus. These have been the reflections of state bounded attitudes having direct influence on the social interactions within society. Now, in this chapter, the primary focus will be on integrating a general profile of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus. Importantly to mention again, this thesis is focused primarily on this immigrant group, which is a peculiar research sample case along the studies relevant with the Bulgarian Turks. Therefore, in the case with the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria this profile will be a sociological inquiry and of great importance to understand and analyze the course of migration in general and [social] citizenship practices in particular among those who migrated to northern Cyprus. For this reason, there will be quotes from the interview transcripts, obtained from the mentioned above immigrant group, that at first glance include subjective and objective descriptions and definitions about their moves.

This chapter will outline also the general motivations for migration in terms of defining *push* and *pull* factors of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. Before all, an introductory explanation will be added in conjunction with the general migration process and the migrant conditions in northern Cyprus of Turks from Bulgaria. This part will be a socio-demographic profile drawn in order to distinguish immigrant Turks, who emigrated from Bulgaria to northern Cyprus. In the following parts, after getting acquainted with the conditions of this immigrant group, their migration

experiences will be integrated depending on the research data narratives comprised of overall *push/pull* factors with varying connotations to emigrate from Bulgaria. As a result, it is aimed to equivalent the *micro* lived migration experiences of the interview respondents with the *macro* state-society relations that Turks from Bulgaria have encountered. This chapter in general will draw before/after migration profile to grasp the state-society relations in reference to the citizenship practices among the Turks from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus. Subsequently, citizenship practices and the identity perceptions elaborately will be handled within specific themes in the chapters coming next, that of Six and Seven.

5.2 Socio-Demographic Profile of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in Northern Cyprus

As it has been mentioned in the previous chapter, there were various deliberate state orientations to motivate Turks to emigrate from their places of origin in Bulgaria. In these regards migrations, which occurred in different time periods were primarily directed to Turkey. This has been mainly because the Turks in Bulgaria have been relying on their cultural identity as being of a Muslim and Turkish origin, which is a discussion subject, based on inclusive historical foundations and pointed earlier. Thus, not surprisingly, there was an agreeable tendency that Turks of Bulgaria (or Bulgarian Turks) were feeling close attachments and belongingness to the national territories of Turkey. As a result of the authoritarian Bulgarian state policies until 1989, involuntary forced migration waves were prevalent among the Turks. To specify, in the sake of this thesis, the research based interview conduct with the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria, who immigrated to northern Cyprus shows special attentiveness to the big migration flow in 1989, since they were involved in and experienced it directly. This migration flow in 1989 particularly has been pinpointed in the previous chapter, which was prevalent as a result of the oppressive assimilation regulations during the communist regime in Bulgaria towards the Turks. In the light of these, the involuntary forced migration, or the deportations of Turks in 1989 turned out to be “voluntary escape” from Bulgaria to their “actual mainland” of Turkey. At this point it is an outstanding argument that these nationalist sentiments have not been applicable in the case with all the Turks in

Bulgaria. While the move to Turkey was accepted as only one and the best choice of being safe and sheltered, this was not approved as an affirmative choice by some of the Turks from Bulgaria. As it has been the case in this thesis, according to the particular immigrant group of Turks from Bulgaria, Turkey is accepted as a difficult “mainland” to adapt and live. This has been the picture, which was drawn depending on the interview transcriptions of those Turks, who were directed to different destinations. For this, “push” and “pull” factors of various kinds, but still on similar lines, have shaped decisions of preference to different destination places. In the case with this thesis, significant number of, which is not to be undermined for partial understanding regarding the course of events, Turks from Bulgaria has preferred northern Cyprus as a destination alternative place for being in safe and sheltered.⁴⁴

After this general introduction, this part aims to figure out socio-demographic profile about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who migrated to northern Cyprus in 1990’s. Although this thesis is focused on this immigrant research sample being very peculiar case among the studies on Bulgarian Turks, there are limited written documents and studies investigating their situational conditions in northern Cyprus.⁴⁵ Hence, what has been noteworthy to pinpoint at first hand is that taking into consideration this group of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, they had not been systematically directed to northern Cyprus relying on any agreement with Bulgaria or Turkey. This has been the explanation made by Rauf R. Denktaş, the former (and the first) president of northern [Turkish] Cypriot state [or Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC)], during an interview conducted with him in the sake of this thesis, since he had been the politician in power when the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria had been ‘invited’ and ‘welcomed’ to northern Cyprus. He explained that there were no verbal or written agreements between any international state posts in the admission and placement of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria to northern Cyprus. He added that since Turkish mass migration flows started from Bulgaria, he personally

⁴⁴ For the relevant discussions in the PRIO Report about citizenship matters in northern Cyprus in general and partially notified with immigrant Turks from Bulgaria see, Hatay (2005:13-14).

⁴⁵ Insufficient but some degree of beneficiary quantitative information about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, living at present in northern Cyprus has been relied only on the two census reports conducted and prepared in 1996 and 2006 by the State Planning Organization in northern Cyprus.

as a president announced publicly that some extent of immigrants could be accepted to northern Cyprus. To him, as a result of this invitation-announcement, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were motivated to migrate gradually between the years of 1989-1995. Also, this has been restated in the interviews conducted with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who explained that they usually took the migration decision to northern Cyprus depending on the publicly announced (unofficial) ‘invitation’ of R.R. Denktaş in 1989. Additionally, not to be undermined, almost all of the immigrants interviewed have stated that the naturalization policies in northern Cyprus prevalent in 1990’s, taking account of the TRNC⁴⁶ citizenship granted in specified short-term periods become influential determinant for obligating the preference of northern Cyprus.

Actually, there might be twofold explanation on the nonattendance of any state systematic about directing the Turks from Bulgaria to have a shelter in northern Cyprus from the point of government stances in Bulgaria and Turkey. Firstly, from the point of Bulgarian state, it managed policies to get remove from its Turkish inhabitants under the domination of communist regime since they denied the assimilation policies aiming to dissolve their ethnic identity continuations based on Muslim and Turkish sentiments. The peak of these was reached in 1989 with the involuntary migration flow at issue. In the subsequent developments, still in an unrelieved social unrest, after the fall of authoritarian communist regime democratic consolidation was intact since the beginning of 1990’s. However, as it has been pinpointed, social unrest having direct influence on Turks oriented them to define their motivations for emigration from Bulgaria. Based on these, international and the domestic debates ongoing on Cyprus and the northern Cyprus being unrecognized might not be possible to allow contracting any agreements with Bulgaria. Indeed, depending on some of the migration narratives in the research data, in the beginning of 1990’s in the presence of democratic adaptations in Bulgaria, Turks were being obligated and taking decisions on their own to leave their places of origin in Bulgaria, on behalf of which they were suggested to prefer Western countries for immigration by the Bulgarian embassy officials. In fact, Bulgaria had seemed to have

⁴⁶ TRNC is the abbreviation of the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus”.

international agreements right after the fall of communist regime with some of the Western countries, which accepted Bulgarian [Turkish] nationals (or citizenship owners) as refugees to have shelter and protection as a result of political persecution. Secondly, from the point of the Turkish state; it might be applicable to direct somehow the incoming immense flow of Turks from Bulgaria to northern Cyprus, who were deported without prior notice by the Bulgarian state regulations in 1989. This is the period when the communist regime collapsed also following the big migration influx to Turkey, which as a country ‘accommodator’ had difficulty to arrange the residency placement of Turks coming from Bulgaria. Thus, because of bounded political and national attachments with northern [Turkish] state of Cyprus and the R.R. Denktaş’s affirmative nationalist political stand towards Turkey, the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were sheltered without any agreement-like contracted approvals during 1990’s. Also, this might be conclusive acceptance aiming to support the community from a Muslim Turkish origin depending on identity sameness named also as *soydaşlık*, referring to the ethnic or racial descent affiliated with supranational identity of Turkish-ness.

Relying on these explanations, some numerical evaluations about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus will be necessary to integrate. Since there are only two census reports to benefit from, firstly to mention the total population estimation in northern Cyprus, in 1996 it was counted as 200.587 and in 2006⁴⁷ it grows up to 264.172 including also the tourists and various kinds of temporary visitors as well. According to the census report of 2006 the de facto total population of northern Cyprus indicates that in ten years period the total population increased by %31.7.⁴⁸ On the other hand, in the 1996 Census report it is indicated that the total population is comprised of prominent “new comers” from nationalities and countries respectively such as Turkey, United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Germany, Iran, Moldova, Pakistan and the others. The major ethno-cultural

⁴⁷ The most recent population census was held in April of 2006, but the survey results were not reported officially as a booklet. However, particular demographic data with tables has been obtained from the State Planning Organization in relevance with the 2006 Residence and Population Census.

⁴⁸ *Cyprus Times*, May 6, 2006, Issue 400.

community in northern Cyprus still is the native Turkish Cypriots. According to the census reports again it is obvious that the “new comers”, who have preferred northern Cyprus as a destination for various reasons are from a Muslim or Christian religious denomination.

Considering these within the northern Cypriot territories, the fourth largest population in the census estimations is the people, whose birthplace is in Bulgaria. The three big and densely populous district cities in northern Cyprus are taken into account in the 1996 census report, which are the capital city Lefkoşa (Nicosia), and the other two coastal cities of Girne (Kyrenia) and Gazimağusa (Famagusta). Importantly, the immigrant Turks coming from Bulgaria, who live in these cities, are estimated respectively in numbers as follows: 637, 655 and 78 persons. Actually, in the 1996 census population the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria comprised only %0.7 of the total population in northern Cyprus and in numbers it is specified as 1370 persons. It is noteworthy to notify that immigrant Turks from Bulgaria who are counted in this census report are divided within three groups. These are the immigrants whose places of birth, all of them, are in Bulgaria and they are divided according to their status of citizenship they possess. In the first group are those, who hold dual citizenship of northern Cyprus (or TRNC)-Bulgaria, in the second group those holding the dual citizenship of Turkey-Bulgaria, and finally in the third group there are immigrants from Bulgaria, who possess only the Bulgarian citizenship. It is important to mention that in the third group, those who possess the Bulgarian citizenship only are the people having right to work only with procedural permissions to stay. In general, people coming from Bulgaria and residing at present in northern Cyprus and also categorized in regards with their dual citizenship statuses above are mostly the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria. Yet, those with the working permissions, mentioned in the third group, are not only the Turks but also immigrant (Orthodox Christian) Bulgarians. These are the Bulgarians, who are in small numbers and usually not with the entire families, emigrated from Bulgaria to northern Cyprus to work and earn money.

In the other recent census report of 2006, the number of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing in northern Cyprus is estimated that in ten years period it increased moderately from 1370 to 1690 persons coming from Bulgaria. Unlike in the previous census report, in the one conducted in 2006 there is immigration-based information according to certain time periods and the places of country origins. In the case with the immigrants from the place of origin Bulgaria, disregarding their ethno-religious origins and estimated in totality, the results are showing that they started to immigrate to northern Cyprus in the end of 1980's. While the number of immigrants from Bulgaria, supposedly referred mostly to Turks, is 53 between the years of 1985-1989, this number grows rapidly in the following years. To illustrate, between the years of 1990-1994, the number of immigrants from Bulgaria becomes 426 and their intense migration entrances to northern Cyprus occurred between the years of 1995-1999 estimated in numbers as 652. The number of immigrants from Bulgaria gradually continues in the following years, during 2000's, with a mean of 74 every year until 2006. These numbers by years supposedly refers especially to the majority of immigrant (Muslim) Turks from Bulgaria, also because of considering the research data obtained for this thesis. This numerical data in the 2006-census report for northern Cyprus evidently indicates immigration patterns mostly about the Turks, who emigrated from Bulgaria in order to escape from the socio-economic unrest prevalent in Bulgaria after 1990's. Also, within this peculiar immigrant group there is certainly immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who could not adapt to the social environment in Turkey when they were deported forcefully from their places of origin in Bulgaria.

After all, the foremost official quantitative information about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria that has been benefited is usually and only as the census estimations mentioned so far. These numbers are limited for interpretation and questionable still. This is because of the claims of the former president R.R. Denktaş and the head of Bulgarian Turkish solidarity association in northern Cyprus, who explained that the total number of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, residing in northern Cyprus might be around 5000. Besides, the official census reports on migration might be uncertain in validity and reliability because of the usual difficulty

in reporting irregular entries and departures of a country. On the other hand, in the sake of this thesis, individual research based investigations by applying for the relevant institutions could not be achieved in northern Cyprus as it has been anticipated, which of the reasons partially have been explained in the methodology chapter of this thesis. Apart from this, in relation to the state support issue in northern Cyprus, made plain by R.R. Denktaş again, only the first immigrant new comers from Bulgaria, who migrated especially between the periods of social unrest in 1989-1992, were provided with housing (usually in the district villages small in population size) that were only about 16-20 immigrant families. In addition, those immigrants were provided not only with accommodation and housing but also with guaranteed jobs in the military offices or other state offices as civil servants in northern Cyprus. On the other hand, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria who migrated afterwards rehabilitated themselves depending on their own material means and survival strategies. All these mean that the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, being able to get the state support in northern Cyprus were those exposed to the deportations in 1989 and the involuntary impelled emigrations from Bulgaria right after the fall of communist regime.

After outlining central socio-demographic information in reference to the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria living in northern Cyprus, now the migration experiences will be integrated within personal immigrant quotes in order to understand their “push-pull” factors in general sense of why they had preferred northern Cyprus as a final destination and under what conditions⁴⁹. Therefore, the migration profile in this chapter will aim to play central role to comprehend as an introductory, with slight notifications to the significance of socially enhanced citizenship aspects to be handled in the following chapters.

⁴⁹ The migration narratives in this chapter parts will be very few in number and thus, intentionally will be kept in elongation. This is because these narrative quotes will be as an introductory basis to letting know the very general migration profile within a certain course of events and the discursive determinants among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, residing at present in northern Cyprus. Noteworthy, immigrant Turkish respondents in reference to the northern Turkish Cyprus they, almost all of them, tended to mention about it only as “Cyprus”, without making ethnic, political or geographical distinctions. They, very unconsciously, take Cyprus into account as an entire geographical island and only in certain arguments of self-identifications, on Turkish-ness it is emphasized with the perceptions of ethno-territorial boundaries.

5.3 Migration Motivations of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria to Northern Cyprus within Three Different Paths of Emigration

There will be three types of migration experiences, which have been classified accordingly. The first group will be comprised of common examples of place of destination to Turkey. They will refer especially to 1989 migration, when the Turks were actually forced by the state policies during the final stages of communist regime to leave Bulgaria. The same group has been also one that returned back to Bulgaria after a short stay in Turkey and later took the second decision to migrate to northern Cyprus on involuntary impelled migration terms. Secondly, there will be respondents with migration experiences, in which the place of destination was not Turkey but a Western country, such as Sweden or Germany. Actually, as it has been mentioned before, these have been the countries that were presented as alternative places of destination by the Bulgarian state officials because of the social and political unrest after the fall of communism in Bulgaria. Hence, there will be quotes from the interviews stating that primarily Turks, who were suppressed and underprivileged in 1989 deportations, had been prone to being accepted under the refugee status to these countries. Consequently, depending on the research data information obtained by respondents of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, after specified term of a stay, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria as a refugee status were announced that this had been a temporary arrangement between the Bulgarian state and to be mentioned Western collaborator states. In fact, it seems that in this announcement it was declared that immigrant Turks of Bulgaria or refugees sheltered in the cases with Sweden or Germany were to return to their place of origin, Bulgaria because of socio-political tensions being stabilized and normalized. In the last case of migration experiences prevalent among the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria, will be about those who left Bulgaria once and move directly to northern Cyprus. Now, these will be quoted considering the real lived experience immigrant cases of Turks from Bulgaria residing at present in northern Cyprus.

5.3.1 Motivations and Experiences of Migrants to Turkey before Northern Cyprus

To mention again, it is important to make the distinction among the “push-pull” factors in regard with the different stresses on different motivational factors prevalent among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria to migrate from their places of origin. These will be highlighted respectfully in significance. Now, first of all, Turks who involuntarily migrated, or deported to Turkey in 1989 and returned back to Bulgaria will be cited in terms of their migration experiences and relevant quotes of why they prefer eventually northern Cyprus.

The interview respondent İ. (45, F, College-Vocational Training High s.) is one of the immigrant Turkish female respondents from Bulgaria, who has reasonable to her “push” determinants to move with her family to northern Cyprus. In her migration narrative there are almost the same central claims and connotations similarly with the other immigrant Turks of Bulgaria who preferred living in northern Cyprus instead of Turkey. Besides, she is mostly focused on the involuntary nature of move, or deportation from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1989 and the difficulties in adaptation during her family’s short-stay in Turkey. The difficulties in adaptation are emphasizing the socially enhanced citizenship practices which, to her standpoints, were considerably different, and thus they chose northern Cyprus, where the right to live and work in safety, that is the social welfare arrangements were similar to that of in Bulgaria they had been accustomed with.

Political regime had changed in Bulgaria. Before the regime change, nobody was allowed to travel abroad. That was why the people were curious about traveling abroad and especially Turks were interested in traveling to see Turkey. This was because we were Turks and we were keen on Turkey due to the belief that Turkey is our mainland. Since we went out of Bulgaria and crossed the border, only then we become aware of the affirmative merits and the comfort in Bulgaria we were familiar with. We were forced to migrate in 1989 to Turkey and when we came to Turkey, we could not find what we were expecting and thinking about Turkey before. We left our possessions; our apartment flat with all the furniture, took the children and came while leaving everything behind, as if everything was already arranged for us in Turkey. We had little money, which was enough for nothing while we entered Turkey. We had not known Turkey before, it was unknown place for us and thus we felt ourselves as out of the blue in Turkey. For example, when you were outside, you had to check around for your safety and watch out your children.

Turkey seemed as serving non-peaceful life conditions for children, for elderly, for women and even for men, it was risky everywhere at the moment you stepped out of home to go anywhere or work. We get seized with fear. We had to bear always in mind what to wear, how and where to walk because males for example regardless of their ages were annoying women in the street. The working conditions were also difficult for my husband and the other males in our family coming from Bulgaria. There were overloaded working conditions in all the working places in Turkey. These became unbearable to us, the culture and the living standards we witnessed were not as what we were expecting. We felt ourselves culturally 20-25 years as if in backwardness. Finally in 1990 we came to Cyprus because it became obviously impossible to stay in Turkey. We heard that there was Bulgarian Turkish immigrants, who migrated to Cyprus and were provided with guaranteed well-paid jobs in the military institutions or state institutions and housing. We came to Cyprus with my husband's relatives and easily found jobs not in the military or state institutions but jobs satisfactory enough regarding the conditions then. I can say that it was very fortunate to come here instead of staying in Turkey, although we cannot reach the economic prosperity, which were utilized by our relatives who preferred staying in Turkey since 1989. But I am sure enough that I have been living in Cyprus very peacefully and in safe for 16 years. Thanks to God we are not in hunger and outdoors. Though, economically we did not achieve prosperity and we still live in rented accommodation, we are peaceful and comfortable also because we provide higher education for our children.

Rejim devrimi oldu Bulgaristan'da tabi ondan önce hiç yurtdışı seyahatleri ziyaretleri olmadı, gelim gidim olmadı yurtdışına, halkın da aşırı bir yurtdışı merağı vardı hele hele de Türkiye'ye. Türk olduğumuz için de özellikle Türkiye'ye hani kendi memleketimiz gibi diye bir merak vardı. Tabi Bulgaristan dışına çıkınca Bulgaristanın rahatlığının değerini anladık. 1989'da Türkiye'ye zorunlu göç ettik. Biz Türkiye'ye geldiğimizde, hayal ettiğimiz, düşündüğümüz gibi bir Türkiye bulamadık karşımızda. Biz herşeyimizi bırakıp çoluk çocuk küçük arabaya bindik dayalı döşeli dairemizi evimizi bıraktık geldik sanki bizi hazır herşey bekliyormuş gibi. Az bir parayla sınırı geçiyorsun, o parayla da ne olacak ne yapabilirsin bilmediğin etmediğin bir yer, damdan düşmüş hale geliyorsun. Onun dışında sağına soluna bakıyorsun, yok çoluğuna çocuğuna yaşlısına gencine, kadınına erkeğine bile huzurlu bir hayat yok, tehlikeli riskli evin dışına çıkmak tehlike işe gitmek tehlike. Bir korku sardı bizi. Onu giysem nasıl olur bunu giysem ne derler, yolun bu tarafından gitsem nasıl bakarlar, yanından geçen laf atıyor, üstüne yaşına başına bakmadan, bunlar bize ters geldi açıkçası. Onun dışında çalışma koşulları da çok zor geldi bize, heryerde mesai saatleri vardı ve bu bize ve özellikle eşime ve diğer ailedeki erkekere çok ağır geldi. Türkiye'deki yaşam tarzı ve kültürü çok ters geldi bize. Bir de 20-25 sene daha geride kalmış gördük kendimizi kültür olarak. 1990 yılında Kıbrıs'a geldik daha sonra. Biz Türkiye'ye zorunlu göç ettiğimizde orada kalamayacağımız anladık ve eşimin ağbeyi de geldi Kıbrıs'a, benim eşim de ikna oldu onların arkasından Kıbrıs'a geldik. O sıralar da gelenlere yardım yapıyorlardı Kıbrıs'ta, iş veriyorlardı, yer veriyorlardı. Askeri bölgelerde işe girebiliyordun, işsiz kalmıyordun maaşlar iyi oluyordu. Bizde Kıbrıs'ta kolay iş bulduk asker, devlet işine giremedik ama, kolay iş bulabiliyordun o dönemlerde. İyi ki Türkiye'de kalmadık da buraya geldik diyorum. Belki mal mülk sahibi olmadık Türkiye'deki birçok akrabamız gibi ama güvenli, huzurlu bir şekilde bu yaşlara geldik 15-16 senedir buradayız. Çok şükür aç değiliz açıkta değiliz. Ekonomik açıdan belki daha biryerlere gelemedik elde edemedik bişeyler, kiralarda atılıyorz hala ama rahat ve huzurluyuz ve çocuklarımızı okutuyoruz.

N. (51, F, Specialized Higher s.) pinpoints on the general unpleasant conditions what push her family to emigrate from Bulgaria. Unlike the previous interview respondents, she explained that she started to adapt to the new social environment in the Aegean region city in Turkey, where they had been placed. However, she regrets that they were obliged to return back to Bulgaria because of the personal familial reasons and that she had had to refuse to accept working in a kindergarten as a teacher, which was her specialization. Since this was the case, N. is primarily focused on the assimilation policies in Bulgaria until 1989, the economic changes after the fall of communism in Bulgaria and the difficulties after migration in terms of adapting to the new shifted life styles and economic statuses in northern Cyprus:

[...] After our names were changed in 1984, we had to face persecution and oppression and our lives had changed automatically as well. It was forbidden to call students with their Turkish names at school, if did so immediately you were reported and signed protocols. Even you had higher risks to be dismissed from jobs, we know many doctors, and teachers fired in this way. We started to live in fear until 1989, we worked in hardship in the public institutions for example, and only we know how hard it was and the God. Consequently, what happened after 1990 in Bulgaria was that everybody got dispersed and went out because of the big migration in 1989. Those who remained were shuttling to their works, the life as if was normalized in benefit of Turks, but the economic difficulties were prevalent this time in Bulgaria. Everybody started to draw his/her way and to find solutions for this blind economic alley in Bulgaria. Some of the men that we know went to Sweden, Germany, England, or Cyprus. Everybody has continued to disperse abroad to migrate actually; the wages have not sufficient to live on. My husband went to Germany after 1990 also to work and earn money and was there for 4 years. Later, he came back and this time he heard from his friend about Cyprus. My husband decided then to go there to work, and I stayed with my children in Bulgaria. In one year period he became a citizen of Cyprus, and after two years period when our son completed his military duty in Bulgaria, we came to Cyprus altogether with the children. And, now the reason why we came here was easy to guess by everybody that it was because we escape from persecution prevalent against Turks, and not because of escape from our own original settled life in Bulgaria. All the same, political leaders in power did what they did, and the people suffered as a result. What is the logic otherwise; to leave my suitable life in Bulgaria I was familiar with, that I was working as a teacher, and to come here to struggle now? Who can choose this way trying to adapt in an unknown environment? We did not come to Cyprus out of a pleasure or good temper; we came for better and peaceful life instead. Yet, it is different story that to what extend we were able to find this conditions here. But we are obliged to stay here, we cannot return back to Bulgaria, the conditions are worsened there and high rates of unemployment are prevalent now. That is why here in Cyprus unfortunately we have to work in whatever job it is, be it domestic cleaner, be it a care taker of an elder or other in order to survive again.

[...]Bu siyaset meseleleri 1984'te isimler deđiřti hayat da deđiřti, o zaman çok zorluklar çekti biz, hele de biz öğretmenler. İsimler deđiřtikten sonra çok zulüm yaşadık.

Çocuklarımıza Türkçe isimle hitap edemezdik, Ahmet-Mehmet dersin hemen protokoller yazılır, imzalanırdı işinden olurdun, ne kadar doktor öğretmen işten çıkarıldı o şekilde. Korka korka yaşadık 1989'a kadar işte, çalıştık ama bir kendimiz biliyoruz bir de Allah biliyor. 1990'dan sonra herkes dağıldı gitti, işine gidip gelirdi herkes sorun yoktu artık iyidi hayat gibi, ama bu sefer ekonomi bozuldu Bulgaristan'ın maddi sorunları başladı. Herkes kendine bir yol çizmeye başladı. Erkeklerimizin bazıları İsveç'e gitti, Almanya'ya, İngiltere'ye veya Kıbrıs'a, herkes dağılmaya, göç etmeye başladı. Maaşlar yetmemeye başladı o zaman. Eşim Almanya'ya da gitti 4 sene kadar kaldı, döndü daha sonra yine ayaklandık Kıbrıs'a geldik bu sefer. Ailecek gitmedik, sadece eşim gitti 1990'dan sonraki dönemlerde işsizlik vardı çok mecburen para kazanmak için. Benim birşey duyduğum bildiğim yoktu Kıbrıs'la ilgili ama beyimin arkadaşı varmış ondan duymuş. Daha sonra Kıbrıs'a gitti beyim vatandaş oldu daha sonra da geldi bizi aldı. Geldiğinde gene Bulgaristan'a bekledik biraz hemen gitmedik Kıbrıs'a, oğlumuz askerdi bitirmesini bekledik sonra toparlandık Kıbrıs'a gitmek için. Şimdi buraya gelmemizin sebebi de aşağı yukarı herkes tahmin ediyordur, çünkü o zulümden kaçtık, hayatımızdan kaçmadık. Siyaset büyükleri yaptı halk çekti. Karıştırdılar ortalığı. Ben neden güzelim hayatımı orda öğretmen gibi çalışırken bırakıp geleyim burada sürünmeye. Kim ister bunu, biz keyiften gelmedik buraya Kıbrıs'a, geldik daha iyi hayat için ama bunları burada da ne kadar bulabildik orası ayrı. Ama mecburuz burada kalmaya da, Bulgaristan'a dönssek orda da durumlar kötü işsizlik var. Burada da temizlikçi, yok hasta bakıcı çalışmak zorundasın ne olursa olsun.

In the interview talk below, T. (53, M, Technical High s.) is one of the interview respondents, who has identified the migration in 1989 as an involuntary in content, but still identifies that he and his family had some valid familial and other reasons, as mentioned above by İ. also, to return back to Bulgaria instead of settling in Turkey. According to T., the new decision for emigration in the following years during 1990's, and as that of his family's stemmed from "push" factors out of economic backwardness in Bulgaria and the socially insecure environment after the big migration in 1989. These have been termed as the extinction of families, friends, relatives and other factors that the assimilation campaigns created in Bulgaria after the deportations of Turks in 1989 become central for triggering the "push" factors. Since these have been the cases, his migration narrative has been benefited in terms of "pull" factors in regards with the socio-economically secured environment and the potential future prospects that T. has defined in the place of destination of northern Cyprus:

Why we migrated in 1994 to Cyprus was because the living conditions deteriorated where we were living in Bulgaria. There were no young people to go to school; there were no working people around after 1990's in Bulgaria as a result of the big migration flow in 1989. That is why in order to save the family, to provide better living standards and education opportunities for the children, we were obliged to set off on this migration way. We emigrated actually voluntarily on our own, unlike in 1989, and choose the place of

destination to Cyprus. I came first in 1994 to Cyprus alone without my family. I became citizen of Cyprus and later decided together with my family to migrate altogether to in 1995. [...] The life in Cyprus in general was close to our life style in Bulgaria. We heard about Cyprus from our friends, who came to Cyprus, become citizen in one year, and obtain better opportunities to improve their economic living standards. We came with our family as well and live here. We had the chance to nurture the children better, to provide them with higher education opportunity and these have been the best satisfying enough conditions to stay here. Besides, we had opportunities to find jobs, work, have social assurance and earn enough to keep going our life.

Bulgaristan'dan göç ettik, 1994 yılında, neden; çünkü ne okula gidecek genç, öğrenci ne de işe gidecek insan kaldı Bulgaristan'da. Nüfuz azlığından, mecburen aileyi kurtarmak için iyi bir yaşam iyi bir eğitim için bu yollara düşüldü. Kendi isteğimizle göç ettik. Aileden ilk ben geldim, Kıbrıs vatandaşı oldum daha sonra ailemle birlikte bu kararı aldık ve Kıbrıs'a göç ettik. 1994'te ben geldim vatandaş oldum 1995'te de ailemi getirdim, yerleştik o zamandan beri az çok çocuklar okudu, biz de işimizle gücümüzle uğraşyoruz gidiyoruz. [...] Kıbrıs, Bulgaristan'daki tarzımıza yakın bir yaşam tarzı vardı. Kıbrıs'a gelme kararı da, arkadaşlarımız vardı buraya gelmişler burda bir yılda vatandaş olmuşlar diye duyduk, daha iyi durumlara gelmişler ekonomik olarak da, daha iyi yaşam koşulları edinmişler. Bizde ailemizle geldik, hayatımıza burada devam ettik. Çocukları iyi yetiştirebildik, çocuklarını eğtebiliyorsun zaten daha fazlası da gerekmiyor. İyi bir eğitim sağladık onlara. İş bulma imkanımız vardı, iş bulduk, sosyal güvencemiz var aldığımız parayla gecinebiliyoruz.

5.3.2 Motivations and Experiences of Migrants to a Western country before Northern Cyprus

Other than the immigrant Turks, who migrated to Turkey and returned back to Bulgaria because of cultural, personal, and other family separation situations, there has been another group of Turkish immigrants preferring or being obliged to rotate to different destinations. These have been the Turks of Bulgaria, who obligatorily migrated to the Western countries as mentioned formerly, and similarly because of various reasons they had to redefine and reconsider their returning back to Bulgaria and deciding to migrate again to northern Cyprus. These cases have been of great importance to integrate into the migration profile also because their motivations have been grounded in different stresses out of different experiences.

For example, S. (47, M, Vocational-Technical High s.) explains his push factors below in terms of his experiences on the suppressive Bulgarian policies in 1980's during the communist regime and their direct effects on the native Turkish population and especially on his relatives and friends. On the other hand, contrary to the previous interview respondents, S. is one of the respondents emigrating from

Bulgaria, or deported with his family to Sweden without entering Turkey in 1989 or later at all. In his case, although appreciating the democracy of Sweden, he had decided to return back to Bulgaria because he claims that he wanted to live and adopt a home country place and a mainland where he would not be discriminated because of his name or ethnic roots. For this, S. explains that officials in the Turkish embassy in Sweden informed him about northern Cyprus and offered him to go there when he had decided to leave Sweden. Also, he has been one of the respondents that mentioned about the R. R. Denктаş's invitation of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria to be sheltered in northern Cyprus, which had impact on his move to that destination. His explanations on the course of migration events and experiences to notify are as follows:

It is a fact that our places of birth and where we were brought up were all in Bulgaria. The reason why we came was to obtain Cyprus as a mainland. During the assimilation politics everything got complicated and mixed and we had no other choice may be. The last point, which was reached, was in 1989 migration event actually. For this reason, we perceived Cyprus as a salvation place where our children are supposed not to face the difficulties that we faced once before. That is why we chose this way. [...] I did not want to memorize the events that we experienced in Bulgaria because they make me feel saddened, annoyed, and actually disturb my psychology. These events usually were the past hardships of Turks in terms of oppressions, assimilation politics, arrests of friends, putting relatives and friends of people into jail, who protested the assimilation, as a result of which they became ill and even died. I had many relatives and close friends who were put into jail and committed suicide and died after that. These were not suicide events committed out of economic reasons for example. These events and others were all reasons, which pushed us to migrate. Of course there were good pleasant things in Bulgaria, such as there was no struggle to earn a living, struggle to find jobs because there were jobs for everybody and thus livelihood. It was safe inside your home and outside also. These were things not to deny of course because these were real lived experiences as well. We had everything in Bulgaria, our own house with everything that we left there. I am trying to explain that we migrated not because of economic conditions we were satisfied economically indeed. What happened in fact was that I was deported to Sweden in 1989. It was a democratically satisfying enough European country but I did not prefer and enjoy staying there. My aim of worry then was to live in a place where to be free, liberated and peaceful, and not to be discriminated because of my name or my ethnic roots in the future.

Doğduğumuz büyüğümüz yerler Bulgaristan'da aslında bu da bir gerçek, buraya Kıbrıs'a da gelme sebebimiz vatan edinmeye geldik, vatan diye sahiplenme amaçlı geldik. Baskı dönemlerinde herşey karıştı Bulgaristan'da başka seçeneğımız de yoktu o zamanlarda heralde. Bunun son noktası da 1989 göçüdür. Bizde ileride çocuklarımız da yaşamasın bizim yaşadığımız zorlukları diye burasını bir kurtuluş yeri olarak gördük. Bundan dolayı da bu yolu seçtik. [...]Bizim uğradığımız baskı ve asimilasyon politikaları, ve Bulgaristan'daki geriye dönük geçmiş sıkıntılarını hatırlamak bile istemiyorum, çünkü onlar benim psikolojimi de bozuyor, üzülüyorum, canım sıkılıyor. Tutuklanıp haksız yere cezaevine atılan çok yakın akrabalarım vardı, intihar ettiler, çok yakın dostlarım vardı,

intihar edenler oldu rahmetli oldu. Bunlar maddi sıkıntılardan kaynaklanan intihar sebepleri değildi. Bunlar da mesela hep etken yani göç etmemiz için. İyi şeyler de vardı tabi Bulgaristan'da, mesela geçim sıkıntısı yoktu, iş bulma derdin yoktu herkese iş olurdu, geçim sıkıntısı yoktu Bulgaristan'da. Yani rahatla dairene girebilirdin, güvenliydi bu tür şeylerde rahat yanlar da vardı yani bunları da inkar edemeyiz heralde. Bizim orada herşeyimiz vardı kendi dairemiz de vardı herşeyimizi bıraktık. Herşeyimiz iyidi ekonomik nedenden dolayı hiç değildi göç etmemiz demek istiyorum. Bunun ötesinde İsveç'e de gittim yani sürgün edildim 1989'da, demokrasi yönünden zaten herşey çok güzel bir Avrupa ülkesiydi ama sinmedi içime. Benim derdim özgürce, hür rahat yaşayabileceğim bir yer olmasıydı. Benim ismimden, veya kökümünden ötürü ayrımcılık görmeyeceğim bir yerde olma amacım.

In the interview conducted with A. (56, M, Specialized Higher s.), almost all of the other interview respondents alike, he puts emphasis on the assimilation policies implemented by the Bulgarian state ruled by communist regime and how these deteriorated the living conditions of Turks in Bulgaria. He explains that due to the Bulgarian state regulations in 1989, he was deported to Turkey and he had to leave his family in Bulgaria. After a short stay term in Turkey, because of the disorder that Bulgaria was within he returned back again to Bulgaria to be with his family. The male respondent A. says that the families returning back to Bulgaria from Turkey had been excluded somehow from the labor market participation and it was difficult to live under such conditions. To notify, this means also exclusion from the social citizenship. Afterwards, he explains the outcomes of the fall of communist regime and the living standards after 1989, which, to A., made sure his family to emigrate from Bulgaria. Importantly to mention, it is the same with A. also that almost all of the other respondents mentioned that the initiative motivators had been the future prospects of the children being vitally considered in the decision to migrate. In the case with A. and his family, they migrated to Sweden in 1990 and returned back to Bulgaria in 1991 and decided to migrate again and this time to northern Cyprus in 1995 altogether with his family. In fact, his quote will be to emphasize the preference choice of northern Cyprus as a migration place where the socially enhanced citizenship dimensions have been prevalent in parallelism with the supranational Turkish self-identification he has associated his family's ethnic background within the northern Cypriot territories:

[...] I did not count our migration to Sweden as a significant event because we were refugees there and stayed only for two years. In 1991 we returned back again from

Sweden to Bulgaria. However, after our arrival we could not find what we expected for future in Bulgaria anymore, since our social environment, our friends, our relatives and well-established regularity were lost. Everybody had migrated, and nothing was the same. With the mere permission of a tourist visa then I decided to enter Turkey to visit my relatives. We decided, then, to pass to Cyprus with a relative as tourists and to see Cyprus in 1992. Thus, my first arrival to Cyprus was in 1992. Actually, our real intention in these times was to migrate to Turkey; however I liked Cyprus in terms of its nice peaceful environment, which reminded me of a European country environment. Also, when comparing with Turkey I liked it more than Turkey because the social life environment in Cyprus was close to what I had been wishing for my family and children. We did not know about Cyprus at all when we were in Bulgaria. Actually, we came here to seek a self-identification environment to ourselves and since our identity of Turkish-ness predominated very much we decided to chose Cyprus. The linkage in our minds was in the way that we perceived Turkey as a mainland, nation with ethnic Turkish sentiments, the northern Cyprus as a smaller mainland in close attachments with Turkey again and comprised of people coming from an ethnic Turkish background. Considering these, we were from an ethnic Turkish origin that had the opportunity to choose one of these two places to migrate. The other reason to choose Cyprus was that because the English language was prevalent in the Cypriot society, I thought it had be better for our children to be in Cyprus, who were studying at an English college in Bulgaria and were good at English language in use. In 1995 I came with my family altogether to Cyprus. I had to add that we came here also because of economic reasons, which prevailed unfortunately in Bulgaria out of economic crisis prominent since 1995. Fortunately we are here because we are economically well and having wages and earnings higher when comparing them with the standards in Bulgaria. We had chances to provide our children with higher education of good quality. In fact, many people like us make such kinds of comparisons and somehow escape from Bulgaria to places where the living opportunities are better.

[...]Alıp başımızı İsveç'e gittik 1989-90 senelerinde oldu bunlar. Ama o sayılmıyor zaten bence, biz orada mülteciydik sadece 2 sene kaldık orada. 1991'de de İsveç'ten Bulgaristan'a döndük biz gene. 1992'de ilk gelmem oldu Kıbrıs'a. Neden tekrar ayaklandık çünkü daha çok çevremizle ilgili, yani olan düzenimizi, çevremizi kaybetmiştik Bulgaristan'da. İsveç'ten döndük Bulgaristan'a ama aradığımızı bulamıyorsun artık. Arkadaşlarım yoktu, benim bütün ailem Türkiye'deydi, göç etmişti onlar. Biz aslında kendi kimliğimizi aramaya geldik buraya Kıbrıs'a, yani Anavatan da Türk, Yavruvatan da Türk, biz de Türk dedik, Türklüğümüz daha çok ağır bastığından buraya geldik. Turist vizesiyle, yeni yılda tatil amaçlı geldim akrabamla Kıbrıs'a 1992'de. O dönemlerde bizim niyetimiz de Türkiye'ye göç etmek ama ben geldiğimde bir baktım çok güzel sakin, Avrupai bir yer burası. Ben çok beğendim, Türkiyeyle de kıyaslayınca daha çok beğendim bana yakın geldi yaşam tarzı o zaman gördüğüm kadarıyla. Daha sonra da karar verdim çocuklarımı, ailemi de buraya getirmem lazım, tam bize göre bir yer diye düşündüm. Öyle de oldu yani, Kıbrıs'ı da hiç bilmezdik Bulgaristan'dayken o zamanlar. Kıbrıs'a gelmemizin sebeplerinden biri de çocukların eğitimi açısından, İngilizce bildiklerinden dolayı Bulgaristan'dan, burada da İngilizce yaygındı, İngilizce eğitimi veren okullar da olduğu için, o yüzden Kıbrıs'ı tercih ettik. 1995'te de çocuklarla eşimle toptan geldik. Açıkça söylemek gerekirse iyi ki geldik dediğimiz bu sefer ekonomik sebeplerden dolayı oldu, burada aldığımız maaşlar, ödeneklerimiz Bulgaristan'dan kat kat fazla. Maalesef Bulgaristan 1995'ten sonra ağır bir ekonomik krize girdi. Herkes de bu kıyaslamayı yapıyor nerede iyi olursa imkanı olan kaçıyor Bulgaristan'dan. Çocuklarımızı okuttuk, kaliteli eğitim almalarını sağladık.

The interview explanations stated by an immigrant woman that of S. (45, F, Basic High s.) have been vital in summarizing her involuntary and obligatory migration to Germany in 1990 with her family. In her talk, there are push/pull factors defining their move to Germany, return back to Bulgaria and migration again to northern Cyprus. It is obvious again; in regards with her standpoints that she evaluates the citizenship practices somehow in reference to the social guaranteed and the secured environments in the places of origin and the destination places she have been so far. For example, to appraise, satisfaction or dissatisfaction in terms of job opportunities, accommodation, education opportunities or the general economic well-being might determine a potential immigrant to stay in the place of origin or seek these opportunity provisions elsewhere. Nevertheless, as some of the immigrant interview respondents have pinpointed, while these are preliminary for the possible motivations for migration or the inclusion or exclusion within a contracted relation into a home or host country, they are not sufficient on their own and the identity concerns also are taken into accounts as imperative decision makers. This has been the way in which the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria have developed their decisions and make the ‘momentum’ conceptions of citizenship meaningful prominently in the presence of immigration factor. This has been the case with the immigrant S. as in below:

[...] We were working at regular and socially secured jobs that the state of Germany had provided us. We were satisfied from our jobs and our life in general, but the accommodation was still problematic and we had to live with other people in communes. This was a big problem for us, there was a scarcity of rented houses and they were expensive, even we were eager to live in a separate accommodation. Actually, since we were declared by the state that we should leave Germany and return to Bulgaria, there were other factors that prepared our returning back to Bulgaria, which were being fed up living in communal life with the other immigrant people and we had earned some money. Thus, we thought that we were ready and it was time to outmigrate again. Apart from these, our children were attending German school and they had a private teacher caring about their adaptation to the social environment. She was helping them in their school, and out of school. My husband and I were at work and working for the whole day, but the teacher was dealing with our children. Our children were small and grasping everything instantly, and they started to speak in German instead of Turkish. At this point we started to think and worry about our future and the children. This was because, we outmigrated with our Bulgarian names given to us during the name-change assimilation campaign, and our children started to adopt the German culture and language instead of the Turkish one. Since we realized that our origins of “Turkish-ness” started to wipe out among our children, as a main reason of this we decided to return willingly back to Bulgaria. The names of the children were Bulgarian ones, they were tending mostly to speak in German,

thus, someday I could not accept my children as Turks and difficult to explain that they were Turk. We considered elaborately that our children's Turkish identity would be under threat for future and deliberated that we were to return back to take our Turkish names back and migrate to Turkey. In 1993 we returned from Germany back to Bulgaria, yet nothing was the same in Bulgaria anymore. Our Turkish neighborhoods, relatives all were gone, they were migrated, and everyday life was tasteless, desperate in terms of general worry about future of my family in. We turned over that there was no option other than to migrate to Turkey. However, the borders were closed and only the tourist visa was allowed to one of the family members. In 1995 my husband and I decided to go to Cyprus as a tourist without our children. Also, we heard that citizenship was allowed in Cyprus and we had no any choice then to like or dislike the place of destination; we came here only to become citizen of Cyprus. Actually, we came to become a citizen of a Turkish territory, no matter if it was Turkey or (northern Turkish) Cyprus.

[...] Normal sigortalı işlerde çalışıyorduk halbuki, Almanya'da devlet yerleştirdi bizi, iyidi işlerimiz, herşeyimiz ama ev konusu hala çok büyük sorundu, toplu yaşadık başka insanlarla hep. Ev, kiralar bulunamıyordu isteyince çok büyük sorundu bu da bizim için. Topluca yaşamaktan usandık, birkaç kuruş para da biriktirdik, bizim zamanımız geldi geri gidelim madem dedik çıkışımız da gelince. Onun dışında, çocuklarımızın özel öğretmeni vardı, hem okula gidiyorlardı hem de evde devlet öğretmen tutmuştu, okutuyordu onları, alıp dışarı çıkıp gezdiriyordu da. Biz beyimle çalışıyoruz bütün gün işte, ama öğretmenleri çocuklarımızla ilgileniyordu. Küçüktü çocuklar hemen kapıyor evde bile Türkçe yerine Almanca konuşurlardı. Bu sefer ne olacak bizim geleceğimiz diye düşünmeye başladık, isimlerimiz pasaportlarımızda Bulgarcaydı, Türkçeye değiştirmeden gitmiştik. Sonra baktık çocuklarımız da burada Almanya'da kalırsa gittikçe batıyorlar, Türklük diye birşey kalmayacak ortada, Bulgaristan'a dönme gönüllülüğümüzün de en büyük etkisi bu oldu zaten. Çocukların adı Bulgar isimleriyle zaten, dil de Almancayı konuşmak için daha çok saldıyorlardı, yarın öbürün de gün gelecek ben bu çocuklara Türk diyemem ki sonra, onlara da nasıl anlatacağım. Düşündük taşındık beyimle, dedik bu çocukların geleceği böyle olmaz, biz gidelim geri, dönelim alalım isim, ad neyse ondan sonra da göç edelim Türkiye'ye. 1993 senesinde döndük Bulgaristan'a ama Türkler, komşulardan, hısımlardan insan kalmamış hepsi göç etmiş. Tek tük insan kalmış. Yani tatsız tuzsuz birşey kalmış bıraktığımız yerler, yani insanın bu şekilde yaşayacak isteği de kalmıyor ne olacağız diye bir belirsizlik. Göç etmekten başka çare yoktu, Türkiye'ye gitmek istiyoruz ama o dönemde de sınırlar kapandı, sadece vizeyle tek kişi gidebiliyorsun. Turist vizesi veriyorlar bize de, göçmen vizesi vermiyorlar birtürlü aileme. Kaldık tabi iki sene Bulgaristan'da, belki birşeyler değişir hem diye, ama hiçbirşey daha iyiye doğru değişmedi. Biz de doğrudan Kıbrıs'a gitmeye karar verdik eşimle ikimiz. Bizim komşumuz vardı Almanya'dan dönmüştü onlarda bizim gibi, Kıbrıs'ı onlardan duyduk, vatandaşlık veriyorlarmış diye. Turist vizesi aldık 1995'te Kıbrıs'a geldik, aynı senede çocukları getirdik. O zaman da beğenmek diye birşey yok, o gözle hiç bakmadık sırf vatandaş olmaya gelmiştik. Türk topraklarından biryere vatandaş olalım dedik, fark etmez Türkiye mi Kıbrıs mı diye.

In the similar lines there have been evaluations of experiences in the interview of R. (43, M, Vocational-Technical High s.), who migrated to a Western country of Germany. However, what is different in his talk, unlike the previous three respondents that had also experienced immigration to the Western countries, is that R. explains their resending back from Germany to Bulgaria as a regrettable event. In

fact, his family reluctantly returned to Bulgaria because, to R., their living conditions in Germany were satisfying more than better. However, after they were declared, with other families as in the situation of R. that they should return to their places of origin alike, they had difficulties in adaptation because of the economic instabilities prevalent in Bulgaria after 1990's. In his migration narrative R. puts emphasis on the differences of welfare state provisions in the localities he and his family have experienced:

I came to Cyprus in 1996, and after three months period my wife came. We become citizens of Cyprus and only two years later we could bring our child to Cyprus with us. We had to migrate from Bulgaria because of only the economic insufficiency and there was no another reason. Of course, the suppressive Bulgarian state policies prominent in 1985 caused social unrest, especially among Turks where they were in great numbers. In 1992 without migrating to Turkey we migrated to Germany with my family. Germany accepted us temporarily as asylum seekers in an agreement with Bulgarian state. The German state placed us to hotels, and every month of 27th we were paid financial aid. It was like a retirement payment that we were receiving, we were quite satisfied with our life in Germany indeed. We were not feeling hunger at all, but we could stay only for 2.5 years. Afterwards, the German officials told us that democracy was prevalent in Bulgaria, the government had changed and multi-party democratic system was adopted. The new political names associated with democracy and who were in power started to be announced such as Jelyo Jeleu and Ahmed Dogan. For this reason, the German state tried to ensure us that the democracy was prevalent and we should return to our places of origin in Bulgaria, and so finally we were sent to Bulgaria. However, when we returned from Germany to Bulgaria, we started to compare the differences in the way that there was sizeable unemployment, economic crisis and depopulation in Bulgaria, which made us reconsider the migration alternative abroad to earn money again. What happened this time, living in Cyprus showed us that it is not where you are born, but where you earn your livelihood. [...] If we happened to stay in Bulgaria, I am not sure how we could provide a similar level of education to our child as in Cyprus. Our child had no difficulties in using the Turkish language or learning it in the lessons, indeed our child was successful. I believe that migration to Cyprus, besides the beneficial economic reasons for us; our child was the luckiest in this migration process in improving Turkish language, taking high quality education and thus having future prospects. This was because at the time when we were to leave Bulgaria in 1990's everything started to deteriorate, and the education system also, for example the discipline at schools was diminished. These were not problems to be questioned before at all, but now these are serious problems of Bulgaria.

1996'da geldim Kıbrıs'a, daha sonra üç ay sonra eşim geldi. Vatandaş olamadan getiremezdik vatandaş olunca çocuğumuzu da 2 sene sonra getirdik Kıbrıs'a. Etap etap göç ettik. Ekonomik nedenlerden dolayı göç etmek zorunda kaldık, başka bir sebebi yok sadece ekonomik nedenlerdi. Ama tabii 1985 yıllarında başlayan baskı dönemleri bezdirmişti insanları, özellikle Türklerin daha yoğun oldukları bölgelerde. Kötü yanı Bulgaristan'ın sadece bu asimilasyon ve baskı dönemleriydi, onun dışında problemimiz yoktu. Türkiye'ye hiç gitmeden, 1992'de Almanya'ya göç ettik ailecek bizde. Daha sonra iltica etmiş olduğumuz için yani anlaşmalı olarak Bulgaristan'la Almanlar aldılar bizi, hotellere yerleştirdiler bizi, her ayın 27'sinde yardım parası yapıyorlardı alıyorduk

paramızı. Emeklilik gibi paramız gelirdi 150 Mark paramız yatıyordu, hiç de aç kalmadık 2-2.5 sene kaldık. Daha sonra demokrasi geldi hükümet değişti Jelyo Jelev, Ahmet Doğan denildi hep Almanlar tarafından ve herkesi ve bizi de taksit taksit Bulgaristan'a çevirdiler gene. Yeni dönmüştük Almanya'dan, Bulgaristan'a da gelince bu sefer Almanyayla kıyaslamaya başladık, farkları da görünce Bulgaristan'da işsizlik, ekonomik kriz, insan kalmamış biz de tekrar yurtdışına mı gitsek para kazanmaya diye araştırmaya başlamıştık. Biz de işte kafalar karıştı o zaman ama geldik yine de ve kaldık, buradayız hala daha. Ne oldu bu sefer nerede doğduğun değil de, karnının doyduğu yer oldu burası bizim için. Adanın varlığını bile bilmezdik. [...] Bulgaristan'da kalsaydık çocuğumuzu okutabilirdiydik bilmem. Türkçe'de zorlanmadı, küçüktü geldiğimizde daha da başarılı oldu hatta okulda. Orda kalsaydık Bulgarca okuyacaktı herşeyi, iyice akli karışacaktı belki, evde Türkçe konuşuluyordu çünkü. Gelmemizde en şanslı çocuğumuz oldu bence, ekonomik sebepler de diyoruz ama çocuğumuzu da kurtardık birçok açıdan, geleceği açısından, alacağı eğitim açısından çünkü Bulgaristan'dan ayrılacağımız dönem orada herşey kötüye gitmeye başlamıştı okullar da disiplini düzeni bırakmıştı elden, şimdi bile hala sorunlar yaşıyor Bulgaristan.

N. (49, F, Vocational-Technical High s.) has been from the interview respondents, who had been suited in the Western country of Sweden and had developed friendly relations with the native population but again being obligated to return with her family to Bulgaria. She explains also how the conditions in Bulgaria in the beginning of 1990 are had worsened and they decided to emigrate from Bulgaria to a destination, where they had wished to provide better life chance opportunities for their children:

[...] We did not face any discrimination in Sweden, the children were at school and we were comfortable there. We had friends in Sweden, whom we were communicating still after we returned to Bulgaria. They came to Bulgaria on holiday and visited us even there. About 1.5 year we stayed in Sweden. Although we were well satisfied with our life in Sweden, we could not stay because of our refugee status and we were deported to Bulgaria. In 1995 my husband came first to Cyprus to take the citizenship, after a month I came and later in 1996 we brought the children. The reason why we had to migrate was to live peacefully and freely and also to provide higher education opportunity to our children. Actually, at first our thought was to take the citizenship of Cyprus and to settle to Turkey, yet we are still here. This is because the work opportunities are multiple; the social structure in Cyprus reminds us of Bulgaria that we were familiar with, rather than the difficult living conditions that we know about Turkey. On the other hand, if we happened to stay in Bulgaria, I think that we could not provide our children with a higher education, and they would not be able to find well-paid jobs, as it is the case now here.

[...]Hiç ayrımcılık görmedik İsveç'teyken, çocuklar okula gitti rahattık orada. İsveçli de arkadaşlarımız vardı hala haberleşiyoruz mesela biz İsveç'ten Bulgaristan'a döndüğümüzde orda bile gelip buldular bizi. Bir buçuk sene kadar kaldık İsveç'te, biz çok memnunduk ama işte kalamadık sınırdışı ettiler bizi mülteci olduğumuz için. Vatandaş yapıyorlarmış diye duyduk, konu komşulardan gelen gidenler vardı Kıbrıs'a. Biz de neden olmasın diye düşündük. Kıbrıs'a ilk önce eşim geldi 1995'te, bir ay sonra ben geldim daha sonra da çocukları getirdik 1996'da. Daha rahat, özgür yaşayalım, çocuklarımızı okutalım

diye göç etmek zorunda kaldık. Buraya gelme amacımız vatandaş olup Türkiye'ye yerleşmektir. Ondan sonra kaldık gittik burada. Daha iyi iş imkanları var, buranın sosyal yapısı Bulgaristan'dakine daha yakın Türkiye'den farklı mesela. Kalsaydık çocuklarımızı okutamazdık heralde. Şimdi çalıştıkları işleri bulamazlardı burada kazandıkları paraları kazanamazdılar.

5.3.3 Motivations and Experiences of Migrants directly to Northern Cyprus

In addition to the previous migration experience categories and the migration narratives, now, the final group of the immigrant respondents and their motivations factors to migrate from Bulgaria to northern Cyprus, as a place of destination will be integrated. What is preliminary with the immigrants included in this migration experience type, who had never migrated to Turkey or elsewhere, is that almost all of them had similar accounts of claiming that they chose northern Cyprus mostly just because to adopt the TRNC citizenship. This has been the case also for the previously mentioned Turkish immigrant cases, which fostered their emigration from Bulgaria on guaranteed grounds. However, in the following migration experiences, Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria are different in that all of them have not experienced routes of deportations, emigrations or returning back.

For example, in the case with the Turkish interviewed immigrant C. (44, M, Specialized Higher s.) similarly as the other male respondent immigrants has been first to migrate alone to northern Cyprus without the other family members and after being allowed to TRNC citizenship, he had brought his family also in the year of 1995. This was, depending on the other similar cases' claims, because in the beginning of 1990's border gates were closed and only tourist visas were applicable. Thus, migration passing through Turkey with the entire family members was not permitted. The male immigrant C. has been one of those who had remained and not included in the first stages of deportation policies in 1989. Yet, later he oriented himself to northern Cyprus while passing transiently from Turkey due to visa's content procedures. To C., push and pull factors in his migration narrative, basically focused on certain welfare state provisional comparison, have been as follows:

After the fall of communist regime there happened bad things such as the devastations of every state institution. For example, cooperative institutions in the rural areas were

devastated also land properties, agricultural machines and vehicles were wasted cheaply and everything was gone. As a result, people become hostile to each other, and the Turks lost again because of the majority of Bulgarians were the people who get what they wanted. Turks actually had no money, they had may be but everything was spent in the migration events. In general, we were not living within peaceful conditions, even after 1990's I did not feel myself secure anymore when we were in Bulgaria. I was feeling that every time something bad could happen to us. How heard about Cyprus was that we had a relative, who came to Cyprus in 1991 and informed us that Turkish Cypriot state was naturalizing the incoming immigrants. I came in 1995 and after my arrival I become a Cypriot citizen within 3 months. We are better here, at least for now; economically especially we are well off. The life is secure and safe, I feel myself safer here. Also, when we came here we encountered almost similar life conditions as in Bulgaria in terms of the suitable working and living environment. There were no any remarkable distinctions between Bulgaria and Cyprus. However, one of the first things that I noticed was that the police in Cyprus had no gun and this made me surprised as what a place it was in here. This had taken my attention because when confronted a police during the suppressive assimilation times in Bulgaria we were afraid and we were hiding ourselves. I can say that I am happy that we came here mainly in the name of our child because we wanted our child to have the opportunity for better education and not to face any discrimination, as it was the case in Bulgaria. I myself experienced discrimination while I was attending to the higher specialized school in Bulgaria and I think that this might be the case still today with the education system. In fact, my child has not faced any discrimination or exclusion here in Cyprus at school because she is from Bulgaria. But the case in Bulgaria was that even you enter the same exams, your success might be disregarded because of being from a Turkish ethnic origin when compared to a Bulgarian student. The other aspect is the job opportunities here in Cyprus that we can find always a job and has the chance to choose better paid or guaranteed one. I shifted how many job activities but I am sure that if I quit my job I will be able to find another one. It is not like in Bulgaria.

Sonraki yıllar yani 1989'dan sonra biraz perişan olduk, göç etmemize büyük bir etken olarak huzursuzluk veren olaylardı, ekonomik kriz vardı, insan kalmamıştı. Komünizm sonrası kötü şeyler oldu, hazırı bozdular, köy kooperatiflerini dağıttılar herkes kapan kapana, parçalayıp köylerde tarla, araç-gereçleri sattılar, ucuza, insanlar birbirine düşman oldu. Türkler yine kaybetti, neden çünkü çoğunlukla Bulgarlar aldı ne var ne yok, Türkler pek birşey alamadı çünkü Türklerde para yoktu, olan paralar göç meselelerinde harcandı çünkü. Huzursuzduk genel olarak ben Bulgaristan'da güvende hissetmiyordum kendimi artık. Sanki her an birşey olacakmış gibi, biri kapına dayanacakmış gibi yaşıyordum. Eşimin dayısı vardı, 1991 veya 1992 yılında Kıbrıs'a gelmiş bizden çok önce, seçimler zamanıymış vatandaş yapıyorlar, hemen gelin Kıbrıs'a gelecekseniz dedi bize. Bende 1995 yılında geldim, 3ay içinde Kıbrıs vatandaşı olduk zaten. Burası daha iyi şimdilik, şu anda öyle, ekonomik olarak daha rahatız burada. Hayat güvenli, güvenli hissediyorum kendimi burada. Buraya geldikten sonra aynı yaşamla karşılaştık bi fark yoktu, polislerde tabanca bile yoktu dedim allah allah ne biçim yer burası ilk o dikkatimi çekmişti geldiğimizde. Biz polis gördüğümüzde korkuyorduk, kaçıyorduk Bulgaristan'da titriyorduk o karışık zamanlarda. İyi ki gelmişim diyorum, niye geldik meselesi, çocuğumuz için geldik iyi bir eğitim alsın diye, ayrımcılıkla karşılaşmasın Bulgaristan'daki gibi diye. Zamanında bende Yüksek okula gittiğimde Bulgaristan'da ayrımcılık vardı, hala da var okullarda bence, eğitim alanında özellikle Yükseköğretimde ama burda çocuğumuz hiç ayrımcılık görmedi okulda Bulgaristanlı olduğu için. Ama Bulgaristan'da Bulgar öğrenciyle aynı sınava giriyorsun, daha başarılısındır belki ama hakettiğin notu almıyorsun, Bulgar öğrenci her zaman daha yüksek not alırdı. Diğer konu

da iş imkanımız var burada, ben kaçtane iş değiştirdim, bugün bıraksam işimi eminim yarın yine bulurum iş imkanı var, Bulgaristan'daki gibi değil.

On the other hand, A. (46, M, Basic High s.) focuses more on the details of social unrest during the suppressive policies during the communist regime in Bulgaria. In his migration narrative also it is obvious that there is an affirmative attitude towards the extended welfare provisions, which will be elaborated in the next chapter, provided during the communist regime. However, in general conditions the explanations of A. again make reference to the emphases put on the exclusionary content of [social] citizenship based on ethnic backgrounds, which was a result of the suppressive assimilation policies directed against Turks. That was how the settled regularity of A., and the other Turkish immigrant cases, in terms of working and living conditions had been disrupted in their places of origin in Bulgaria. Similarly, with the previous immigrant cases, in the name of children's well being in the future and their not being influenced somehow from the degenerated state-society relations in Bulgaria migration decision become intact. Importantly, A., unlike the previous immigrant respondents, is one who has been involved with his family into a late migration in 1999 to northern Cyprus, and the details of his migration narrative are as follows:

[...] The life in Bulgaria ceased to exist actually after 1989 for us, where we were living. Job opportunities expired, we remained alone, the children remained alone, and thus we started to think how we can save our children and fell in to the migration roads. The period of suppressive state policies devastated the people and their everyday life regularity, in fact. I remember the nights that we could not fall asleep during these times. We could not lighten up the rooms of our houses because we were afraid not to be noticed by the army patrols that possibly might take my brothers, who were not working and to sent them to work in distant Bulgarian localities. This was the case usually that people, who were out of work were arrested and sent away from their villages to work for the state. You were to work for little money or even payless and appointed for job activities with unhealthy conditions by the state. These were places such as Kozloduy where the people were working in poisonous environments and there always had a high possibility those people never to return back home. These regulations started in 1984 and we could not go outside home and walk freely around. This lasted for 5 to 6 years until 1989. When remembering all about these, surely I could not think of myself back again in Bulgaria, though our entire life passed there. Of course, I can accept that the communist system had affirmative sides as well in such that we had our entire social beneficiary rights, but we could not endure the cultural and religious assimilations directed against us. [...] It was only in 1996 when I could arrange to come here to Cyprus. None of any state arrangements brought us here, but we on our own came here with the tourist visas. We lived in boarding houses altogether with the other immigrants after our arrival to Cyprus

and everybody was waiting to take the citizenship. Finally, we became citizens then altogether, after that I brought my wife and the children in 1999 to Cyprus. [...] We escaped from Bulgaria actually and came here to obtain the citizenship of northern Cyprus, and to settle in Turkey because all our relatives are there. However, in such a case, we might be required a permission to stay since we are not citizens of Turkey and thus we will fall into the category of run-away foreigners. This will create problems to my family and the children that is why we were obliged to stay here for now and adapt to the work and the social environment.

1989'dan sonra hayat bitmiş oldu bizim oralarda. Yani işler bitti, yalnız kaldık, çocuklar yalnız kaldı çocukları nasıl kurtarırsın diye düşünmeye başladık düştük yollara tabi. Bu baskı dönemi de mahvetti milleti ve düzenlerini. Bizim uyumadığımız geceler de çok oldu o baskı dönemlerinde. Lamba yanardı mesela ama battaniyelerle pencereleri kaplardık dışarıdan gözükmesin ışık diye, kardeşlerim işsizdi korkuyorduk onları asker alır da uzaklara gönderir diye. Asker kontrol yapardı apar topar sorgulardı kimi boşta görürse kim kimdir nerede çalışıyor diye. Boşta görürse de seni gönderiyor seni köyünden uzaklara devlete hizmet etmeye çalışmaya, az paraya çalışıyordun, veya hiç para vermezlerdi. O da iyi yerlere göndermiyordu zaten, devlet nereye yerleştirirse Kozlodu'y'a mesela zehirli yere. Sonra o adam geri ya döndü ya dönemedi belli değil yani. 1984'te başladı bu baskılar, sokağa çıkamıyordun çok zorluk çekmiştik. Boşta gezmek yasak. Beş sene, altı sene 1989'a kadar devam etti bu iş. İnsan hatırladıkça zaten merağı kalmıyor, canı istemiyor, hayatımız orada geçti belki ama. Bu Komünizmin iyi yanları da vardı, bütün haklarımız vardı ama şu namusuna dokunmak var ya o kötüydü işte. [...] Ancak 1996'da geldim buraya Kıbrıs'a da. Turist vizesiyle geldik yani devlet getirmede bizi. Biz pansiyonlarda topluca kalıyorduk vatandaş yapıyorlardı herkesi o zaman. Böyle toptan vatandaş oluyordu herkes. 1999'da çocuklar ve eşim geldi. [...] Türkiye'ye yerleşme merağımız vardı, bütün akrabalarımız orada. Bulgaristan'dan buraya kaçtık, geldim burada vatandaşlık veriyorlar diye, şimdi Türkiye'ye gidecek olsak orada kaçak olacağız oturma izniyle kalmak lazım heralde, git uğraş yine. Ailem razı oldu, mecbur kaldı burada kalmaya şimdilik, iş güç yer de edindik az çok.

In similar lines, in the interview with K. (52, M, Basic High s.) there is a pinpoint made to the lack or presence of a right to live in safety and freedom based on equal opportunities in the case of Bulgaria and northern Cyprus, which is also among the concerns of social citizenship. That is how K. describes very briefly his thoughts with own words:

I want to state that the migration that we were involved in was a forced and involuntary one. In fact, it was originated as a result of the suppressive Bulgarian state policies and not because of the economic deteriorations that become prevalent after 1990's. [...] In the big migration events in 1989 we preferred and migrated directly to Cyprus. I had known Cyprus and it was not an unknown place to me. Since these citizenship issues happen to be heard, we came and become citizen of Cyprus in 1990. I felt myself freer when I came here; I found the freedom here. I am not discriminated because I am a Turk; the suppressive environment experienced in Bulgaria is not prevalent in here. The people are more warm-hearted here in Cyprus, but the most importantly what makes me happier here is the state of being free.

Buraya göçün zorunlu göçünü ele alacaksa hiç ekonomik sorunlardan dolayı değildi. Aksine devlet baskılarından dolayı kaynaklanan bir zorunlu göçtü bizimki. [...] Biz’de göç olaylarında 1989’da direk Kıbrıs’a geldik, Türkiye’ye hiç gitmedik, Kıbrıs’ı tercih ettim. Bilirdim Kıbrıs’ı hep, hiç bilinmedik bir yer olmadı bizim için. Ondan sonra bu vatandaşlık konuları çıktı, biz de geldik vatandaş ettiler bizi 1990’da. Özgür hissettim kendimi buraya gelince, özgürlüğümü burada buldum. Oradaki baskı yok burada tabi, Türk olduğum için ayrımcılık görmüyorum. İnsanları daha sıcak burada. Özgürlüğümüze kavuştuk, beni en çok mutlu eden şey budur.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has aimed to integrate the overall different migration experiences among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who chose as a final place of destination northern Cyprus. In fact, in the sake for this thesis, this chapter and its parts have been merely to build a sociological migration description, which is deliberated to understand the course of event relations by means of migration narratives divided into three migration experience categories. In every interview talk specific events and dates have been explicitly emphasized because it is observed that only then the migration process reveals determinants of “push-pull” factors to migrate. At first glance, these experiences have been significant in referring to “push-pull” factors of different kinds and with various connotations. That is how in the light of these descriptions immigrant Turks from Bulgaria have tried to make their decisions reasonable and meaningful while reevaluating their migration narratives. These have been significant experiences in the migration processes since the Turkish immigrant male and female interview respondents have comprised first hand estimable migration information necessary for the discussions throughout this thesis. Additionally, to mention it again, these interview respondents are the first generation Turkish immigrant families from Bulgaria.

Having presented migration narrative samples in the preceding parts, several notifications will be necessary to outline related with the specific immigrant/migration characteristics. Firstly, it has been obvious that the entire immigrant research sample of this thesis, comprised of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, has been focused on the involuntary migration kind that they grounded their motivations for migration factors. In theory, the immigrants’ situational

descriptions so far might be equating predominantly with the two types of involuntary migration experiences, which are *involuntary forced migration* and *involuntary impelled migration*. Theoretically again it is argued that a migrant called for such obligatory types of migration might be within a status of *allocate*, (*indentured laborer*), (*political*) *refugee*, *displaced persons*, *socially displaced* or *ecologically displaced* who are migrants potential to leave their places of origin due to terror of possible persecution out of ethno-political reasons, fear of war or ecological natural disasters (Standing, 1984). Thus, in the case with this thesis research sample, those exposed to the first stage of Turkish deportations directed by the communist state regime in Bulgaria, Turkish immigrants were in a status of a refugee when they were obliged to cross borders to different destinations in 1989-1990. This is the case with those who directed their move to the Western countries of Sweden and Germany and tried to supply a shelter and protection to themselves. Besides, the various lived experiences are referring also to the *impelled* nature of the migration. This is because; unlike the forced involuntary migration type, the Turkish immigrants had to decide for a destination place to migrate on their own will. In the case with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, who perceived Turkey as an actual mainland ready for shelter in 1989 deportations were disappointed because of adaptation difficulties to the working and living conditions in Turkey, or because of family separations, then, in no way they were obligated to return back to Bulgaria on their own volitions. On the other hand, migration flows, which have occurred after the fall of communist regime during 1990's, particularly directed to northern Cyprus, seem to be as if *voluntary* out migrations. This is relevant also with the "free will" of a potential immigrant to determine on its push/pull factors made as part of a progress towards a goal to migrate. Yet, in regards with the respondents' migration narratives, they all have regretted about their involuntary *obligation* to migrate because they have had to leave their all possessions and accumulations in their familiar, since birth, social regularity in the places of origin in Bulgaria.

Secondly, another prominent characteristic among the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria at present living in northern Cyprus is their migrant web of linkages through which they had decided on northern Cyprus as a destination place. Briefly to

mention, the first immigrant Turkish newcomers from Bulgaria usually between the years of 1989-1992, who came relying on the invitation of R. R. Denktaş welcoming to shelter and provide protection, might be theoretically matching the definition of *active migrants* benefited from Standing (1984). These active Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria were first to be familiarized with the social environment in northern Cyprus. In case of finding northern Cyprus as an agreeable and preferable to live and work, somehow they significantly had been playing an informant role for the next new immigrant waves of friends and relatives from Bulgaria. In the case with the research sample in this thesis, Turkish immigrants being able to move to northern Cyprus after 1992's might be called as *passive migrants* because of their reliance on the first-hand detailed information about the life on the island gained through the active (first comer) migrants' web of communications. In addition to these, immigrant Turks, who preferred northern Cyprus as a destination place seeking better living opportunities, being absent and this disturbing their everyday life regularity in Bulgaria could be defined as *long-term migrants*. This is, to Standing (1984), the "real" migrant type significant for interpretative analysis in regards with manifold dimensions, both in the places of origin and destination. Since immigrant Turks from Bulgaria migrated to northern Cyprus and have been living there for 10-15 years, they supposedly might be termed as long-term migrants. Even though, depending on the research data findings, the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria have left their places of origin and shifted their social, economic, and cultural life it is difficult to decide whether their migration is temporary or permanent in content. This duality will be notified in the next chapters and according to the discussions to be integrated the reasons for this will make a comprehensive sense.

Thirdly, and finally, considering the migration process that the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria have been involved and pinpointed in this chapter, there have been manifold *push-pull* factors explained by them. These have been focused on relevant discussions in regards with their status in certain 'contracted' state-society relations before migration to Bulgaria and after migration to northern Cyprus. In regards with the first wave migration flows, it is obvious that the migration motivations have been out of political reasons of persecution towards Turks in

Bulgaria. On the contrary, keeping this still in mind, respondents in the research sample have tended to compare their lived migration narratives in terms of possibilities to live and work in safety in the places of origin and host countries, where they sought shelter and protection. In all likelihood, there has been an evaluation of differences and similarities according to the shift of lifestyles they had undergone as a family. In these regards, it is striking that the main idea in the shift of lifestyles evaluations corresponds with the (changing) citizenship practices also, when the migration narratives have been elaborated sociologically neatly. Before all, this is firstly because, taking into consideration the “pull” factors to migrate to northern Cyprus, all of the Turkish immigrant respondents had pointed out their primary wish to take their families to northern Cyprus only in case of permission to TRNC citizenship. This must be a maneuver made as part of progress toward a goal, which is to have right for a guaranteed status membership in a welfare society. Of course, all these immigrants obtained TRNC citizenship in the name of socially contracted protection, as an escape from the uneasiness in these terms prevalent in Bulgaria even still today. Nevertheless, international and domestic controversies about the legal and political recognition of northern Cyprus give an incentive for attentiveness immigrant Turks from Bulgaria to keep and maintain close attachments to their Bulgarian citizenship status as well.

It is evident that the immigrant respondents have described particularly the differences considering at least the three social spaces (Bulgaria, Turkey and northern Cyprus) with what was/is lacking ‘there/here’ and what was/is present, or possessed ‘there/here’. Thus, all the *lacking* and *present* aspects specified in all of the migration narratives such as the aspects of living in safety, working under guaranteed conditions, providing better education opportunities, having health care assurances and children’s future prospects are all explanatory with the social citizenship approaches and aspects. On the other hand, migration narratives have indicated how social citizenship experiences influence in a parallel way the self-identifications and cultural boundary formations of the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria. That is, having citizenship status membership to a certain political community might foster the identity sentiments of *belongingness* in a specified locality, space, or situational

background of relationships and interactions. Additionally, shared in commonality relations and the interactions among the immigrant Turks, who live in northern Cyprus at present create “recognition of a ‘sense of us’ and community stems from the awareness that things are done differently *there*, and the sense of threat that poses for how things are done *here*”(Jenkins, 2004:111). These will be thesis topics to be discussed in the following chapter discussions.

Having evaluated the summarized notifications and peculiarities related with the migration narratives of Turkish immigrant interview respondents from Bulgaria integrated so far, the central standpoint of discussion in this thesis will be restated together with the research data to be integrated in the succeeding chapters’ parts. Now, in the next two chapters there will be specifications respectively of concrete socio-economic conditions and the socio-cultural relations based on lived experiences of the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria.

CHAPTER 6

EXPERIENCES OF IMMIGRANT TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN TERMS OF SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP DYNAMICS IN THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION

6.1 Introduction

In regards with the actual aim of this thesis, depending on the research data findings, in this chapter the socio-economic conditions of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria will be specified in three broader themes. These are the labor market participation, social security services and property ownership. They are the specified areas, through which they are supposedly to help to interpret and discuss the changing [social] citizenship experiences as a result of migration factor also. This chapter will include lived experience samples of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria and their living and working conditions in the presence of continuities of citizenship practices with before and after migration.

6.2 Socio-Economic Conditions of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria

Having stated the general introductory part, briefly to mention, the three broader themes will refer to welfare state provisions analysis. This will be in the way that labor market participation will include subjects like occupation choice, wage patterns and the general economic conditions. Secondly, the social security services will include subjects such as distributive social rights of old age pensions, access to health services, unemployment compensations and other social security assurances. Finally, property ownership data findings will be referring to the unmovable properties, accommodation and housing that the state provisions tend to allow. As it is obvious, these are all determinants of social citizenship practices and concerns of welfare state provisions to provide equal opportunities to live and work in safety and guaranteed status. In addition to, the end result of this chapter will be to clarify the contracted relation between the state and the members of it in reference to the

conceptions of citizenship whether it is inclusive or exclusive and on what bases. These will be pinpointed in the case of immigrants Turks while taking into consideration their citizenship practices in the place of origin Bulgaria and place of destination northern Cyprus and to grasp the subjects of socially “engaged citizenship” in the presence of migration factor also.

6.2.1 Labor Market Participation

One of the social citizenship determinants is labor market participation, which will include the closely related variable of education also. The comparative analysis of labor market participation will help to see differences between the conditions in the place of origin and the place of destination. It is meaningful to understand whether a shift is prevalent after the process of migration in regards with occupation and economic well being paying attention to the education through which it might be provided. Noteworthy, in the following interview quotes, the distinction should be made between the occupation and the work activity. For example, while there will be statements, explaining the occupation type of an immigrant respondent and the work activity in the place of origin Bulgaria, in the northern Cypriot conditions only the work activity will be considered. This is because the first-generation Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria, usually between the ages of 35-65, have not taken any additional occupational specialization courses or education after their migration to northern Cyprus. All in all, these will be regarded in certain ‘micro’ state-society relations, or contracted relations since there is interrelatedness among education, occupation, work activity and the economic status of livelihood with state provisions also. These are subject matters to understand labor market participations among Turkish immigrants in their places of origin Bulgaria and in the destination of northern Cyprus.

For example, T. (53, M, Technical High s.) is a small enterprise factory worker responsible in the production process in northern Cyprus. He is well satisfied with the working conditions and his salary in general. Even so, he and his wife have been doing additional temporary work activities besides their permanent jobs. This

is, to T., not because of to earn much more money for buying a new car, or a house but due to financing their children, whom they provide opportunity to attend university and take higher specialized degree in the future. Although he likes his job in northern Cyprus, T. is complaining about it lacking the preliminary must essentials, which were prevalent in the general workforce in Bulgaria. The immigrant respondent T. defines them in terms of discipline, quality and respect between employers and employees, and among employees themselves. To T., it is how he explains below his educational background and the mismatching of work activity before and after migration for various reasons:

I studied for an instrument and process technician, including iron turnery and frieze. My higher school education lasted for 4 years. I was a successful student at school, I was satisfied with my specialization interest field and enjoyed everything what I had been learning. I regret that I have not had any opportunity to practice my specialization since then. I was a truck driver after I finished the high school in Bulgaria instead. I did not prefer to be a driver in fact, but because this was one of the limited choices that the state was motivating people in the rural areas. There were additional monthly short-term education courses and after that you could receive a certificate and start to work in a more appropriate relevant state institution. I worked for the most part as a driver of heavy motor trucks in my village and unfortunately I could not work as a specialized instrument technician. This was because Bulgaria provided disciplined, fine quality education during Communist regime but had no developed industry. Thus, I could not perform what I had learned and got specialized in actually in the right work place. Before 1989 there was no any private institution to work in, everybody was working for the state; everybody was a civil servant working in various state institutions. And as everybody I was working in a state institution in the village rural cooperation. Since, we were living in the village we had additional work activities as well as, tobacco planting, and other agricultural products, animal farming for use and profit, and gardening as well. After the fall of Communist system in 1989 everything collapsed in the rural settings, and the well working the most prominent state institutions during Communism had vanished. After that everybody had to work whatever it was prevalent then and with lower wages and under these conditions I became a post officer in the village after 1989 until we came here to Cyprus. Besides, I believe that I was able to do so, because the education system in Bulgaria and the discipline taught us to do whatever job it is and wherever it might be and proved us opportunity of such way of looking. I think that thinking in this way also makes an individual successful and adaptable to the new environment.

Torna ve friz, soğuk demirin işlenmesi (instrument engineering on turnery and frieze) ile ilgili eğitim aldım. 4 yıl lise eğitimi aldım bu konu üzerine. Okulumda, derslerimde de başarılıydim keşke eğitim aldığım mesleğimi yapabileseydim seviyordum da eğitim aldığım alanı ama olmadı. Şoför olduk, bu işi seçtim değil o vardı o zaman, zaten devletin açtığı kurslar olurdu herkes kendini belli bir alanda yetiştirmek için kurslara gidiyordu. Köyde yaşayanlar için en geçerli neyse orada işe başlayıp çalışıyordu. Bulgaristanda şoförlük yaptım ama en fazla, teknisyen gibi çalışamadık o imkanımız yoktu. Büyük sanayi kuruluşları maalesef ki yoktu, eğitim aldık ama istenilen yerde yani olması gerektiği gibi icra edemedik mesleğimizi. Şoförlük dimperli kamyonla yaptım, inşaat sıvı beton ve

malzemeleri taşıyorduk. 1989 yılından önce özel sektör yoktu, devlete çalışılırdı ben de devlete, devlet kuruluşlarında, köy kooperatiflerinde herkes gibi çalışıyorduk. 1989'dan sonra herşey yıkıldı, kalmadı komunizmdeki en çok çalışan devlet kuruluşları, bende postacı gibi çalıştım kendi köyümde, 1989'dan sonra da en son o işi yaptım onu da bırakıp Kıbrıs'a geldik sonra. Başka ek işlerle de uğraştık, hiç durmadık ki. Köyde yaşadığımız için, tütüne giderdin, hayvancılık, bahçcilik hepsi vardı. Kendi işlerimize ayrı gidiyorduk, eve gelince işten de tarlaya gidiyorsun, mecburi çalışman lazım herkesin tarlada tütününü vardı düzen öyleydi. Biz buraya Kıbrıs'a gelince ayrıca eğitim almadık zaten yaşlar da ilerliyor artık alıp ne yapacaksan o yüzden bulduğun işe sıkı sarılıp bildiklerini uygulayabilirsen başarılı da oluyorsun. Çünkü, Bulgaristan'da o zamanki eğitim sistemi bizlere her yerde iş yapabileme imkanı üzerine kurulu bir eğitim sistemiydi.

According to the evaluations made by A. (46, M, Basic High s.) somehow he was enjoying his occupation in Bulgaria. He attended a high school in Bulgaria based on tourism with an intensive foreign language of German. He explains that he had worked as a barman and waiter or receptionist in hotels, but he could not complete his education for a tourist counselor and study for two more years. What A. makes a distinction of is his working in state bounded firms and the guaranteed status of his job in the tourism sector. After the fall of communist regime he has explained that he continue to work in relevance with his occupation for his own benefit in a restaurant in his village hired from a state institution. He states that almost 12 years in total he had been forking in guaranteed work positions and earned well. Additionally, he had been dealing with profitable job activities prevalent in the rural life. He gives examples of collecting, alternative medicine leaves, various plants or fruits or dealing with farm animals, which, to him, was a significant necessity in order to live on in the rural environment. Also, A. puts emphasis on how after migration to northern Cyprus, the work activity performance and the workforce environment, quoted below by him, have changed in a disappointing manner, which could be added to the citizenship discussion analysis in terms of its exclusionary content:

Here in Cyprus I am a worker in the construction sector. I am dealing especially with painting and insulating. I am not doing a job that I specialized on and took my education. Actually, I applied once to the Bulgarian Turkish association for a proper job relevant with our education background. They found a job to me that I was offered to work as garbage collector in the municipality as a civil servant. I regret that I did not accept the job of a garbage collector because it is one of the well paid guaranteed jobs in Cyprus. But this was the job that was hired only by the Roma people in Bulgaria. The aim of the Bulgarian state was to provide job to the Roma people, who were with no education, diplomas or who were thieves not to allow them look around. Thus, to tell the truth, the suggestion to work as a garbage collector made me feel insulted. However, it was a

promising job in Cyprus since it was a civil servant job activity with a guaranteed salary and the social security rights. Yet, I did not accept it then and I did not realize it in this way that the garbage collectors are taking guaranteed salaries twice as much from the salary that I am earning now. This was an example of mine, but many Bulgarian Turks having specializations could not work in their areas. There was a primary school teacher that I know personally and she was not able to become a primary school teacher here in Cyprus despite her Cypriot citizenship.

Burada izolasyon, boya inşaat işiyle uğraşyoruz. Aldığım eğitimle de hiçbir alaka yok şimdi yaptığım işle. Sözde buradaki Bulgaristan Türkleri'nin derneğine gitmiştik yazdılar ne okumuşum Bulgaristan'da ona göre iş bulacaklardı, sonra aslında buldular iş, Belediyede işe gir çöpçü gibi dediler. İstemedik bizde o zaman ama pişmanım şimdi çünkü devlet işi, garanti iş ama bizim Bulgaristan'da çöpçülük işlerini Çingeneler yapardı eğitimsiz diplomasız olanlar, ağır geldi bize de. Bizim Bulgaristan'da Çingeneler hırsız olanları da vardı, onlara böyle işler verirlerdi ki etraflarına çok çok bakınmasın. Ama olmadı işte, ne bilelim adamlar şimdi benden iki misli fazla maaş alıyor. Ama sadece ben değilim çok insan var Bulgaristanlılardan okuduğunu mesleğini yapamadılar. Öğretmen bir arkadaş vardı vatandaş ta buraya ama öğretmen olamadı. Kimse faydalanamdı pek bu işten, vatandaşlıktan diplomalardan. Hiç memnun değilim şimdiki işimden, ama mecbur çalışacaksınız. Ben işimi severek çalışmıyorum ki burada. Şimdi çalışma koşullarımıza bakınca benim mesela işim zor, pis iş zehirli malzemelerle uğraşyorum, onu hergün yutuyoruz. Bugün yarın hastalıklar başlayacak, sakatlanacağız bir gün. Ama kimin umrunda ya çalışırsın ya gidersin, daha iyi iş bulabilirsen git diyecek adam sana. Bizim aslında memnun olacağımız iş yok, yani bizim yaptığımız işler buranın yerlisinin bilmediği işler. Almanya'da, İngiltere'deki Türkler ne yapıyor mesela oradaki göçmenler, oradaki yerlilerin, bilmediği etmediği işleri yapıyor onlar da ama onlar paralarını alıyor bari, yaptığı işin karşılığını alıyor. Özel sektör olması da sakat iş yani yarın işsiz de kalabilirsin iş bitince. Bugün 5 kişiye sek aynı işi yapan, yarın 10 öbür gün hiç de olmayabilir. O kadar da zor değil bu iş yani biri çıksa hemen yenisi bulunur. Ama ne oluyor eski işçi olunca onlar bu sefer zam istemeye başlıyor vermeyince de bırakıyor eski işçi yenisi geliyor razı o mesela maaşına sonra o da itiraz edince hadi sende git diyor işveren. İdare ediyoruz, ama iyecek içecek şimdilik bol ise sorun yok, geçiniyoruz.

In similar lines, S. (44, M, Vocational-Technical High s.) has explained that he worked as a turner in the village state cooperation and was satisfied with the conditions prevalent then in Bulgaria. Yet, he has emphasized that after the fall of communist regime working conditions and earnings had deteriorated. On the other hand, similarly with the previous immigrant respondent, he has much concerned with his working environment in northern Cyprus dissatisfying in content. Also, the immigrant quotation below stated by S. might equate with the discussions of unequal and exclusive conceptions to citizenship as a result of migration.

I work as a driver-distributor here. It is a job of being a carrier/porter actually. I started as a driver in a private firm but I am doing various tasks besides being a driver. What I am not satisfied with the work conditions here is the inequalities between the job task performed and the salary amounts when we consider a native Turkish Cypriot and a

Bulgarian Turk in my workplace. I am witnessing that there is an uneven and unjust mismatch of these. There are people, who started to work after me, in the firm that I am working and they are taking now much more fulfilling salaries without doing anything but because of being natives. It is prominent also that some of the employees are the relatives of the firm owner having close relations with the political party in power also and they have higher wages and simple tasks and usually office work. I am considering myself that I have no any relations with any political party or any powerful family relations here in Cyprus, thus I am doing all kinds of jobs, earning lower wage and I can not protest for this in any way. I am pleased only that we pay lower price to our rented accommodation and my family can still live on by doing always calculations not to exceed our spending.

Dağıtımçı şoförüm burada. Hammalçılık aslında, özel şirkette şoför diye başladık ama herşeyi yapıyoruz. Diğer konu ben kendime bakıyorum birde yerlilere Kıbrıslılara, yaptığımız işlere birde kazançlara, çok haksızlıklar var. Benden sonra başlayanlar oldu işe ama benden fazla maaş alıyor iş yaptığı da yok. Bilmem hangi parti yönetimdeyse onun adamları geliyor bizim arkamız yok diye ben ne tahsilat parası alıyorum nede şoförlük yani şikayet etmeye kalkarsam o da olmuyor. Benden sonra gelen adam vardı partiden geldi benden fazla para alıyor bir iş yaptığı da yok. Çok memnun değilim, adaletsizlik var diye ama başka çare de yok. İdare ediyoruz işte, kiraya az veriyoruz öbürtürlü zor geçiniyorduk. Kiramız, elektriğimiz fazla olmazsa geçiniyoruz, devamlı hesap kitap yapıyoruz fazla olursa geçinemeyiz heralde.

These immigrant respondents who have been mentioned so far are participating in the labor market in the private sector firms in northern Cyprus. Thus, they all tend to complain the side effects of the free market economy and the inequalities created, and thus fostered by the citizenship conceptions that will be mentioned in the discussion. This complains prevail supposedly because they all were civil servants in Bulgaria because of the communist regime sanctions. In these regards, almost the entire immigrant Turks from Bulgaria has been satisfied with their working conditions because the welfare state provisions always had protected them. What the immigrant Turks criticizes is the non-guaranteed working conditions in the private workforce despite the fact that the contracted membership to the northern Cypriot state community is apparent. On the other hand, there are few civil servant workers in the northern Cyprus among the immigrant respondents, who actually emphasize the reliance on the beneficiary and privileged status of the working conditions, hours, vacancies and other socio-economic provisions.

For example, R. (40, M, Secondary s.) has no any specific profession because of his lacking attendance to high school when he was in Bulgaria. He had done seasonal jobs in Bulgaria, such as working in the constructing sector or a driver, and

was satisfied with the earnings. He states that the only problem when leaving to work out of home was the separation from family. Now, he explains that in northern Cyprus he is a civil servant that is worker in a municipality institution and being happy with this. According to his statements below working as a civil servant is the most demanding in northern Cyprus, since the guaranteed provisions of the state are always available. He adds that being a state or civil servant is the most comfortable job in northern Cyprus and having the flexible work activities and work hours and still advantageous in guaranteed position and wage salaries. The same is also with G. (43, F, Basic High s.), who was a tailor in a state firm and after migration she is doing cleaning in the state institution, upon which G. quitted her domestic cleaning job. She claims that she found the comfort with all the provisional guarantees as she was working in a state bounded institution in Bulgaria. In similar lines, A. (56, M, Specialized High s.) is a civil servant and he defines the civil servant as privileged and suited guaranteed position as such:

I am quite satisfied with my working conditions here in Cyprus. I have no any complaints about it. Since my job is being a civil servant in a state institution, my social security services are guaranteed and I have all the conditions at work that I can hope for. Actually, being a civil servant is the most agreeable and guaranteed job that someone could do in Cyprus. Here in Cyprus almost all the native Turkish Cypriots are civil servants in different official institution posts. We were lucky enough to catch this chance to be a civil servant in Cyprus and our civil servant wages are more than satisfying now.

Hiçbir şikayetim yok işimden dolayı, sosyal güvencemden dolayı. Bütün istediğim koşullar işimde var zaten burada da. Memnunum burada zaten memur olarak çalışıyorsan Kıbrıs'ta çok rahatsın. Kıbrıslıların çoğu ya memur, yada kendi işleri var. Zamanında biz de o şansı yakaladık, memur olduk iyiz yani. Geçinecek kadar paramız var, fazlasıyla iyi maaşlarımız.

Besides, the divisions between the unequal working conditions in the private and public sector in terms of provisional guarantees in regards with the conditions in northern Cyprus. On the other hand, there are also exclusionary citizenship matters in regards with the ethnic connotations and unequal treatments in labor market participation. For instance, one of them is K. (52, M, Basic High s.) has explained that his profession is an electricity technician, but pointing how he had to choose and study in this field because there were no any other opportunities provided for Turks in Bulgaria. Now, in northern Cyprus he is running his own business in a small-scale

flexible enterprise and defines himself as a manager working for his own benefit. He defines the unequal treatments in the labor market, despite his citizenship membership to Bulgaria:

I studied for an electrical technician at high school for three years. The choice of occupation was not depending to the person but to the conditions and the social environment. People were tending to do jobs, which were introduced by the state regulations. For example, Turks were allowed to have usually jobs and occupations such as driver, electrical technician, or construction worker. Besides, as our specializations we always had livestock breeding and agriculture. We were earning to the extend that we were to earn and live on. The Communist regime based the education system to teach a people a particular profession. People then were obliged to like their jobs and statuses, because there were no other choices to obtain opportunity to live on. It was common that the Turks were not motivated or not permitted to take positions of managing directorates. You could not choose your field of work and you were to accept of what you were appropriated by the state offices.

3 sene lise eğitimi gördüm. O zaman durumlar onu gerektirirdi, biz de elektrikçi olalım dedik. Türklere başka birşey vermezleri ki zaten, ya şoför olacak, ya elektrikçi olacak, ya sıvacı olacak bunlardı yani. Hayvancılık tarımcılık da vardı iş hayatımızda, onlar hep vardı. Geçinecek kadar kazanırdık, ister istemez geçinmek zorundasın. Komünizm doğrudan meslek öğretiyordu. Mecburen seveceksin işini başka türlü geçinecek fırsatın olmazdı, başka çaren yok. Türklere genel müdürlük verilmiyor mesela. Devlet memur görevlileri ona göre seçerdi insanları, yoksa seçemezsin sen kendi alanını ne verilirse ona razı olacaksın.

Finally, to take into account the opinions of the male respondent of R. (43, M, Vocational-Technical High s.) he is complaining the present situations in northern Cyprus in notifying the social citizenship practices in exclusionary terms after migration. His explanations were common also among the other immigrants, who were identifying themselves with latent conditions of “second-class citizenship”.

I feel excluded here in northern Cyprus no matter wherever we are participating in the work activities, be it even in the most prestigious ones in the military offices or civil servant occupations in the public sector. This is my general opinion because even so, the native Turkish Cypriots accepted our wives as domestic cleaners, and the husbands as distributor-drivers. However, they do not try to understand that we are obligated to do these jobs, and not because of accepting them already as if always working in such low-graded jobs in Bulgaria. Turkish Cypriots never accepted us as themselves, but being aparted as always different from them. The native people here in northern Cyprus value with money and economic statuses, and not because of education, or the successfully proper jobs. There is a widespread understanding as if you are an immigrant, this means automatically you are poor and deprived and even insufficient for merit and valuable things. Actually, our people, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, should be complained since there are people accepting the prevalent conditions easily without question and creating such subordinated images in front of the native community.

Kendimi dışlanmış hissediyorum, sonuç olarak biz nerede de çalışsak askerde de olsak, devlet işinde memur da olsak Kıbrıslılar karılarımızı temizlikçi, kocalarımızı da dağıtımçı şoför zannediyor. Bizim insanlarımız bu işleri mecbur olduğu için yapıyor halbuki, sanki hayatımız boyunca insanlarımız hep bu gibi işlerle uğraşmış gibi. Bizi hiçbir zaman kendileri gibi kabul etmediler. Kıbrıslılar burada insanları parayla ölçüyor, senin tahsilin veya yaptığın güzel işlerle değil. Nerdeyse sen göçmensin, fukara demek ki ahmaksın diye düşünüyorlar. Bizim Bulgaristanlılar da ama bazı şeyleri kabul ediyor böyle imaj yaratıyor, yani kendi insanımızda suç var biraz da.

To continue with another area where the state provisions will become evident in what way they function in the contracted relation between the state and the members of it, is the specification of evaluating the social security services in general.

6.2.2 Social Security Services

In this part comparative data based information will be integrated in terms of social security services referring to the health, education and the other social security state allowances in general. Important to state, immigrant respondents have made straight divisions between works in the public and the private sector, as notified before, in northern Cyprus. Almost all of them emphasize privileges of working in state institutions, since the wages are guaranteed and higher, suspension of work allowed in certain instances, and possibility of suitable work hours. It is argued that these conditions are rarely met in the private sector work places. Although, the social security depending on the TRNC citizenship is to be provided by the employer in the private sector, immigrant respondents have argued that there are private firms not responding to the social policy regulations, such as the usual problem with the minimal wage determined by the state. Also, the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria have made the distinction that since they were working to the state as civil servants in Bulgaria, they were not worried about their social rights at all. Moreover, access to health services and education were provided to all citizens and their rights were not violated. In fact, they compare their conditions in Bulgaria, prevalent during communism and after that, to these in northern Cyprus at present. They state that they earn as much as to their basic needs, their social rights are protected yet, their

positions in the work statuses are not guaranteed since the private sector is not promising this. The problem and the specification with the private sector is important because almost all the immigrant Turks tended to be hired in the private sector rather than the public.

There were prevalent general pleasant conditions in Bulgaria before Turkish immigrants' migration from Bulgaria; almost all stated about their socially secured citizenship statuses. Important to point out, these were the conditions presented during the communist regime when the immigrant Turks were actively involved into the workforce while having extended social rights. It is evident that after the fall of communist regime and not smooth politically, economically and socially, as mentioned, transition to democracy, all the social security services have been put in to different regulations. And that is why the immigrant respondents stated that the social security benefits once they had are not prevalent anymore and they were the obligatorily guaranteed conditions associated with the communist regime regulations. However, while they were satisfied with these conditions in Bulgaria, the suppressive assimilation policies also prevalent during communist regime towards the Turks were complained. For example, S. (45, F, Basic High s.) points this in summary as such:

We had our social security in Bulgaria and the state provided everything in this sense. Nobody was in worry about such things because everybody had the social security rights. During the Communist regime, people were not in need to claim something, which was lacking then. Even the future of our children was guaranteed by the state and we had not been given the opportunity to think and worry about these. We only had the problem of deciding where to go on holiday, which was allowed every year. I was satisfied in the working conditions and the social security that I have no any complains about then. This was relevant with the Communist regime when we were there and lived under this regime that the state regulations were rigid to secure, guarantee and comfort the citizen. These were the lived things, which were satisfying the people then until the time that the suppressive policies had prevailed and destroy our regularity.

Sigortan vardı orada mesela, herşeyini zaten devlet karşıladı. O konuda kimse sorun yaşamazdı, herkes o haktan yararlanırdı. İnsanın o zaman isteyebileceği birşey yoktu ki o zaman. Çocukların geleceğini bile devlet ele alıyordu, insanları düşündürmeye fırsat bırakmıyordu. Bizim orada tek kafamıza takıp düşünebileceğimiz sorun, senede bir kere tatile çıkacağız da nereye gitsek acaba da dinlenelim olurdu. Burgaz'a mı gidelim, Karadenizin hangi kıyısına gitsek onları düşünürdük. Yoksa onun dışında, ek iş yapan insanlarımız da vardı, vakitlerini o şekilde değerlendiriyorlardı. Ama ben hiç ek işle uğraşmadım çünkü çocuklarım küçüktü onlara anca zaman ayırabiliyordum. Memnundum, bir şikayetim yoktu işimden. Zaten bizim orada olduğumuz dönemlerde

Komunzim zamanında herkes memnundu yaptığı işten, hemen hemen herkes, tatmin ediyordu insanları yani herşey, ta ki düzenimiz bozulana kadar baskı dönemleri başlayana kadar.

In similar lines, A. (56, M, Specialized High s.) explains how social rights were protected and distributed evenly in Bulgaria. Yet, to him there were wrong state policies in Bulgaria, which put in a disadvantaged position the village residents. This was, the mostly cited one in the interview with the other immigrants, the right to have a city citizenship, which was to allow living and working in the urban environments only on permanent condition. This was in a way excluding the resident people especially the Turks mostly living in the rural areas, which were bounded, to live in the rural and cut from the opportunities prevalent in the urban, such as higher education, or private property ownership. On the other hand, he is one of the civil servant employees in northern Cyprus, who explains that he have had this chance and he is suited socially that the social security conditions are guaranteed in all cases in northern Cyprus as well.

We all were socially guaranteed and protected by the state in Bulgaria. The guaranteed conditions were all prevalent in Bulgaria such as full access to education or health services. We were all comfortable with these conditions. However, I regret that there were rights not provided to all the people such as the prohibition to move freely from rural areas to urban dwellings to live or to work. For example, even though you had enough money to buy an apartment flat from a city, you were to be a city citizen firstly to do this. Especially we and the Turks like us were obliged to live in the rural areas because of being brought up in the village environment and our families always were there. That was why we could not move out of the village and thus had no right to possess anything there. This was a ridiculous state regulation. In general we were socially secured and satisfied and we were living on. The wages that we were earning in Bulgaria during the Communist regime were enough for our expenditures. This was because everybody was earning the same and spending in the same way. Nobody was complaining about because nobody was in hunger then. I am meeting the retirement conditions and in about 5 years I will receive my old-age pension from Cyprus and wishing to be healthy to see those days. The 22 years that I worked in Bulgaria unfortunately will remain there and will be useless for retirement procedures. Since my job is being a civil servant in a state institution, my social security services are guaranteed and I have all the conditions at work that I can hope for.

Bizim devlet güvencemiz vardı zaten, hepimiz güvendedik o konuda. Eğitim, sağlık konusunu hiç düşünmezdik o güvence şartları her zaman vardı Bulgaristan'da. Ama yine de keşke başka haklar da tanınsaydı bize işte, köyden şehire gidemezdik mesela, yasaktı. Paran olsa da daire alamıyordun şehirden, önce oranın nüfusuna geçmiş olman lazımdı ama genelde biz de köyde doğduğumuz için için köyün dışına çıkamıyorduk. O çok kötü saçma bir uygulamaydı. Memnundum iyidim yani, geçiniyorduk da. Bulgaristan'da aldığımız maaşlar yetiyordu o dönemlerde, sonuçta herkes aynı alıyordu, birdi ya.

Kimsenin de şikayeti olmazdı, kimse de aç kalmazdı. Emeklilik orada çalıştığım o öyle kalacak şimdilik, ama burada 60 yaş ve üzeri, 15 yıl çalışılmış yılları olanlara emeklilik veriliyor, Allah ömür verirse 4 sene sonra emekli olabileceğim. Bulgaristan'da 22 yıl çalıştıklarımız maalesef kalacak. Hiçbir şikayetimin yok işimden dolayı, sosyal güvencemden dolayı.

Important distinction is that there are informal sector employees working in the northern Cypriot workforce especially among the immigrant female respondents. It is worthwhile to mention about them under this heading of social security beneficiary services as a social citizenship determinant. They are usually domestic cleaners, care taker of an elder or ill people, baby-sitter, or others in their present jobs in northern Cyprus, who were previously tailors, accountants, kindergarten cooker or even kindergarten preschool teachers, all in the state bounded institutions in Bulgaria. Also, they are from different education levels and important characteristic with them is that mostly they are lacking social security benefits, and put differently in another way lacking the right to have properly working citizenship engagements in a contract with the state. For example, C. (43, F, Secondary s.) explains how social security rights such as education, health services, retirements and other family socially secured allowances were all provided by the state regulations when they were in Bulgaria and people were not worry about their social rights. Now, she is a domestic cleaner and not having any social security investments. She admits that she will no have chance of retirement in northern Cyprus and aim to work until she is healthy and to support her children economically:

The state of Bulgaria obligatorily was cared about the social security services of its citizens. The most prominent thing was that while we were searching for a job in Bulgaria we did not get worried about our social assurances at all because they all were already guaranteed by the state. The otherwise case was not thought at all, this was the case in Bulgaria when we were there. Maternal pay leave and the all other payments were satisfying. We were paying attention to our wages actually and had the opportunity to choose well-paid jobs only and did not care about the other working conditions because they were always suited. Working for ourselves or for the state was always satisfying and all the jobs we were performing had their necessary guaranteed conditions. Here I am looking to earn more money; we are not working for the state but to our own benefit. For this reason, I am a domestic cleaner now but I worked in a private firm with its social security benefits but I was doing the same job of cleaning, washing around, the windows, making coffee and tea. I was earning 25YTL daily in my socially assured job while I am doing the same job and earning 60YTL daily as a domestic cleaner. I started to compare the working conditions and I came up to a thought that I could earn much more while doing the same job. I am satisfied very much with my earnings of a domestic cleaning job.

Actually, I preferred this because of my children and I think to work as possible as much until we are healthy enough. If I wanted I could invest my social assurances on my own as some immigrant Bulgarian Turkish women do. I don't, because I do not want to deal with the procedures. I am doing well with my earnings and the expenditures. I had a surgery operation for example and I did it in the private hospital, which cost much, but I was treated in a more careful manner indeed.

Bulgaristan'da devlet zaten mecburen sosyla güvencesini düşünürdü kendi vatandaşının, düşünmezdik yani iş ararken sigortalarımız olsun diye kimsede öyle bir kaygı vardı çünkü olmaması söz konusu değildi. Doğum izinleri de öyle her iş yeri verirdi, mecburdu. Ama daha iyi ödenekli bir iş bakardık onu seçme şansımız vardı sadece, insanlar da iş ararken maaşının iyi olmasına bakardı sadece heralde. Kendime çalışırken, veya devlete de çalışırken memnunduk. Garantisi hep olurdu yaptığımız işlerin. Burada sigortalı işe gittim aynı işi yine yapıyorsun, yine temizlik, camları silmek, süpürmek, çay yapıyordum ama günlüğüm 25YTL, temizlik işinin gündeliği 60YTL. Neden daha fazla almayayım aynı işi yaparak. Kazanımdan memnunum, fazlasıyla hatta. Çocuklarım için uğraşıyorum, bir iki sene elimiz ayağımız tuttuğu kadar çalışalım diyoruz. Sigortamı kendim de yatırıyorum, uğraşmak istemiyorum, elimdeki parayla kendi işimi görüyorum. Hasta oldum, ameliyat oldum hep özele gittim, parası da fazla oluyor ama daha iyi bakıyorlar işine hem.

In another final example, N. (51, F, Secondary s.) is domestic cleaner also, who unlike the above female respondent of C., tries to invest on and put money on her own the social security payments through which she wishes to get retire in northern Cyprus:

Here in Cyprus since our arrival I have been a domestic cleaner for 12 years. Even though we are not satisfied with the job activity we are doing and its conditions, we had no other option because it is difficult to find jobs for various reasons; be it qualifications, or my older age. Our wages are satisfying but I invest my social security payments for my own. I am trying to pile up my 15 workable years to get retired. I have several years still to realize this and I am working for it despite the fact that I get older, started to incapacitate and exhaust. We will see what will happen in the future. We espoused our children and now I only wish healthiness to get retired and not to be dependent to our children economically.

12 sene oldu ben ev işine gidiyorum. Memnun da olmasak başka çalışabileceğimiz iş te yok. Bize iş artık neredede. Maaşlar iyi ama, sigortası yok ben kendim yapıyorum yatırımlarımı. 15 sene olunca çalışılmış sigortadan emekli olabiliyorsun. Bende onu bekliyorum yani 55yaşında olabileceğim olursam kismet. Çalışıyoruz ama rahatsızlanıyoruz da sık sık artık yaşlar da ileledikçe gücümüz yetmemeye başlayacak. Geçinecek kadar kazanıyoruz, yetsin para diye bakıyoruz. Çocukları evlendirdik artık Allahtan ömür diliyoruz da emekli olabilelim diyoruz. Olursa iyi olur tabi, çocuklara yük olmamak için.

These have been the social security services comparatively quoted within the conditions both in Bulgaria and the conditions at present in northern Cyprus. It is

obvious almost in all of the evaluations made by the immigrant Turks that they were benefiting the properly working social security allowances and guaranteed benefits of the welfare state provisions prevalent during communism. This reasons why they are making comparisons of private/non-guaranteed and the public/highly guaranteed work sectors and emphasizing the socially secured stands between state bounded or not employer and employees.

6.2.3 Property ownership

This theme will give the general understanding of again what changed after migration in their property ownerships in reference to social citizenship allowances of state bounded provisions. Actually, it is important to reveal what they left behind and how they define their possessions today in northern Cyprus. It is important to note that property ownership will be explained in terms of unmovable properties, as a house, land, and gardens and the general attitudes of the respondents about their possessions and the state interventions. Importantly, since only the new comers in 1989-1992 were provided with houses by the state support in northern Cyprus, mentioned earlier, the later comers are all living in the rented accommodations, or few trying to buy with monthly payments of foreign currency apartment flats instead of staying in rented accommodations. However, property ownership is complained politically and economically in many aspects and the immigrant Turks could not initiate actions for property ownerships.

T. (53, M, Technical High s.) explains that he have unmovable properties and land in Bulgaria. Also, he is willing to possess other properties from urban districts in Bulgaria, in case if children happen to return back to Bulgaria. However, he complains about the state regulation of “city citizenship” during communism, which to him enabled especially Bulgarians to buy properties such as apartment flats in the urban areas. Indeed, T. says this official application did not address to Turks at all, mentioned and complained earlier again by other immigrant Turks also. He describes the regulation in content that to buy an unmovable property, a citizen in Bulgaria had to live about at least 5 years permanently in the city and thus to obtain a permission

of special “city” citizenship. However, T. explains that this was an intentional state policy to keep already living in the rural areas Turkish population in the villages. Hence, to T. the intended was achieved and Turks had to remain with their families and work their land especially in the rural settings. On the other hand, he complains that the government in northern Cyprus is not sensitive with immigrant needs of accommodation, and that they are still in the rented accommodations.

We had properties in the village and we could not invest our earnings to city surroundings also because you have to be registered as a citizen of that city. This was possible after living and working necessarily for at least about 5 years in the city and if you were not able to meet these conditions you could not buy a real estate property from a certain city. This was a state policy to keep people in the villages and not to escape to the cities altogether. However, as a result of this state regulation Bulgarians in the villages all escaped to the cities and bought apartment flats and other properties and the Turks remained mostly in the village close to their families and relatives. We have our own house in Bulgaria and we wish to keep it there in order to retain our ties with our place of origin. Additionally, it is not clear what will happen in the future that is why I think that for all the possible cases it is better we own our house there in Bulgaria.

Şehir yerine de yatırım yapamıyorduk, çünkü şehir nüfusuna kayıtlı olman lazımdı, en az beş sene de şehirde devamlı yaşaman ve çalışman gerekiyordu bu koşulu sağlamayınca da şehir yerlerinden mal-mülk satın alamıyordun. Bu devlet politikası da insanların köylerden kaçmaması için yapmıştı, ama ne oldu Bulgarların hepsi kaçtı sonra şehir yerlerine apartman daireleri aldılar ve köylerde gene Türkler kaldı. Evimiz de var şu an olmasını istiyoruz çünkü oranın doğumuyuz, gerektiğinde memlekete ziyarete gittiğimizde kendi evimizde kalabilelim. İleride ne olacağı da belli değil her amaçla bulunması iyidir diye düşünüyorum.

In similar lines, A. (56, M, Specialized High s.) says that he has unmovable property in Bulgaria and he will not going to sell it. On the other hand, in northern Cyprus he states that he has no any property ownership. A. also complains the state in northern Cyprus that it has not been providing immigrant Turks of Bulgaria with accommodation aid through appropriate loans, for example. He interprets this in a way that the on going political conflicts in Cyprus, especially in relation to the unmovable property exchanges between the native Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities prevent the northern Cypriot state to put in an action such state supported residence construction projects. He states that in the first Turks from Bulgaria wave migration, which is in the beginning of 1990, observable accommodation and job assistance was provided then by the government in power.

Also because of the Annan Plan supposed to resolve the Cyprus issue, the real estate properties such as a parcel of land, and the other real estate property issues get complicated and obscured in Cyprus. This was remarkably problematic among the native Cypriots themselves and let alone the Bulgarian Turks to claim for a real estate property project in Cyprus. The Cypriot government accepts that we are proper citizens and inter-cultural agents but these are all the affirmative explanations and nothing more come out unfortunately. The reason for this is the problems of Cyprus, which are too complicated actually to their native citizens. There are many Bulgarian Turks who have bought their own houses (apartment flats), from different construction companies, on their own earnings provided by their own opportunities and not the state. However, those people will have to carry on paying their debts for years in terms of the houses that they wish to move and live.

Bu Annan Planı meselesinden dolayı da mal mülk, toprak, arsa konuları çok tartışıldı o yüzden şimdiden sonra da daha zor bu iş yani Kıbrıslıların arasında sorunlar çıktı, ne kalmış bize artık böyle birşeyi talep etmek. Devlet iyi sadık vatandaşsınız diyor, elçi görevi görüyorsunuz diyor ondan öte de gitmiyor maalesef, onların kendi sorunları yetip artıyor onlara zaten. Bulgaristan Türkü ev alan oldu ama devlet vermedi ki hep kendi imkanlarıyla, borçlandı senlerce ödemek zorunda kalacak.

To become a private property owner of a house is an expensive, which is not affordable by the earnings of immigrant Turks is the general approach revealed in the research data narratives. The general mode developed by the immigrant Turks to explain the events is that the apartment flats or houses are very expensive in northern Cyprus with payments of foreign currency and uncertain in the future for political and economic reasons whether such investments are properly worthy. For this, some of them invest their money in Bulgaria and try to provide children with property possessions to guarantee their future. On certain similar accounts, E. (40, M, Vocational-Technical High s.):

We are allowed to live in Cyprus now but we are confused to take decisions about real estate property ownership. We plan to adopt an apartment flat or other real estate properties but they are very expensive in fact. The cheaper ones cost about 40.000£-50.000£ and the buyers are obliged to pay for 180 months which is 15 years monthly payments. I am not sure actually whether we get retired and be alive to afford these dept of payments. The native Turkish Cypriots here in Cyprus are not that much worried about such payments like us. This is because even north Cyprus is unrecognized it is their place of origin and home country and they cannot think otherwise. Also, if they happen to have difficulties with their real estate property payments, they have always their relatives around to support one another financially. Unlike us, the Turkish Cypriots have investments and earnings in the banks or on real estate properties and thus they are freer to take decision about any kind of investment and money issues.

Devlet yerleşme izni veriyor oturun diye ama. Kendimize daire veya arsa düşünüyoruz ama çok para onlar da 40.000-50.000£ 180 ay 15 sene demek ödeme koşuluyla biz emekli

olup ömrümüz yetecek mi bu borçlara, hayatta olacak mıyız. Burda yerlileri Kıbrıslılar giriyor bu borçların altına, adamların vatani başka türlü düşünemiyorlar zaten, akrabaları da var sıkıştığında 4 tane akrabasından yardım alır halleder hem para var yani yerli halkta bankada orda burda.

S. (47, M, Vocational Technical High s.) differently from the previous respondents explains that he has no any property in Bulgaria, because he sold them after migration. He is one of who has a detached house in northern Cyprus, which is provided by the state. Yet, he is worried about if the conflicts on the island in terms of real estate properties persist and the house, on which they spent lots of money to repair, happen to be taken back.

We sold our apartment flat in Bulgaria and we have nothing as a real estate property there. Previously, we both had a big apartment flat and a detached house with a garden but we sold them both, because we decided to invest our earnings on the house that we own now in Cyprus. The house that we are living now was provided by the Cypriot state and I am happy that we are not living in a rented accommodation. However, since the case is as such we are covering our family expenditures and still the wages and the income that we earn with my wife is inadequate. I wish to keep this house in Cyprus but I am not sure about the future and politics in Cyprus if they going to take what we tried to obtain in here.

Sattık dairemizi Bulgaristan'da. Şu anda bize ait birşey kalmadı. Daire de vardı ev de vardı. Evimiz bahçeliydi, dairemiz de büyüktü ama buradaki eve yatırım yapıyoruz şimdi. Devlet ev verdi bize, yani kirada değilim diye en azından biraz olsun seviniyorum, ancak kendi ihtiyaçlarımızı karşılıyor, yine de para yetişmiyor. Kendi evimiz iyi iş tabi ama, onu da anlaşmazlıklardan dolayı almazsa devlet politikaları elimizden tabi, bu acaba var ya hep kafalarımızı kurcalıyor bir güvensizlik yaratıyor ne olacağız diye.

Property ownership subject have been revealed to certain extends. It has been evident that the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria had their own houses and the land properties when they were in Bulgaria. The usual case among all is that all the properties are inheritance from parents and grandparents. On the other hand, when they moved to the northern Cyprus they had to accommodate themselves in the cheaper rented apartment flats, or rented again, small auxiliary attached house. Since the state in northern Cyprus has no any supportive provisions, they all try to solve accommodation concerns on their own such as buying also cheap houses and repair them to make livable in order not to pay for rented accommodations. Or, other immigrant Turks take the political and economic, quoted from data transcripts, the risks prevalent in northern Cyprus and they bear the expensive loan burdens to pay

for their new accommodations expected release them from discomfort of rented accommodations.

6.3 Future Prospects of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria

In this part of the chapter it is important to integrate data information on the personal future prospects of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria to summarize in a way the socio-economic conditions among Turks from Bulgaria. This will be derived from the research data referring to personal opinions, as significant to grasp the immigrants' future hopes, goals and prospects as what they were in Bulgaria and in terms of which conditions they were shaped now in northern Cyprus. Thus, in this way it could be possible to compare whether future plans have changed, realized and in what way.

A. (56, M, Specialized Higher s.) points that before migration after the deteriorated socio-political conditions in Bulgaria Turks turned their future hopes towards escaping to Turkey. Yet, after migration particularly to northern Cyprus he is happy with his choice that he has been able to provide higher education opportunities for his children. Besides, he is eager to keep in close attachment with both of the citizenship statuses he possess, that of Bulgaria and northern Cyprus. This is an example making 'flexible citizenship' (Ong, 1999) meaningful, almost common stand view in the case of almost all of the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cyprus.

[...] I have been able to provide better fine quality education for my children. This makes me so happy that I am not going to hesitate about their future whether if they are in hunger or under economic or political suppressions. We invest our earnings on them and still partially assisting them because they are studying and pursuing their graduate higher education. I do not know and we will see what and where they will decide to settle in the future for themselves. Apart from this, I want to be a house owner of our own but we have not managed this yet. After we financially arrange our children as much as we can, my wife and I will care about ourselves and wait for our retirements that we have few years, if we are lucky enough for this. If the expectations are met in this sense then we will think with my wife to stay and live six months in Bulgaria and six months in Cyprus. Actually, we could not cut our ties and communication with Bulgaria, but I am not sure for our children and I think their ties will cease in the course of time. Indeed, our children are not very much agreeable with the parents' future plans and everybody takes his/her way to follow. These are all that I am think of my future and I want to add that economically we are well-suited and satisfied but the goals that we are trying to reach always are never ending ones.

[...] Çocuklarıma iyi bir eğitim imkanı verdim. Bu beni çok mutlu ediyor, onları düşünmeyeceğim yani ileride de olsun aç kalmasınlar, ezilmesinler diye. Onlara yatırım yaptık, hala eğitimleri devam ediyor. Görelim bakalım ne olacak, neye karar verecekler ilerisi için. Diğer konu ev sahibi olmak istiyorum ama olamadık daha. Çocukları hallettikten sonra, artık kendimize bakacağız emekli olmamıza da az kaldı belki o da olur inşallah ileride. Sonra altı ay Bulgaristan'da altı ay Kıbrıs'ta yaşamak isterim. Biz koparamıyoruz birtürlü bağlarımızı Bulgaristanla ama bizim çocuklar zannediyorum ki koparacak. Onlar bizim düşündüğümüz gibi düşünmüyor artık. Herkes kendi yolunu tutuyor. Şimdilik düşündüklerim bunlar gelecek için. Ekonomik olarak da çok iyi durumdayım ama yapmak istediklerimiz bitmiyor hiç.

C. (43, F, Secondary s.) states that they were shaping their plans about future when in Bulgaria. Now, she figures out that she wishes her children be in a better position economically, comparing to their first arrival, and be free from the hard working conditions thus, to achieve a satisfying and guaranteed status in northern Cyprus.

We did not think about our future all the time but even then our plans about the family were based on the children, who were always into our primary consideration. After we got married with my husband, and started to seek for a house to buy in the village, a big one with an additional vacant backyard suitable to build a house for my grown up children. In these cases we were dreamt about the future obligatorily because of our children. We bought and did everything we liked and wanted. We were well suited all in all compared to the general conditions and opportunities then in Bulgaria. If I am to consider the conditions now, there have been many improvements and developments in Bulgaria may be not in the beginning of 1990's but in the following years. We bought everything new in our house and I was thinking as if I could not leave my house in the migration events. All the rooms were with new furniture and we were keeping them for our children's' future. Everybody was like us actually; we were working and buying everything with fine quality while expecting to comfort the children in the future. Yet, all the accumulations of people had been devastated during the migration events. I care only about my children and their well being, so that is why we are working to exhaustion. We got weary out as a result of our backbreaking work activities both in Bulgaria and in here and because of our growing ages and being forty I noticed that we started to get tired prominently easily. What I want my children to accomplish from now on is that when they come to their forties to become their own bosses of their own jobs, to be ownerships of their own residence properties and not to depend on anybody. We are satisfied with our life in Cyprus but I am not sure if the living standards would be the same in the future as in today. If unexpected things would happen here in Cyprus, we will take the way back to Bulgaria. We do not know really what might happen here in Cyprus in the future with all these talks and negotiations... But it is really confusing that you cannot decide what to do and that is why we got divided into two.

Geleceğimizi hep düşünerek yaşamazdık, ama yine de birşeyler yapacağımızda çocuklarımızı hep düşünürdük. Ev alacağımızda mesela köyde, evlendikten sonra, iki çocuğum oldu küçüktüler daha ama köyde satılık evlere bakarken büyük olsun istedik, önünde arsası da var diye dedik ileride çocuğumuzun birine yine birşey yaparız belki diye. Düşünürmüşük gene de, mecbur çocuklar olunca. Herşeyimizi alırdık canımızın istediğini yapardık. O zamanlarda Bulgaristanın hayat şartlarına göre iyidi durumumuz. Şimdiki

Bulgaristan'ı desem orası da burası gibi ilerledi birçok konuda, ama 1990 başındaki senelerde hayat şartlarına göre pek ilerleme yoktu, ama yine de neyse o zaman alırdık her ihtiyacımızı. Herşeyimizi almıştık yepizyeni, göç meselesinde çıkamayacağım heralde evimden derdim hep. Hatta odaları döşerdik sıfır mobilyalarla o odalara girilmezdi, çocukların odasına da yeni alınmıştı mobilyalar hiç kullanamadılar. Herkes öyleydi aslında, çalışıyorduk istediğimizi, en iyisini almaya çalışıyorduk, çocuklar rahat etsin gelecekte diye ama bu göç durumlarında Bulgaristan'da herkesin herşeyi darmaduman oldu. Çocuklarımı düşünüyorum artık onlar iyi olsun diye şimdi eziliyoruz. Bulgaristan'dayken de çok ezildik buradayken de, 40'ına gelince, yaşlardan dolayı ilerlediçe artık biz de zorlanıyoruz. Ama isterim ki çocuklarımda 40'ına geldiğinde kendi işlerinin patronları olsun, yani kiralarda sürünmesin başkalarına muhtaç kalmasın. Kıbrıs'ta hayat standartları şimdiki gibi olur mu gelecekte bilinmez, şimdi iyiz burada. Burada birşey olursa Bulgaristan'ın yolunu tutarız, yani ayağımın biri buradaysa diğeri de Bulgaristan'da. Bilmiyor insan buranın ne olacağını, anlaşmalar kötüye giderse, arada kalıyor insan ne yapacağını bilmiyor ikiye bölünmüş durmdayız.

From a different point of view, E. (40, M, Vocational-Technical High s.) was hopeless about Bulgaria to realize future expectations before. Now, he looks from a different perspective in shaping his future expectations, as hoping the embargoes to be abolished in northern Cyprus and to run applicable to the new conditions his own business managements.

Our economic conditions of course have changed positively after migrating to Cyprus. For example, if trade embargoes happen to be abolished, like many tradesmen I will possibly be able to run my own business freely in North Cyprus. I will be able to export fruits and vegetables freely and legally to Bulgaria, which are originating here in Cyprus such as oranges, lemons, and potatoes. If we consider our economic status now we are not in the expected level. We can think to settle here but it is an unrecognized country and everything is unclear, and mixed up for future.

Ekonomik durumlar tabi ki değişti buraya gelince. Gelecek için daha farklı düşünüyorum, planlarımız da değişiyor. Ambargolar kalkarsa mesela Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta kendi ticaretimi daha serbest yapabileceğim belki. Mesela burada yetişen portakalı, limonu, patatesi alıp daha serbest Bulgaristan'a götürüp satabilirim. Bulunmak istediğimiz yerde değil pek. Buraya yerleşmeyi düşünebiliriz fakat tanınmayan bir ülke, ne olacağı belli değil, bizim kafalar da karışık.

K. (52, M, Basic High s.) states that he was pessimist in his future hopes in Bulgaria before migration. Now, after migration he points out that he is optimist now and hope to continue his free and economically and socially comfortable life in Cyprus.

We lived in a pessimistic atmosphere while we were in Bulgaria as if every moment something bad would happen. In every instant we were concerned with the obligatory idea

of migrating to Turkey one day as a mere future plan. It was not possible to be free as our own nation territory and to wave the flag in Bulgaria. We are free and comfortable in perceiving the life here in Cyprus. I am fortunately satisfied with my economic status and I have my own house here. We accept Cyprus as our home country mainland. Our children are happy also about their life because they are free, secure and comfortable here in North Cyprus. If we consider the disagreement on the island, the division between the native communities and the status of North Cyprus as being unrecognized internationally, I am not really concerned with these. I can see that nothing will change in the future and I am doubtful that the status of north Cyprus will be well-suited internationally and will be better than now.

Karamsar yaşadık zaten Bulgaristan'da diken üstünde oturur gibiydin. Ha göç ettik ha edeceğimiz diye biz hep bunun derdinde olduk. Kendi toprağın, kendi vatanın gibi bayrağını savuramazdın. Burada daha rahat bakabiliyoruz hayata artık, ekonomik durumumdan memnunum, evimiz de var çok şükür diyoruz. Burasını Kuzey Kıbrıs'ı vatan saydık, geldik, çocuklar da memnun hayatlarından burada, özgür ve serbestiz burada. Burada anlaşmamazlık varmış, Kuzey Kıbrıs tanınmıyormuş o beni ilgilendirmiyor, ve beni bağlamaz.

S. (47, M, Vocational-Technical High s.) says that his future plans were focused on the migration process, and they were not sure about their future before leaving Bulgaria. Yet, after migration, unlike K. in the above quote, he is worried about his family's future in northern Cyprus. This is because he thinks that the political dispute on Cyprus and the northern part may effect directly their citizenship position as well since they are exteriors, and may be either included or excluded from the possible state agreements.

[...] I see myself permanent in here but I am not sure whether the state of North Cyprus perceives me as permanent. For example, there was the "Annan Plan" according to which the new comers living in the northern part of the island such as immigrants of all kinds were to be deported out of the island. The people who were under question usually were the Turks coming from Turkey, the Turkish soldiers and the other immigrants like us. If this plan was to be realized in the real life, then we would have to leave every possession behind us and migrate again. I do not know what might happen in the future but I feel insecure at times in here as well. We took the passport of Cypriot state (North Cypriot state) but this is not the solution altogether. We feel the same in North Cyprus as it was like the state of being in worry that we felt once in Bulgaria. We then started to buying and renewing our goods at home here, to repair the house as we like but we are always in hesitation whether we will be in the requirements to migrate again especially during the arguments held on the "Annan Plan". The arguments discussed in this way are leading to confusion and wearing out our life materially and morally indeed.

[...] Ben kendimi, ailemi gelecekte burada görüyorum gene belki ama devlet beni kalıcı olarak görüyor mu beni bilmem. Mesela "Annan Planı" vardı, planın kriterlerine göre de burada adaya sonradan yerleşen göçmenleri sınırışı etmek durumunda kalacaktı Kıbrıs.

Türkler, askerler ve bizim gibi göçmenler mesela. Bu durumda gerçekleşseydi bu plan biz burada yaptığımız herşeyi bırakıp yine göç etmek zorunda kalacaktık heralde. Yani burada da bir güvensizlik var yani bilemiyor insan gelecekte neler olabilir. Tamam Kıbrıs pasaportunu aldık belki ama pasaportla da bitmiyor mesele. Bulgaristan'da yaşadığımız gelecek kaygısı gibi, aynı şey biraz burada da var, Kıbrıs'ta anlaşma olursa göç edermiyiz, çıkaracaklar mı bizi acaba diye. Bu sefer de biz sıfır eşya alıyoruz, evi tamir ediyoruz ama acaba yine göç olur mu diye düşündük bu Annan Planı tartışılırken. Bunlar da sıkıntıya yol açıyor, hep acaba mı diyorsun, bu da bizi maddi manevi yıpratıyor.

6.4 Conclusion

As it has been all mentioned in the interviews, it is possible to reach a general conclusion about the socially enhanced citizenship about the Turkish immigrant respondents in comparison with before and after their migration. In general, they explain their economic activities as satisfying in both social spaces because they actively participate in the workforce. Even so, it is prominent that their participation in the labor market indicates differentiations before and after migration and has verified connotations to interpret in reference to citizenship conceptions. Important notifications to pinpoint again have been that when considering the socio-demographic data results they show that the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were all in civil servant positions in Bulgaria. This was the case obvious especially during the communist regime in Bulgaria, which could be interpreted with exclusionary content of citizenship, most prominently with the 'city citizenship status' state regulation addressing to the Bulgarians. This is because, since immigrant Turks were residing in the rural settings they were motivated by the state regulations to improve themselves according to the necessities of the rural life only and chose their profession areas in response to this. This could be criticized that the extended social rights without the full legal and political citizenship engagements might be characterized with authoritarian dictatorship type of rule (Janoski, 1998). For example, respondents argue that until the communist regime, occupations in which Turks had tendencies to educate themselves are as mechanical technician, instrument engineering, turnery, electricity technician, driver in different heavy vehicle categories, medical auxiliary, waiters and so forth. On the other hand, there were professionals of nursery school teacher, tailors, waitress, cooker, and worker in a state factory, cattle dealing and so forth. These were professions of Turkish immigrant male and female respondents.

Some of these job activities were hired usually in state village cooperation institution, where the division of labor is shared within the village population. Beside the performances of these job categories, almost all respondents were dealing with gardening, agriculture and stockbreeding. Nonetheless, after the fall of communist regime, and the mass Turkish migrations from the rural areas caused devastation in the stable working state institutions in the villages. After that, some of the interview respondents explain they started to search jobs in the private sector in the cities, live on livestock breeding, and agriculture, do their small-scale own business, or go abroad to earn money. In fact, after the political regime transformation in 1990's in Bulgaria, rapid unemployment rates and the social unrest alarmed the population of Turks to migrate in the case with those migrated to northern Cyprus. Overall, even the contracted relation was based on agreeable rights and duties; the citizenship tends to be exclusionary in the opportunities limited in the rural settings mostly for Turks but guarding benefits to the ethnic nationals of majority Bulgarians. This is how citizenship is exclusionary in especially socially enhanced aspects based on ethnic differentiations, which 'disregard', 'degrade', and foster the perception of 'second-class citizenship' (van Gunsteren, 1998; 63, 99).

On the other hand, after migration to northern Cyprus, immigrant Turks of Bulgaria had no choice to select any job category, which is to be more suitable to their background. These immigrants work in low-skilled jobs and usually comprising the lower statuses in the social hierarchy, which could be matched with the conception of "middleman minority" of Sway (1988). The jobs they do in northern Cyprus are not in close relevance with their educational background, yet they take positions in the labor force where the vacant employment areas are somehow necessary to be fulfilled. These jobs are usually are as driver, worker in the construction sector, and for female respondents they do jobs as sales-clerk, baby-sitter, domestic cleaner and keeper. Also, doing jobs at night such, as security guard, and distributor- delivery driver are common job activities among immigrant male respondents. On the other hand, there are respondents who are running their own business or working as civil servant workers. It is obvious those immigrants Turks of Bulgaria, both male and female are active in the labor force in northern Cyprus are

preferable in jobs that the natives are not taking over. They are usually socially secured but still problematic among the immigrant women working in the informal sector, or other private sector workers, which put them obligatorily in an inferior social status. Actually, this is how the Marshall's (1949/1992) perspectives about the citizenship dimension based on universal legal, political but especially in the case with this thesis social citizenship fueling to abolish inequality in terms of differentiated economic statuses fail to prove among the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria. Especially, the socially enhanced citizenship, promising equality, guaranteed status positions based on the contracted relation of rights and duties supported theoretically by Dwyer (2004), are all affirmative conceptions but in the presence of migration factor the welfare state provisions fail to function. This leads immigrant groups to search for survival strategies in underprivileged status, because their status make meaningful in all prevalent cases the relationship of 'exclusive cultures' and thus, 'exclusion from citizenship' (van Gunsteren, 1998).

Considering all the citizenship related notifications prevalent among Turkish immigrant from Bulgaria, they both in Bulgaria and the northern Cypriot working and social conditions tend to be mostly excluded from the state-bounded welfare provisions. Firstly, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria are excluded from citizenship based on equally shared opportunities because of their ethnic background of being from a Turkish origin. Secondly, the same immigrant group tends to be excluded from certain state provisions; especially matters in the labor market participation are becoming prevalent because of 'non-native', 'exterior' 'marginal' and lower statuses in the social hierarchy attached to the Turks from Bulgaria. In combination of all these citizenship practices among Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria, this is how, most prominently evident in the future prospects migration narratives, they make the 'flexible citizenship' (Ong, 1999) useful. This way of benefiting from dual citizenship make them practicing 'inclusive citizenship' but on individually based self-interested seeking for guarantee protecting state provisions both in Bulgaria and northern Cyprus as a consequence of migration.

Now, it is worth to evaluate how these citizenship statuses and practices prevalent in the socio-economic life conditions have impact on the self-identifications among Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria. The next chapter will be closely relevant in understanding the citizenship membership statuses and the identity perceptions in parallel relation.

CHAPTER 7

SOCIO-CULTURAL RELATIONS AND IDENTITY PERCEPTIONS OF TURKS FROM BULGARIA IN THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION

7.1 Introduction

After the socio-economic conditions of immigrant turks from bulgaria, now in this chapter socio-cultural relations will be explained. The overall concentration is on the social networks, neighborhoods, cultural activity performances and the association and the participation level. This analysis will brought into question the cultural interactions and their identity perceptions of turks from bulgaria both in bulgaria and in northern cyprus. This will be useful to understand how ‘flexible citizenship’ is influencing identity perceptions before and after migration as well.

7.2 Socio-Cultural Relations among Turks from Bulgaria

Data description of socio-cultural relations of Turks from Bulgaria will be focused on social relations among Turks from Bulgaria in their everyday life practices, specifically with the cases in place of origin Bulgaria and destination place northern Cyprus. For this reason interview talks will be cited on topics such as neighborhood relations, marriage patterns and the self-perceptions in the end. In this part, the data, which will be integrated, is supposed to help to analyze the experiences of Turks of Bulgaria with the other culturally different communities in the societies they have been within interaction.

7.2.1 Social Networks and Neighborhood relations

In this part, social networks will refer to the reciprocal relations of Turks of Bulgaria in the everyday socio-cultural activities. That is, their preferences will be considered in terms of whom they prefer and in what degree to share their experiences with. This will be based on two sided data, as it has been the case in the previous chapter citizenship themes.

C. (44, M, Specialized Higher s.) explains that they had intensified and sincere relations with their Turkish as well as Bulgarian friends, when they were in Bulgaria. This condition does not change, but it is obvious that C. prefer to be together with the immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in northern Cyprus, rather than any other cultural community in northern Cypriot society.

Our village was mixed with different communities that there were Bulgarians and Turks, but we used to interact mostly with the Turks. We had a group of family friends and communicated with them on a regular basis. Our social relations were good in general with our neighbors, who were our relatives at the same time. I had no problems with anybody actually and I was agreeable with Bulgarians and the Roma people. It was because of my personality may be that I had very good and valuable relations with everybody in the village. Here in Cyprus we live together with different communities. There are people from Hatay (immigrants from Southern Turkey), Pakistani, Romanians that we know personally and the others. We meet with the people from Bulgaria often (with reference to Bulgarian Turks). We had neighbors from Bulgaria. Actually one Bulgarian Turkish family is the neighbor that we are communicating with. We have good neighborhood relations but we are far apart in regular communication with the other neighbors. There are neighbors from Turkey and the Cypriots (native Turkish Cypriots) but we are not in touch with them.

Karışıkta bizim köy Bulgarlar, Türkler vardı, ama genellikle Türklerle buluşup görüşürdük, belli bir gurubumuz vardı, tayfacık onlarla görüşürdük. İyidi ilişkiler. Komşularımız akrabalarımızdı da zaten, iyidi yani komşuluklarda. Sorun yaşadığım insanlar yoktu Bulgarınla da, Çingenelerle de hepsiyle de anlaşabiliyordum. Benim yapımdan dolayı da herkesle çok iyi ilişkilerim vardı. Burada her toluluktan insanlarla yaşıyoruz. Hataylısı var, Pakistanlısı var, tanıdıklarımız da var hatta bu insanlardan, Romeni de var. Bulgaristanlılarla daha sık görüşürüz. Bulgaristanlı komşularımız var. Mahallemizde bir tane Bulgaristan'lı aile var onlarla komşuluk yapıyoruz. İlişkilerimiz iyi ama diğer komşulardan uzak duruyoruz. Onun dışında Türkiyeli de var, Kıbrıslı da, onlarla pek karışmıyoruz işte. Kapı komşularımız Kıbrıslı, iyidir belki ama dursun yerinde. Bulgaristanlılarla, arkadaşlarımla görüşmeyi tercih ederim kafa yapılarımız daha çok uyduğu için. Bizim memleketten insanları daha yakın hissediyorum kendime.

R. (43, M, Vocational Technical High s.) explains that in Bulgaria there were Bulgarians and Turks they were in close cultural relations. However, they preferred to share their intimate social relations with the Turks, rather than Bulgarians. Now, in northern Cyprus R. states that they have limited social life, and they meet only with several immigrant families like them from Bulgaria. And what he says about the neighborhood and social networks is the actual complain almost in all of the interviews and it is as follows:

Here in Cyprus we are living mostly with the people of Turkish communities. I feel myself close in relevance to the Bulgarian Turks and distant to the remaining others. This is because we had common subjects to share with the Bulgarian Turks and the others actually are seeing us in the way that they want and like to see us. That is why we are excluded or insulted in certain cases, which lead to disagreements and misunderstandings between Bulgarian Turks and the Turkish Cypriots that really bothers me. There are 4-5 Bulgarian Turkish families with whom we are coming together as if neighboring with them. We as a family prefer to come together with Bulgarian Turks, who are a few of them and we have good relations with them in general. We have to choose among Bulgarian Turks either with whom we should meet because there are people who are gossiping, lying and self-conceited ones. We keep distant from such kind of people as much as possible. Except for this all our neighbors are Turkish Cypriots, we see that they have good neighborhood relations with each other but nobody from them comes to us and thus we stay distant from the neighbors here. Indeed, we are entirely in discordance from both of our and their sides in terms of everyday interactions. Thus, we do not meet each other and come together on regular basis. As a result of all these, we have no lively social life here in Cyprus, at least for us, and our social life is comprised of going to work from home and from home to work again and all the time closed at home when we are out of work. We communicate with 3-5 families as friends and going one another and that's all. Apart from this we have no other social activity and places to go. There are big differences in relevance with our social life between Bulgaria and Cyprus. While we were better in Bulgaria in terms of our social life, we haven't got any socializing in Cyprus, which is one of the things that make me upset. We haven't got our family friends and our parents here and our entire social environment is in Bulgaria with whom we interacted. Our everyday regularity was socially lively, our social environment was there indeed and we were arranging occasions whenever and with whoever we liked.

Türk toplumundan insanlarla yaşıyoruz burada. Kıbrıs'ta Bulgaristanlıları daha yakın hissediyorum kendime diğerlerini daha uzak. Bulgaristanlılarla daha çok ortak konumuz var o yüzden. Diğerleri de bizi görmek istediği gibi gördüğü için bazı konularda dışlanıyoruz, veya küçümseniyoruz o yüzden anlaşamamazlıklara yol açıyor bu durum bazen, birbirimizi anlayamıyoruz Kıbrıslılarla mesela, bu da benim canımı sıkıyor. 4-5 aile var Bulgaristanlılarla görüşüp komşuluğumuzu da onlarla yapıyoruz. Fazla yok zaten ilişkilerimiz de iyi. Yani genelde biz ailecek Bulgaristanlılarla görüşüyoruz ama seçmek zorundasın da görüşeceğin insanları çünkü bazı insanlar var dedikodu peşinde sadece, yalancılık ve kendini övmek peşinde olan insanlardan uzak duruyoruz mümkün olduğunca. Onun dışında burada bütün komşular Kıbrıslı, onlar kendi aralarında birbirine gidip geliyor komşuluk yapıyorlar görüyoruz sonuçta ama bize gelen giden olmuyor zaten bizde uzak duruyoruz öyle olunca. Uymuyor kesinlikle de iki taraf o yüzden ne onlar gelir ne de biz gidiyoruz. O yüzden de sosyal hayat yok burada, bizim için en azından öyle işten eve, evden işe sonra da kapalı evde. 3-5 aile dostumuz var, onlar bize biz de onlara gidiyoruz bundan ibaret, ama onun dışında sosyal faaliyet gidecek yer yok onun dışında. Bulgaristan'daki sosyal yaşantımızla burası arasında çok büyük farklar var. Orada daha iyidik biz sosyal hayat açısından, burada yok en çok üzen şeylerden bir tanesi de bu. Yok annemiz, babamız yok arkadaş çevremiz herkes orada olduğu için herkesle görüşürdük. Çok güzel geçirdi yani, çevremiz oradaydı bizim sonuçta ve yapacak şey kiminle olursa olsun bulurduk her zaman.

F. (55, F, Basic High s.) like many of the other immigrant respondents claims that the social relations and the neighborhoods were of good manner in Bulgaria,

with all the communities. Now, in northern Cyprus she feels herself as immigrant in the Cypriot society and cannot feel comfortable with the other cultural communities in interacting as she is doing so with the Turkish immigrant like her:

Bulgarians and the Turks were mixed up and we were living together. There were Gypsies also. There was not a state of disagreement among us. Since we were mixed and in an agreement we could not do any exclusive favors. We had usual closeness within the Turkish community but still we were used to living mixed thus people did not have discriminative attitudes of behaving in hostile relations to one another. We were neighboring with the Bulgarians, but had really well suited relations with them. There were Turkish neighbors but to speak the simple truth we were assisted in many respects by the Bulgarian neighbors and friends and I believe that we learnt many lessons from them. When they heard about our migration, they came to embrace us with warm affections and sadness towards us. We live with Turkish Cypriot neighbors here but coming together mostly with the immigrant Bulgarian Turks like us. It is a different social atmosphere when gathering with Bulgarian Turks because you feel that you are not alone. We feel ourselves closer to the immigrant Bulgarian Turks because usually the immigrants can yearn for the motherland similarly like us. Of course the Turkish Cypriots are all human beings but they cannot understand us as in the way Bulgarian Turks do. We have similar worries to share with the Bulgarian Turks as a result of similar past experiences. Turkish Cypriots had also hardships in the past but in the course of time they seized the property loots and become well off and they forgot where they came from⁵⁰. They did not start from the zero point because they established their life again on the ready property ownerships. Also, Turkey is supporting since how many years on the Turkish Cypriots. For these reasons, they were not with one luggage in their hand after the migration events like us. Different worlds and the people really we are in accordance with the people in Cyprus only in the workplaces and on work issues. There is apartness as if except for the work life among the people and nothing more.

⁵⁰ Important to notify, this respondent refers to the one of the most prominent events after the the ongoing social and the political divisions in the 19th century when they become unendurable and turned out to nationalist divisions between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots. These nationalist divisions between the two native communities were revealed in a more explicit way, and the division of the island in 1974 become also geographical and territorial one. Afterall, internal migrations, (involuntary compulsory) moves on the island occurred, which recommended the Turkish Cypriots in the southern part of Cyprus to move to the northern part, and the Greek Cypriots from northern to the southern part. What was interesting with this unfair but compulsory residence replacement process was the so called “property capture” (or also referred by Kızılyürek as “economy based on captured property” related with the economy in northern Cyprus). This means that after these internal moves, economically the more subordinate Turkish Cypriot community suddenly become the prosperous. This was realized through taking into possession the Greek Cypriot properties. Kızılyürek (2002) states that after 1974, upon the establishment of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus as a separate state, the national consciousness of Turkish Cypriots was based on “Turkish-Centred” nationalism wave. In the following years after 1974, the idea of justified saviour “motherland” Turkey become more prominent in the northern part of Cyprus. Besides, the rising Turkish nationalism in northern Cyprus has not perceived the Turkish Cypriots as a community within its peculiar cultural and political existence but solely as a part of the Turkic nation. Yet, this laid out the foundations of “Turkish Cypriot-Centred” and “Cyprus-Centred” political oppositional behaviour as well (ibid, 2002:290).

Bulgarla Türk karışık herkesle yaşadık. Çingene de vardı. Anlaşmazlık gibi bir durumumuz yoktu. Biz karışık olduğumuz için ayrıcalık yapamazdık, anlaştığımız için, aslında Türk Türktür ama yine de karışık yaşamaya alıştığımız için, öyle bir kompleks yoktu. Bulgarla da yapardık komşuluk ama ilişkilerimiz çok iyidi. Türkler de vardı ama Bulgarlardan da çok yardım gördük, onlardan da çok şey öğrendik, ders aldım onlardan. Doğruya doğru. Bizim göç edeceğimizi duyduklarında gelip gelip sarılıyorlardı nereye gidiyorsunuz diye. Problemimiz birşeyimiz yoktu karışıkta ama diyalogumuz iyidi herkesle. Kıbrıslı Türklerle yaşıyoruz burada da, ama yine de göçmenlerle olunca daha iyi oluyor, hava daha değişik oluyor. Yalnız olmadığını hissediyorsun. Göçmenlerle, Kıbrıslı komşularla sık sık görüşüyoruz, ama daha çok Bulgaristan göçmenleriyle görüşüyoruz. Göçmenleri daha yakın hissediyoruz kendimize. Vatanım vatanım diyor vatan hasreti çekenler... Kıbrıslılar da insan ama onlar bizi Bulgaristanlıların anladığı gibi anlayamaz. Aynı dertleri paylaşabiliyoruz Bulgaristanlılarla, düşmeyen daldan anlayamaz halden demişler. Kıbrıslılar da çok zorluk çekmiş ama sonradan hazır ganimete konunca, nerden geldiğini zaman zaman unutupuyorlar. Bizim gibi sıfırdan başlamadılar ki, şirketlerini hemen kurdular Kıbrıs ayrılınca ikiye. Kaç sende beri Türkiye yardım ediyor, göç edince hazıra geldiler yine de sıfırdan başlamadılar bizim gibi bir bavulla elinde değildiler. Çok farklı dünyalar, sadece iş konusunda işte anlaşabiliyorsun insanlarla, herşey kopmuş gibi sadece iş konusunda alakan, bağlantın oluyor insanlarla onun dışında birşey yok. İşinden eve evden işe.

Another example is U. (42, F, Vocational-Technical High s.). She explains that she had quite affirmative social relations in her village and neighborhood when in Bulgaria, be it Turks, Bulgarian or the Roma people. Now, she is complaining about the neighborhood surrounded usually by the Turks from eastern parts from Turkey:

We live together with 99 kinds of nationalities here in Cyprus, and we are the “number one hundred” in this list. There are really very different communities of people here. This situation does not lead to any disagreements I think, since we have been here for 10 years we have not faced problems with anybody and we are living in general accordance. We have many family friends that we are gathering with but we don’t have any neighbors of friends in our quarter to communicate with. I am not visiting the neighbors and they are not visiting me in return. If families residing in this neighborhood are about 10, the children might be about 50-60 in total. We cannot open many times the door of the house because of the crowdedness and the noisiness of children. This is a Turkish quarter of Lefkoşa actually, so I don’t have any social relations with the neighbors here. We are greeting each other but don’t having proximity. There are 3-4 Turkish Cypriot families in this neighborhood, who are also about to escape from here to different districts of Lefkoşa.

Karışık yaşamak da bana göre sıkıntılara yol açmazdı. Daha çok Türk arkadaşlarla görüşürdük toplanırdık, ama Bulgar arkadaşlarımız da vardı işten okuldan her gittiğimde görüşürüm onlarla da. Bulgar da olsa insan olanı da vardı içlerinde. Ben insanları severim bana taş atana ben ekmek atarım, benim için herkes insandır karşımdaki de yeterki insan olsun. Ne Çingene bakardım ne gavur bakardım herkesle hemen kaynaşırdım, ne büyük ne küçük bakardım hepsi aynıydı benim için. 99 çeşit milletle yaşıyoruz, bizde 100’üncü millet burada Kıbrıs’ta. Nebileyim değişik milleten var insanlar. Valla 10 yıldır çok şükür

anlaşmazlık olmadı kimseyle. Herkesle anlaşıyoruz. Arkadaşlarım çok, aile arkadaşlarımız var ama mahallede arkadaşımız çok yok ne ben onlara ne de onlar bana gelir. 10 aile varsa 50-60 çocuk var heralde mahallemizde. Kapıyı açamıyoruz bazen. Türkiye mahallesi yani burası. Vallahi ilişkilerimiz yok pek konu komşuyla da o yüzden. Selam sabahım vardır insanlarla ama pek yakınlığımız yok. Ben onlara gitmem onlar da gelmez. Kıbrıslılar 3-4 aile vardı mahallede onlar da kaçıyor zaten başka semtlere pek kalmadı onlar da.

This has been the neighborhood relation as how the immigrant Turks tend to communicate mostly with the people from their own background. While in Bulgaria they had affirmative relation with the rest of the society they were neighboring with Turks. After migration it is obvious that they tend to interact in their every day social life with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria sharing similar background and thus, cultural commonnes.

7.2.2 Cultural Activity Performances

In the cultural activity performance explanations, data information on the practices of cultural sentiments such as weddings, marriages, funerals and the other cultural or religious activities will be paid attention. This will again be based on two-dimensional data in relation to before and after migration process. Important to note, when the immigrant Turks have been asked about their cultural, and ritual practices they all notified the suppressive communist regime sanctions most prominent between the years of 1984-1989, until its fall.

T. (53, M, Technical High s.) states how some religious cultural activities peculiar to Turks started to be banned after 1984 in Bulgaria. These religious activities were of Muslim traditions that Turks performed to pursue their cultural reproduction. After 1990's suppressed Bulgarian policies, T. adds that these cultural restrictions were removed. On the other hand, after migration he does not encounter any significant cultural differences in northern Cyprus, since the Cypriot society in the northern part is already from a Muslim and Turkish origin. Especially, his talk is important in explanations about the cultural activities outline in Bulgaria:

Between the years of 1985-1989 the circumcision and the Turkish language usage were prohibited. Islamic traditions of our funerals were also prohibited and dead were obligated

to be interred in the Bulgarian and not to the Turkish graveyards by their relatives. The reason for this was to abolish the traditional distinctions of Turks and make Turks visit their dead in the homogenized Bulgarian graveyards. At present, the graveyards of Bulgarians and the Turks are separate in the villages. In the weddings it was allowed to play Bulgarian music only and the Turkish music was prohibited. Also, there were official policemen supervising the weddings and there was a limited time regulated for an entertainment. Except for these until the 1989 events only Bulgarian channels were on the TV and during the 1985-89 events, listening to the Turkish radio was not allowed. Turkish radio channels were deliberately disturbed. Life became normalized after 1989 in Bulgaria as it was the case before the suppressive policies and we were comfortable and relaxed again. The weddings and the funerals were all performed with the gathering of relatives and friends. The suppressions and the limitations were until the year of 1989. Now there is the satellite TV system, which is prominently prevalent in Bulgaria and preferred by the Turks to watch the Turkish channels instead of Bulgarian ones. And about the marriages in Bulgaria was that, in no way marriages were accepted among the relatives, as it is the opposite in Turkey. Our people were definitely against such things. Turks preferred to get married with a Turk again and the marriages between Bulgarian and the Turks were not prevalent and not approved by the families and parents also. Marriages with the Gypsies were not preferred also. This was because in such mixed marriages the religious worship and the other traditional rituals were not matched at all. It was an unhealthy relationship at which their families excluded the married people. Lack of harmony and defectiveness was inevitable in such cases.

1985-1989 arası sünnet yasaktı, Türkçe konuşmak yasaktı, cenazeler Türk mezarlarına gömülmezdi, Bulgar mezarlığına yakın Türk cenazelerine yeni yer açılmıştı oraya gömülüyordu Türkler de amaç da daha sonra bir tel örgü ile çevreleyip, komple Bulgar mezarlığına çevirmekti. Şimdi mezarlar ayrıdır köy yerlerinde, Türklerinki ayrı yerde Bulgarların ki ayrıdır. Düğünlerde sadece Bulgar müziği çalınırdı, o da polis gözetiminde Türkçe müzik yasaktı ve gündüz yapılırdı düğünler gece geç saatlere kadar eğlenemezdim. Onun dışında 1989 olaylarına kadar sadece Bulgar kanalları izleniyordu, 1985-89 olayları arasında Türkçe radyo dinlenmezdi çünkü bütün bölgelere ses dinleme cihazları konulmuştu, yani TV yoktu ama radyoyu da kısıtlamışlardı. 1989 sonrasında eskisi gibi oldu, değişti daha rahattı baskı döneminden önce de rahattı Türkler öyle oldu. Düğünler olsun cenazeler, akraba erkek-hanım tarafının eş dost katılır hep beraber yapılırdı. 1989 yıllarına kadardı bu kısıtlamalar, şimdi uydu sistemi çıktı ve Bulgaristan'da da Türkçe seyrediliyor televizyonlarda, Bulgarcadan çok daha fazla tercih ediliyor Türkçe kanalları. Evlilik işi ise mesela Türkiye'deki gibi akraba evliliği mesela yoktur, katiyen karşıdır herkes bizim orda böyle şeylere. Bulgaristan'da genelde Türkle Türk evlenmeyi tercih ederdi, hiçbir daim Türkle Bulgar evlenmezdi, zaten aileler de tercih etmezdi. Çingenerle de evlilikler tercih edilemezdi. O tür evlilikler tercih edilmezdi kesinlikle ne dini ibadetler ne de başka örfler uymazdı. Sağlıksız bir ilişki oluyordu, gençler aileleri tarafından da dışlanıyordu, uyumsuzluk oluyordu, sakat iş oluyordu yani.

A. (56, M, Specialized High s.) also emphasize the suppressed policies in reference with the performances of the cultural, Muslim religious activities among Turks in Bulgaria. On the other hand, after migration he explains that the slight cultural differences were prevalent in northern Cyprus in comparison with the native

Turkish Cypriots. A. is affirmative about the cultural activities and the interaction in terms of intercultural marriage:

Since we are in a Turkish state, we can keep alive our own cultural traditions. The Turkish customs and the traditions here in Cyprus are not unfamiliar to us and indeed some performances of our traditions are similar actually. There is no difference in between but may be slight nuances only. For example, unlike here in Cyprus, our usual wedding ceremonies are including meals and beverages of alcoholic and non-alcoholic kind, but here the weddings are simple in content and comprised of mainly greetings and money pinned or otherwise attached to the new married couple. Some of the guests are dancing some are sitting and watching around, people who know each other come together for conversations, all are the same everywhere. I think that simple and slight differences remain and nothing more. We do not feel alienated as a result in Cyprus and our people of Bulgarian Turks get accustomed to this social environment easily. And about the marriages here in Cyprus is that they started to mix up intercultural. The young Bulgarian Turks prefer to get married with either Turks from Turkey or the Turkish Cypriots. The Turkish Cypriots also tend to marry and join with the Bulgarian Turks. Although there are some families and parents who do not agree on such intercultural marriages, the young willing couple insists on and then families in no way accept their marriage. Actually, there are young couples that did quite successful marriages in Cyprus. Still, my general thought on the marriages in Cyprus is that you can marry a Cypriot but cannot become a Cypriot. I believe that the younger generation should remember what their past is and what their parents and families have withstander for.

Kendi adetlerimizi burada yaşatabiliyoruz Türk devletine geldik sonuçta. Burada da olsun yabancı değil yani Türk adet ve gelenkler bize, biz ne yapıyorsak burada yaşayan diğer insanlar da aynısını yapıyor. Arada fark yok bence, belki ufak tefek nuanslar vardır sadece. Bizim Bulgaristan'da düğünlerimiz yemeli içmeli olurdu ama burada öyle değil, daha sade yapılıyor, yeni evli çift davetlilerin tebriklerini alır, para takılır neyse daha fazla bununla geçiyor, daha sonra dans edilir veya bir kısım oturduğu yerden seyredir. Tanıdıklar görüşüyor, sohbet ediyor insanlar burada da böyle. Ama o kadar farklılık olacak artık. Ama sonuç olarak hiç yabancılık çekmedik biz burada Kıbrıs'ta, hemen ayak uydurdu insanların buradaki ortamlara. Burada da artık karışmaya başladı evlilikler, Türkiyelilerle de Kıbrıslılarla da evlenmeyi tercih ediyor bizim gençlerimiz. Kıbrıslılar da olsun artık dediğim gibi Bulgaristanlılarla da karışmaya başladılar onaylamayan aileler de var, ama bir bakıyorsunuz çocuklar tutturuyor evleneceğiz diye ailelere de kabul etmekten başka çare kalmıyor. İyi yani gençlerimiz burada çok uyumlu evlilikler yaptı. Ama benim düşüncem şudur Kıbrıslıya gideceksin ama Kıbrıslı olmayacaksın, yani gençlerimiz geçmişini unutmamalı, ailelerin yaşadıklarını unutmamalı.

R. (43, M, Vocational Technical High s.) is important how he elaborates the intercultural marriage in northern Cyprus between the immigrant Turks and the native Turkish Cypriots:

Here Bulgarian Turks prefer their children to marry again with a Bulgarian Turkish boy or a girl. However such calculations of wishes are not practicable all the time. What happens actually is that in the case of marriage issues Turkish Cypriots achieve to assimilate us

culturally. I am not assimilated personally since I am not attracted anyway by the people to stay here in Cyprus and I am excluded and discriminated because of my immigrant background. But what happens with the marriages and our younger generation is that they are assimilating somehow; they speak with the Turkish Cypriot accent and it is like a fashion to behave like a Turkish Cypriot. I do not know actually whether this is a bad or good behavior for the future of our children. But it is true that our young are tending to imitate the native community in here and whether we want it or not they are spontaneously becoming Cypriots by themselves. Even you become like a native Turkish Cypriot, you may not be actually accepted by the Turkish Cypriots into their social environments in return and you may remain to imagine only that you are a Cypriot. Nevertheless, I think that our children are not to be offense for this, and if marrying with a Turkish Cypriot is accepted as an offense, then not the children but we, the families or parents are definitely responsible for these blameworthy things. We brought our children here and they join with Turkish Cypriots and decide to marry with one of them but if we were to take them with us to Africa then they would possibly find an African to marry with. If we are going to behave reluctantly for our children's marriages with a foreigner then we should have remained in Bulgaria. All in all, how we can expect our children to find a right and appropriate friend of a Bulgarian Turk to them while this is not always the case. Hence, it is agreeable that the Bulgarian Turkish children meet and join friends of the remaining rest of Turkish Cypriot children, who comprise the %95, the majority in the school and other environments around the Bulgarian Turkish.

Burada Bulgaristanlının yine Bulgaristanlıyla evlenmesini istiyor. Ama bu tarz hesaplar şaşıyor bazen. Bu evlilik konularından dolayı Kıbrıslılar bizi kültürel olarak asimile etmeyi başarıyorlar. Belki beni şahsen asimile edemiyor, cezbetmiyor insanlar beni burada kalmam için dışlıyor ve ayrımcılık yapıyor göçmen olduğum için, ama evlilik konusuyla gençlerimiz asimile oluyor. Kıbrıslıların aksanı ile konuşuyor, moda gibi olmuş Kıbrıslılar gibi davranmak. Yani böyle giderse iyi mi olur, kötü mü olur bilmiyorum ama gençlerimiz özeniyor yerlilerine. Yani istesek de istemesek de gençler kendiliğinden Kıbrıslı oluyor. Sen Kıbrıslı olduğunda asıl Kıbrıslılar seni kabul etmiyor yine o ayrı, sen kendin Kıbrıslı olduğunu zannediyorsun. Ama çocuklarımızın da suçu yok, eğer bu suçsa da Kıbrıslıyla evlenmek, suç çocuklarda değil bizde ailelerde kesinlikle. Biz çocuklarımızı buraya getirdik Kıbrıslı buldu diyelim, ama Afrikaya götürseydik onları Afrikalı bulurdu. Biz istemeseydik çocuklarımızın yabancıya evlenmesini, biz Bulgaristan'da kalacaktık. Yani çocuklar nerden gitsin de Bulgaristan Türkü arkadaşı bulsun kendine. Bulgaristanlı Türk varsa kafası uyuşmayabilir, ne yapsın bu çocuk mecbur %95'lik Kıbrıslı gurubun içerisinde arkadaş ediniyor okulda ve dışarda.

In similar lines, how İ. (45, F, College-Vocational Training s.) summarizes the cultural differences in terms of certain cultural occasions:

Despite the fact that we did not make distinctions between the Turks and the Bulgarians and shared commonality on the same table while eating and drinking and working together, in the case of marriage we fell apart and it was unusual for a Bulgarian and a Turk to marry with each other. It was paid attention not to entertain such a marriage and there were very rare instances in the big cities only practiced in an unfruitful manner. I haven't got any friends and relatives around with such mixed marriages. Apart from this, the cultural activities have changed completely what we were familiar with in Bulgaria and I am not glad about the ways of how customs and traditions are practiced here. God avoid, but I am not gladly agreeable especially on the funeral ceremonies here. For

example, when someone dies in the hospital, the dead woman or man is not brought home to farewell in a certain manner. This saddens me in here because the very ritual carefulness of the dead person is missing, as it was the opposite in Bulgaria. Also, the weddings are very simple and artificial to me here in Cyprus. Our weddings in Bulgaria were full of joy, liveliness and were cheerful celebrations overall. Here in Cyprus marriages with Turks from Turkey are not preferable and the preferred ones are those with Bulgarian Turks or Turkish Cypriots. Actually our children started to mix with everybody in terms of marriages. Why I am dividing the Turks from Turkey is because especially the men are tending to be quite authoritarian on their wives beyond the usual matter of jealousy and keeping them in the background of a minor importance. There are the better and more intelligent ones too but it would be a big chance to coincide with them.

Ne kadar da ayırım yapmasak da aynı sofrada yemek de yesek, aynı işte de çalışsak ama evliliğe gelince bu ayırım yapıyordu Türklerle Bulgarlar arasında. Buna dikkat ediliyordu, Bulgarla evlilik yapan Türkler oluyordu ama o da çok büyük şehirlerde oluyordu, benim de yakın çevremde tanıdığım yoktu. Bu gibi karışık evlilikler de hoş karşılanmazdı. Oradakilerden tamamen değişti, ve buradaki örf adetlerden hiç hoşnut değilim. Allah göstermesin özellikle burda cenazelerden hiç hoşnut değilim. Hastanede vefat ediyor mesela ne eve getiriliyor cenaze son olarak görmek, vedalaşmak için. Bulgaristan'daki özenti hiç yok o meftaya karşı burada, orası beni çok üzüyor. Düğünler çok sade çok sahte geçiyor. Bizim Bulgaristan'da düğünlerimiz eğlenceli, fıkır fıkır geçerdi, düğün deyince öyleydi büyük şenlik olurdu. Evlilikler de Türkiyeli olmasını tercih edilmez. Bulgaristanlıyla olabilir, Kıbrıslıyla da olabilir, karışıyor çocuklarımız artık. Türkiyelileri de ayırmamın sebebi onlarda kıskançlığın ötesinde bir otoriterlik var, kadınları her zaman ikinci planda tutmak gibi. İyileri de var ama onlar bize rast gelmez heralde.

It has been obvious how the cultural performances differ in both social environments in Bulgaria and in northern Cyprus. Especially in the intercultural marriage patterns it has been prominent that immigrant Turks tend to form cultural boundary formations in reference to their ethnically similar communities. Based on this, 'us' and 'them' divisions become apparent.

7.2.3 Associations and Participation

Associations and the participation level among immigrant respondent Turks of Bulgaria is an important topic also. This is to understand again the cultural associations and the participants among whom they tend to interact mostly. For example, R. (43, M, Vocational Technical High s.) emphasizes that, even there is an ethno-cultural closure between the community members of immigrant Turks, and he mostly stays on the conditions in northern Cyprus. He complains about the associational gatherings would be based on more collectivist rudiments rather than

individualistic, which is the situation today among immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus:

Of course, the organizations I mean should be good and agreeable in their nature and not the evil ones that organize people to revolt. What I mean is to get organized peacefully and in solidarity and to voice opinions if necessary against unjust treatments. Of course, all these have their right methods and procedures and the necessity to obey. To have an organization is a very agreeable event in general and in reference to the situation here coming together for conversations with our people of Bulgarian Turks makes us feel better. Unfortunately, this is an environment not provided at present by the institutionalized association of Bulgarian Turks now in Cyprus. I think it has always been this way and it always will be and there is nothing to do for this association to straighten it in a desirable way. There is a saying in Bulgaria; “save yourself by you” and it is closely relevant with our situations that everybody tries to relieve on its own. This is the logic opposite to the motto of “one for all, and all for one” according to which everybody is claiming for its own rights and this is how things work at the present. There is no solidarity among our people of Bulgarian Turks and it is difficult to be agreeable with the majority of them who are different in their minds. I am sad about this but there is nothing to do with.

Örgütlenme ne olursa olsun, hangi konuda olursa olsun çok iyi bir şeydir. Dernek, sendika olsun çok önemli kuruluşlar, dernek demek hakkını alabilmektir. Birlikten güç doğar mantığı taşır bu tarz örgütlenmeler. Örgüt demek birlik demek, çok şey demek ama yapabilece. Karım benim Komünizm partisine üye olmuştu, herkesi teşvik ediyorlardı zaten olması için. Hiçbir faydasını görmedik. 1990'dan sonra DPS partinin ilçe örgütleri vardı, ama benim hiç alakam olmadı, yardımlarını görmedik, istemedik de. Ben belki onlara yardımımı vermişimdir, oyumu verdim ama onlardan bir yardım beklemedim. Dernek parti ne olursa olsun, Türkler kendi aralarında örgütlenmesi çok güzel bir şeydir. Ama iyi amaçlı dernek olacak, kötü amaçlı ayaklanıp isyan etmek değil sakın sakın dayanışmak, gerektiğinde haksızlıklar olduğunda sesini duyurmak. Ama bunun yöntemi prosedürü vardır onlara uyarak. Dernek olması çok güzel bir şey, bizim burada biraraya gelmemiz için biz kendi olanımızla sohbet edince daha iyi hissediyoruz kendimizi ama öyle bir ortam sağlamıyor dernek maalesef. Böyle gelmiş böyle gidecek galiba, bence bu derneğin düzelmesi için yapılacak da hiç bir şey yok öyle olmasa ama bir laf var Bulgarca ‘spasyavay se po edinično’, Kendini bireysel olarak kurtar diye aynı o hesap bizim işimiz de. ‘Birimiz hepimiz, hepimiz birimiz’ mantığına zıt gelen bir şey bireysel çıkarlarına bakıyor herkes, ama burada bu mantık çalışıyor. Birlik yok, bizim insanların çoğunla anlaşmak da zor, öyle olmasa keşke ama yapacak bir şey de yok. Bir şey değiştiremeyiz, zaten öyle bir niyetim de yok. Orta şekerli. Ama zaten şimdiki durumundan daha iyi bir duruma getirilemez dernek. İnsanlar arasında da çok ayrı düşünceler var, kafa yapıları var.

İ. (45, F, College-Vocational Training s.) also states that the associations should be affirmative in content. She explains how in the period when she lived in Bulgaria there were no any associational organizations, since the communist regime initiated all the communities in Bulgaria to join the Communist Party regional offices.

There was nothing about any type of association in Bulgaria. There was only one Communist Party then and nothing else at the time when we were there. I had no any membership to any party or an association. Since I was a kindergarten teacher as an educated woman, I was offered many times to join the regional district Communist Party office. In our village I was requested a candidacy for the Communist Party presidency but families of my husband and my parents were against it. I was an obstinate person and was about to accept the presidency but I denied at last. After we emigrated from Bulgaria associations were established but we had no any relevance with them. This is also because we cannot go frequently to Bulgaria and we have been in Bulgaria for the first time in 2004 after 12 years of our migration. Associations are of course pretty good well-working institutions, which should be prevalent. When we are talking about an association, it is meant like a collective action not of course as an opposing action towards the government in power or a separatist organization. For example, the association established here in Cyprus in the name of Bulgarian Turks is the type of an organization that I have meant before; a solidarity organization as a result of a need to come together. I am one of the founder members of this association but it has not lasted in how we started in the very beginning. I am not attending to this association anymore and joining the activities. Our people of Bulgarian Turks are also very passive and their persistent way of look is as if “do not touch me and do whatever you want”. The association president now in the head is trying to do something and to gather people together but nobody is interested in anymore.

Orda örgütlenme diye birşey yoktu. Sadece komunist partisi vardı. Bizim zamanımızda başka hiçbirşey yoktu. Ben üye değildim hiçbir parti veya örgüte. İşimden dolayı çok teklif geldi ama ben kabul etmedim. Köyde komunist parti başkanlığına aday gösterildim ama ailem her iki taraftan da ısrarla karşıydılar. Dik kafalıydım bende çok sıcak bakıyordum ama partinin kapısından döndüm. Onun dışında bizden sonra oldu ama hiçbir alakamız olmadı daha sonra zaten pek sık da gitmiyoruz Bulgaristan’a da 12 seneden sonra 2004’te Bulgaristan’a gittik. Güzel birşey tabi olması gerekiyor. Ne yönetime karşı ne de başka bir bölücü örgüt olarak algılıyorum hani örgütlenme derken bizim burada Kıbrıs’ta mesela dayanışma adı altında biraraya gelmek için dernek kurulmasına ihtiyaç duyuldu. Derneğin ilk kurucularındanım ama ne oldu başladığımız gibi devam etmedi dernek işi. Bizden sonra. Çok pasif insanlarımız bana dokunma da ne istersen yap anlayışıyla devam ediyor. Dernek başkanı da insanları topluyor, birşeyler yapmaya çalışıyor ama katılan yok.

In the case with final respondent of A. (56, M, Specialized Higher s.), he explains how the associations are of good merit to run. He emphasizes the associational activities in the association established among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. He states that it is important to have such organizations in order properly to follow the state sanctions in general and in particular relevant with the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. This how the association in northern Cyprus function, besides the gathering of people from the same background, and negotiating the problems prevalent and addressing them through the state channels to relevant state offices to solve them.

[...] And about the associations here in Cyprus is that I still think positive things and that was why the Bulgarian Turks went towards to establish one in 1995 that I am an active member. We have common and shared problems to solve. Associations are accepted as bridges with responsibilities at which individuals not one by one or individually but collectively are to share and solve. This is always the case to be prevalent because if someone went to request a support individually the related bodies might not care and interest in but collectively to solve is the appropriate way to deal with by means of associations. One of the duties of the Bulgarian Turkish association is to register everybody to provide with an appropriate job in the state services according to their educational background. Also the state of N. Cyprus provided us with a foundational house to place Bulgarian Turks in need of urgent accommodation. Additionally, all kinds of passport procedures and problems are dealt through the association, which has direct contacts with the Bulgarian embassy. As a result, this association is an agent for such services while trying to deal with in the name of collectivities of Bulgarian Turks. Thus there has to be an established association in order to make the business run.

[...] Olumlu şeyler düşünüyorum dernekleşme hakkında yani Bulgaristan Türkleri de zaten o amaçla dernek kurmaya yöneldi. Çözeceğimiz ortak sorunlarımız var, dernekler köprü olarak görev görüyor, yani bireylerin tek tek değil de, bireysel olarak sorununu arz etmeye gidersen zaten işin zor oluyor kimse de ilgilenmez, ama bazı sorunları toplumsal olarak çözmek lazım. Yani devlet katında iş bulabilmek için herkes kaydını yaptı Bulgaristan'da ne iş yapıyormuş burada da aynı meslekle yararlı olabilir mi bizim insanlarımız diye derneğin üstlendiği görevlerden bir tanesi de bu. Lojman verdi yerimiz de var devletin yardımıyla sağlandı bunlar. Ondan sonra bu pasaport işlemlerimiz için doğrudan Bulgar elçisiyle, Konsoloslukla temasa geçtik. Bu hizmetler için de dernek aracı oluyor. Dernek olmazsa olmaz zaten, bu işler de olmaz herkes ayrı ayrı koşturmak zorunda kalır. Üyeyim derneğe katılım da çok zayıf değil genel olarak.

As it has been explained the associations are stated as affirmative organizations in order to get together and solve common problems and if possible to engage the state provisions for proper solutions.

7.3 Conclusion

Having explained the general social networking among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, it is obvious that there are ethnically and culturally based boundary formations within the in-group categorizations. This is how immigrant Turks differentiates themselves from the Bulgarians or Roma people in the social interactions when they were living in Bulgaria. Depending on the statements mentioned so far, it is apparent that immigrant Turks from Bulgaria redefines their ethno-cultural boundary formations (Barth, 1969) based on their interactions on commonly shared cultural performances. As in the case with immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, it has been observable that the ethnic identity formation process started

when Bulgarian policies started to define them as a threatening entity for the Bulgarian nation state due to being different in ethnic identifications that is the belongingness to the Muslim Turkish origin. This is how to Nagel (1994:154) the ethnic identity is the result of a dialectical interaction involving internal and external opinions and processes, as well as the individual's self-identification and outsiders' ethnic designations-i.e. and that what you think your belongingness to community membership, or ethnicity is, versus what they, or others think your ethno-cultural background is. Briefly, it is how in all the socio-cultural settings where the interactions of everyday life have been prevalent, and the redefinition of identity take place is also fostering the development of attitudes and behaviours based on particular contextual differences (exteriors) and similarities (interiors) also defining the dichotomies of "us/them", "we-ness/the others-ness", "there/here" identity concerns studied by Jenkins (1994), become also prominent among the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria. In other terms, it is explicit of making meaningful mostly the concept of 'in-betweenness' (Bhabha, 1994, 1996).

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION: INTERPRETING THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this research study, the main idea is to bring into analysis the social citizenship experiences of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing at present in northern Cyprus. The study is based on two dimensional research data, concentrating comparatively on the conditions of these immigrants both in Bulgaria and in northern Cyprus. This comparison aimed to indicate the changing citizenship experiences, with a specific focus on social citizenship rights, as a result of migration process that the immigrants were involved in. Since the social citizenship analysis as a result of migrant experiences is the main reference point of this thesis, people's motivations to migrate were particularly given significant emphasis.

For all these reasons, broader social themes were specified according to which the significance of social citizenship analysis aimed to address to the various inclusive and exclusive aspects of it. These themes were divided into two main topics, one of which was economic conditions of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in terms of labor market participation (work and occupation), social security assurance, and the property ownerships. The second topic of analysis was based on socio-cultural relations in terms of social networks and neighborhood, cultural activity performances, and the degree of associations and level of participation of the people. Overall, I aimed to examine these themes for the analysis of citizenship membership status and the citizenship practices within a contractual relationship between the state and the individual in the case of immigrant Turks of Bulgaria. Having restated the intention of this thesis, on the one hand, I tried to understand whether the citizenship practices are indicating variations as a consequence of migration experiences and if so, in which respects. On the other hand, understanding was aimed to exploring the immigrant identity perceptions which depended on the social citizenship practices performed in certain social spaces in the country of origin - Bulgaria - and country of destination - northern Cyprus-.

Depending on the research data and the chapter discussions, significant sum of notifications should be made in relevance with the citizenship matters of the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria at present in northern Cyprus. First of all, it is evident that the places of origin among the Turkish immigrants in northern Cyprus are all coming from different rural regions of Bulgaria. Although their characteristics as village residents before emigration, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, were not a closed community in itself and all had close contacts with the urban social environment depending on various reasons such as having relatives and friends, getting education and specialization and through participation in the labor market. It is important to mention also that these immigrants emigrated in different time periods due to such different motivation factors. As it has been mentioned before, they are from villages of district cities such as Hacıoğlu Pazarcık (Dobrich), Silistre (Silistra), Razgrad (Razgrad), Eski Cuma (Targovishte), Kızanlık (Kazanlık), Hasköy (Haskovo) and Kırcaali (Kurdzhali). There are two broader geographical regions that these district regions are located within. These regions are known as the Dobrudja (including Hacıoğlu Pazarcık, Silistre, Razgrad), in the Northeastern part of Bulgaria and the Kurdzhali region (including Eski Cuma, Kızanlık, Hasköy and Kırcaali), in the Southeastern Bulgaria. These are the most populace regions with Turks in Bulgaria. To specify further, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria who migrated to northern Cyprus are reflecting the general conditions of Turks in Bulgaria as such that before migration they were usually residing in the rural villages in Bulgaria and dealing with agriculture in terms of gardening, cultivating and farming.

Secondly, having explained their location, another characteristic about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, is that they were not a homogeneous ethno-cultural migrant group but heterogeneous in cultural and linguistic, still with slight nuances of being Muslim Turkish. Before migration the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria who lived in the two opposite regional directions of Dobrudja and Kurdzhali were distanced and not always communicating or interacting socially and culturally in commonness. Their level of attachments to the place of origin in Bulgaria and the traditional Muslim Turkish customs vary slightly across regions. Even so, the entire research group of Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria were identifying themselves

with being from the “Turkish” and “Muslim” origin. Also, the categorization of “Bulgarian Turk” was usually acceptable by them because it was referring to “Turkish-ness” in general with the roots in Bulgaria. Yet, the varying lived experiences in reference to the social citizenship practices in Bulgaria were creating different perceptions of self-identifications among the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. To exemplify, those who were residing in the Kurdzhali region, where the Turks were densely populated were exposed to explicit assimilation policies directed by the Bulgarian state during communist regime. Some of the interview respondents resided in the Kurdzhali districts explained how they were neighbouring only and interacting mostly with the Turks. They had no intimate relations with the Bulgarians and actually did not prefer to have because the Bulgarian community was associated with the Bulgarian nation-state suppressive policies.

In addition to those immigrants coming from the Kurdzhali regions, almost all of the immigrants who were influenced directly from the suppressive policies in the communist regime during 1980’s and in hardship with their families to survive economically and socially tend to identify themselves mostly as being a (an ethnic) “minority”, “discriminated” “excluded” and “second-class citizens”. Depending on the research findings, all these categorizations became still prevalent in an articulated continuation even after the fall of authoritarian communist regime in Bulgaria. This resulted in the continuous emigrations of Turks from Bulgaria during 1990’s. During the interviews respondents shared their future prospects that they were hopeless and worry about especially for their children’s welfare because the access to higher education was difficult to afford in Bulgaria. According to the respondents’ opinions it was also because the Turkish children were not equally evaluated, obviously differentiated in Bulgarian society by their Turkish names, together with the Bulgarian children in reaching the education opportunities and the white-collar jobs consequently. Taking into consideration the narratives, it is possible to argue that the claims on the social exclusion experienced among Turkish immigrants before their emigration from Bulgaria to be explicitly a concern of social citizenship. It is how the equal and universal bases of citizenship status and the membership into the wider political community are neglected. The disregard of this and the exclusion is

apparent mostly in social terms because of ethno-cultural backgrounds in the case of immigrant Turks' experiences in Bulgaria, although they are politically and legally recognized.

Thirdly, in parallelism of the above discussions, the findings of the study indicated that processes of social exclusion and inclusion from social citizenship display different profiles in both Bulgaria and in northern Cyprus for the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria, depending on different social factors. In both locations opportunities of education and having an occupation as well as the chances of labor market participation varied to a great extent. The immigrant Turks from Bulgaria included in the research sample were asked to compare their experiences in Bulgaria with those in northern Cyprus.

According to the narratives of the respondents in relation to their social citizenship practices in Bulgaria, it is noteworthy to pinpoint that all of them, without exceptions, had been describing their lived experiences of education, occupation and labor market participation with reference to the regulations of the communist regime in Bulgaria. The first generation immigrant respondents lived under this regime for a major part of their lifetime and had enough experiences that influenced their future prospects as well their social statuses at present even in northern Cyprus. Additionally, they had witnessed the transformation of the political regime and so were able to make comparisons between the conditions during and right after the communism in Bulgaria. As they have declared, they have achieved a substantial degree of education and qualification in Bulgaria but their educational achievements were limited and not sufficient to provide to them an opportunity of getting urban jobs with a higher status. This was, according to their interpretations, a limitation of the communist regime applied towards the Muslim Turkish community. To elaborate further, the educational level of the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria have been only up to the level of a high (vocational or training based) school degree which was not giving them an opportunity to participate into the urban labor market. Any inclination to continue even after their vocational high school education seems to remain limited since they mostly had been residing in rural areas. All respondents

said that after they get married, they remained in the rural areas. Thus, the education becomes in closely related to the types of occupations (like heavy vehicle drivers, life-stock breeding, turnery, etc.) mostly relevant for the rural areas. Some of them coming from the Northeastern Bulgarian regions, where fertile and the most suitable land production prevail, additionally were engaged with the intense agriculture and farming activities. On the other hand, the geographical inconveniency in the Southeastern regions of Bulgaria, because of the mountainous surrounding was causing difficulty in the appropriate labor market participation. According to the male interview respondents from the Kurdzhali region of Bulgaria were vocational high school graduates or having secondary school enrollments, some of who were doing seasonal works aparted from their families in the regions of Bulgaria where the work activities were abundant. Although the jobs done were nearly well paid with satisfying working conditions, they were mostly blue-collar and low-status ones.

That is why, to some extent some of the interviewed immigrants criticize that their education was limited with specific schedules of vocational high school and they were not able to improve themselves. Also, in similar discussion to this, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria argue that university education was not affordable for Turks living in rural areas, and they were lacking the opportunities because of their ethnic backgrounds of being a Turk. For example, usually respondents complain that engineers, doctors, lawyers, and the other specialized occupations needing higher university education are usually desirable and reachable to the Bulgarians, living in the urban areas. It is important to mention again that living in the urban areas was restricted during the communist regime and there were special regulations. The main state regulation in this sense according to the immigrant respondents was the “city citizenship”. This was stated as a social citizenship status permitting residence in the urban environments only to those who are to move to the city and expected to live and work at least for five years. If these requirements were met only then a membership of such a citizenship allowed a person to possess unmovable property in an urban setting. Thus, a profile of social exclusion from social citizenship in Bulgaria was mostly represented in the narratives through lived experiences of education, occupation and labor market participation of the

respondents depended on the residence environments of urban and rural environments as well.

Apart from the prominent dynamics of social citizenship exclusion, social inclusion dynamics are also prevalent among immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing at present in northern Cyprus. These were the social assurance, or the social security services benefited in Bulgaria. This was also explained in relation to the communist regime regulations. It is obvious from the respondents' views that they were meeting all the equal rights to benefit from social security promised by the state provisions. There were no complains in the narratives but approvals of the socialist system focused on before 1990's sanctions in Bulgaria. Immigrant Turks without exceptions emphasized and exemplified how the welfare communist state was guarding the socially secured rights to be protected and provided fully. Social citizenship in this sense was engaged and inclusive in practice in Bulgaria, but possibly matching the critics of social citizenship. The ideological critique to the state welfare providing extensive social rights hinders the proper functioning of a society instead of making it socially 'engaged'. Such a welfare state is defined to be inefficient/ineffective and deteriorating economically, socially and politically the contracted relation between the state and the citizens. As a result of all, extensive social rights and provisions are tending to create and promote 'underclass', or passive dependency on the state rather than the subordinated conditions of poverty (Dwyer, 2004:58, 62-63). To certain extents, the same approaches could be relevant in defying the tendencies of social citizenship limitations in education, occupation and labour market participation in Bulgaria described by the immigrant Turks on the one hand, and on the other extensive social rights and the guaranteed provisions by the state. This was as such that the state-bounded mutual conditionality during the communist regime was guaranteed in the creation of state defined categories of 'need', 'deserve', 'duties' or 'rights' regulating the behaviours of the community members. Even though the Turks, who had to emigrate from Bulgaria, were performing their 'conditional' duties on equal bases in Bulgaria, in certain instances there were exclusionary state approaches disregarding opportunities in providing

equal right access, thus differentiating the community members and creating regional inequalities.

Having apprehended dynamics of social inclusion and exclusion depended on citizenship practices in Bulgaria; there is a significant profile of these in northern Cyprus to underpin also. Immigrant Turks of Bulgaria in their narratives tended to figure out their lived experiences after migration to northern Cyprus as more “free” and socially inclusive mainly because of their Muslim Turkish identity. They were living in a territory where the majority of the population was Muslim Turkish Cypriots. Hence, the exclusive factor in Bulgaria became a major factor of social inclusion in their experiences in northern Cyprus. Despite these feelings of identification with their new social environment in terms of their ethno-cultural backgrounds, their migrant identities played an exclusionary role for the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus. What is striking in the social relations of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria is that they tend to come together with the Turkish migrants coming from Bulgaria alike them. Almost all of them, including the male and the female respondents that they perceive themselves as excluded in the social relations already established in northern Cyprus. They explained how they are not accepted fully as members to the social environments by the native Turkish Cypriots. At this point, it is how the concept developed by Barth (1969), ‘ethnic/cultural boundary’ formations became evident in the relevant social spaces where the cultural interactions take place. The lived experiences in the past in the places of origin and the migration experiences make the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria to affiliate themselves with one another on ‘commonality’ of sharing similar attributes. This makes them neighbouring mostly with the same immigrants like them instead of communicating in the every day life with the Turkish Cypriots. In northern Cyprus immigrant Turks from Bulgaria share in common only in the work environments with the Turkish Cypriots. All the interactions usually occur and maintain on the bases of ‘similarity/differences’ of ‘symbolic cultural’ redefinitions in terms of ‘who we are’ and ‘who they are’ (Jenkins, 2004). These identity reformations and redefinitions were especially more apparent with the presence of a migration factor. In these regards, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria construct their perceptions of we-

ness and otherness on particular space and time conditions depended on similarities and differences in reference to duality of “there” and “here”.

On the other hand, immigrant Turks from Bulgaria all emigrated from Bulgaria when they were almost middle-aged. This was an outstanding factor in determining social citizenship in northern Cyprus. To put it differently, the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria being in their middle ages; when they came first, also the first generation immigrants preferred northern Cyprus as a destination place, prevent them improve their education up to higher levels. Hence, their pre-achieved education qualifications in Bulgaria and coming from an emigrant profile made them late comers for the already established labour market opportunities in northern Cyprus as well. Hence, it was difficult for this middle-aged emigrant group to enter into well paid and high status jobs. Rather they were able to enter jobs, which the native Turkish Cypriots do not want to undertake. As it was mentioned, these are jobs as driver, factory worker, and the other blue-collar jobs, which were undertaken by the male respondents. In the same respects, baby-sitter, tea-coffee maker, domestic cleaner, office cleaner, salesclerk are jobs filled by the female immigrant respondents. While these were low-graded and blue-collar jobs in the social hierarchy, they were described to be well paid and satisfying in the general working conditions. However, those respondents performing such job activities were criticizing about the uncertain and unguaranteed working conditions in the private sector, or the informal sector jobs undertaken by the immigrant Turks. Apart from this, there were a few male and female respondents, who were able to take part in the public sector works occupations as civil servants in northern Cyprus. It is important to say that they usually were likely to be guaranteed but still low-status job activities. For example, there were female respondents working as civil servant in a state institution, doing tea or coffee. The usual case was then that both in the public and the private sector immigrant Turks from Bulgaria were meeting satisfying conditions economically, since they are paid at least the minimum wage determined by the state bureaucratic decision-making. However, almost all immigrant respondents tend to notify that they were usually low-graded because of their jobs being obligated to perform in northern Cyprus, and they are not allowed to do jobs prominently

undertaken by the native Turkish Cypriots, be it in the private and the public service sector.

As a result of all these, it might be argued that because of such established and situational conditions according to which immigrant Turks have difficulty in integration into the northern Cypriot society, they were not surprisingly identifying themselves as “foreigner”, “discriminated”, “immigrant” and “second-class citizen”. It seems that they are not completely satisfied socially with their conditions in northern Cyprus, after their emigration from Bulgaria. However, it is intact that their future expectations about saving their children from the unfavourable economic and social conditions encountered by the first generation immigrant parents. This is evident in the narratives that almost all the immigrant children have at least high school enrollment and attendance to university. In these regards, it could be argued that social mobility through education is expected in the way that the immigrant children are provided with higher education by their families and specialization aimed in undertaking high-graded and white-collar jobs consequently. This is corresponding with dimensions of social citizenship elaborated by Marshall (1950/1992), which emphasize the role of education to improve the welfare state and the members of it to call for more “engaged citizenship” status. These arguments were focused on providing high levels of education opportunities in order to abolish the inequalities embedded by the capitalist production system, which is advantaging and disadvantaging certain groups in the social. Thus, the educated community members will be free and aim-oriented to improve on equal bases in the society.

Above all, the Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria feel “in-between” and matching with this concept of Bhabha (1994, 1996) in many certain citizenship instances in the presence of migration process. That is why the practices of citizenship in terms of its inclusiveness and exclusiveness affected immigrant Turks in northern Cyprus in respects that they migrated since they were excluded socially evident in their self-identifications, mostly prominent with the categorization of “second-class citizen”. After migration these first generation immigrant Turks were not completely adaptive into their social environments since their perceptions of “second class citizenship” take new forms in northern Cyprus. In addition to, the

social citizenship practices of mostly exclusionary terms were evident in influencing the self-identifications as well. This also fuels the dichotomy of between the “adaptation and nostalgic sentiments” between the “home” and “host” countries.

In regards of the theoretical groundings, which were laid at the very beginning in this thesis, the social rights were agreeable in theory but they fail in practice to satisfy especially immigrant Turkish community from Bulgaria living at present in northern Cypriot society. While in the first case there was an evidence of “citizenship of ethnic exclusion”, in the second there was a formation of “citizenship of social exclusion”. Relying on this research study, it is possible to argue that social citizenship is hardly to be handled without the identity perceptions also, which play significant role in defining the “life-world” of an individual. It was evident that such a socially constructed citizenship approach may be reliable for the immigrant studies in investigating and rethinking the status, membership and the belonging matters to make citizenship rather inclusive, enhanced and engaged broaderly. For this, in such cases likewise Turks from Bulgaria who immigrated to northern Cyprus, the citizenship state policies should be reconsidered in relevance with migration and rather inclusive citizenship rights and social policies to be developed and make “engaged citizenship” possible.

In order to restate the hypotheses about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria lied down in the beginning of this thesis, it is possible to say that almost all of the pinpointed relationships have been evaluated and justified so far up to certain extents. This research proves that there are prevalent dimensions of inclusive and exclusive dimensions of social citizenship but as it was proposed they are not relevant in the place of origin only. On the contrary, it is still evident how they are prevalent in the destination place after migration causing hardship in adaptation to the Turkish-Muslim social environment also, which was one of the reasons for escape from the Bulgarian-Christian one. All the prevalent relations were analysed and partially elaborated in this sense, but it would be noteworthy to reemphasize one of the hypothesis about the dual citizenship. As it was reversibly proposed in a hypothesis, the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria does not perceive the dual citizenship

of Bulgaria and northern Cyprus as advantageous. While this make “flexible citizenship” (Ong, 1999), meaningful as placing these immigrants in statuses to survive through the both citizenship memberships, they remain in all instance “in-between” as disadvantageous. The conclusion could be drawn on how they are either “exploiting” the benefits of these contracted relations, but also being “exploited” by the same prevalent mutually bounded relation defining the state preconditions and the expectations of the members.

Finally, this research and the thesis constructed aims to contribute for further research on this research group profiles of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria residing at present in northern Cyprus. Overall, this thesis hope to draw the general comprehension of the partially fulfilled discussions on migration experiences, social citizenship practices and the self-identity perceptions in the case of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria. One of the limitations prevalent heretofore in the thesis is the comparative experiences and the perceptions about the immigrant Turks from Bulgaria from the point of native community of Turkish Cypriots view in the present research setting of northern Cyprus. This could be a parallel research study in developing furtherly the interpretations and discussions integrated in this thesis.

REFERENCES

Books and Articles

- Ágh, A., (1998) *The Politics of Central Europe*, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Anagnastou, D., (2005) "Nationalist Legacies and European Trajectories: Post-communist Liberalization and Turkish Minority Politics in Bulgaria," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, (January) Vol.5, No.1:89-111.
- Anderson, B., (1991) *Imagined Communities; Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, New York, Verso.
- Barth, F., (1969) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, Bergen-Oslo: Universitets Forlaget and London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Bates, D. G., (1994) "What's in a Name? Minorities, Identity and Politics in Bulgaria," *Identities*, Vol.1 (2-3), pp.201-225, OPA (Overseas Publishers Association).
- Beijer, G., (1963) *Rural Migrants in Urban Setting, An Aanalysis of the Literature on the problem consequent on the Internal Migration from Rural to Urban Areas in Twelve European Countries (1945-1961)*, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Netherlands, Published under the auspices of the Netherlands Ministry of Social Work and the European Society for Rural Sociology.
- Bhabha, H. K., (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K., (1996) "Culture's In-Between," in Hall S. and Gay P. D., (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.
- Bilsborrow, R. E., Oberai, A.S. and Standing, G., (1984) *Migration surveys in low-income countries: guidelines for survey and questionnaire design*, London: Dover, N.H., USA: Croom Helm. Pp. 14-57.
- Bova, R., (1991) "Political Dynamics of the Post-Communist Transition: A Comparative Perspective," *World Politics*. 44 (October 1991), 113-38.
- Castles, S., (2000) "Underclass or Exclusion: Social Citizenship for Ethnic Minorities," in Vasta, E., (eds.), *Citizenship, Community and Democracy*, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Cockburn, C., (2004) *Hat, Kıbrıs'ta Kadınlar, Taksim ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Düzeni* [The Line: Women, Partition, and the Gender Order in Cyprus], translated by S. Somuncuoğlu, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005.
- Crampton, R., J., (2002) *The Balkans: Since the Second World War*, London: Pearson Education.
- Crossley, N., (2001) "Citizenship, Intersubjectivity and the Lifeworld," in Stevenson, N. (eds), *Culture and Citizenship*, Politics and Culture: A Theory, Culture and Society Series, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Cyprus Times*, (2006) "De-facto 2006 Population Census Report Results", Issue 400, 6 May.
- Dayıoğlu, A., (2002) *Bulgaristan'daki Müslüman-Türk Azınlığı (1878-2000)*, (Ankara Üniversitesi, PhD Thesis).
- Dayıoğlu, A., (2006) *Toplama Kampından Meclise*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Demirtaş-Coşkun, B., (2001) *Bulgaristan'la Yeni Dönem, Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Ankara Sofya İlişkileri*, Ankara: Avrasya Bir Vakfı, Avrasya Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi.
- Dimitrov, V., (2000) "In search of a Homogenous Nation: The Assimilation of Bulgaria's Turkish Minority, 1984-1985," *London School of Economics and Political Science*, UK, December 23:1-22.
- Doğruel, F., (2005) *Hatay'da Çoketnili Ortak Yaşam Kültürü*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Donald, J., (1996) "The Citizen and the Man About Town," in Hall S. and Gay P. D., (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.
- Dwyer, P., (2004) *Understanding Social Citizenship*, The Policy Press and the Social Policy Association.
- Eminov, A., (1997) *Turkish and other Muslim Minorities in Bulgaria*, London: Hurst & Company. Chp.1-2
- Eminov, A., (1999) "The Turks in Bulgaria: Post-1989 Developments," *Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 27, No. 1:31-55.
- Eminov, A., (2000) "Turks and Tatars in Bulgaria and the Balkans," *Nationalities Papers*, Vol.28, No.1:129-164.
- Faulks, K., (2000) *Citizenship*, London and New York: Routledge.

- Fowkes, B., (2002) *Ethnicity and ethnic conflict in the post-communist world*, New York: Palgrave.
- Genov, N. and Krasteva, A., (2001) *Recent Social Trends in Bulgaria 1960-1995*, Montreal&Kingston, London and Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Giatzidis, E., (2002) *An Introduction to Post-communist Bulgaria: Political, Economic, and Social Transformations*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press (distributed by Palgrave).
- Ginsberg, R. H., (1999) "Conceptualizing the European Union as an International Actor: Narrowing the Theoretical Capability-Expectations Gap," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, September, Vol. 37, No.3:429-54.
- Guinness, P., (2002) *Migration*, Hodder & Stoughton Education, London.
- Hall, S. and Gay, P. D., (1996) *Questions of Cultural Identity*, Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.
- Hardt, M. and Negri A., (2000) *İmparatorluk [Empire]*, translated by A. Yılmaz, İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 2001.
- Hatay, M., (2005) *Beyond Numbers: An Inquiry into the Political Integration of the Turkish 'Settlers' in Northern Cyprus*, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), Cyprus Centre, Report 4.
- Henderson, K. and Robinson, N., (1997) *Post-Communist Politics*, London: Prentice Hall, pp. 163-181.
- Hetherington, K., (1998) *Expressions of Identity: Space, Performance, Politics*, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Hills, J., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D., (2002) *Understang Social Exclusion*, Oxford University Press.
- Hutchinson, J. and Smith D. A., (1996) *Ethnicity*, Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- İçduygu, A. and Keyman E. F., (1998-9) "Globalleşme, Anayasallık ve Türkiye'de Vatandaşlık tartışması," [Globalization, Constitution and the Citizenship Debate in Turkey], *Doğu Batı*, No.5:147-159.
- İçduygu, A., Çolak, Y. and Soyarık, N., (1999) "What is the Matter with Citizenship? A Turkish Debate," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.35, No.4:187-208.

- Isin, E. F. and Wood, P. K., (1999) *Citizenship and Identity*, London: Sage Publications.
- Jackson, J. A., (1986) *Migration*, London, New York: Longman.
- Jacobson, D., (1997) *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Janoski, T., (1998) *Citizenship and civil society: a framework of rights and obligations in liberal, traditional, and social democratic regimes*, Cambridge University Press.
- Jansen, C. J., (1970) *Readings in the Sociology of Migration*, Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.
- Jelavich, B. and Jelavich, C., (1977) *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920*, University of Washington Press: Seattle and London.
- Jenkins, R., (1997) *Rethinking Ethnicity: arguments and explorations*, London: Sage Publications.
- Jenkins, R., (2004) *Social Identity*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Kamil, İ., (1989) *Bulgaristan'daki Türkler'in Statüsü*, İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Keyman, F. E. and İçduygu, A., (2003) "Globalization, Civil Society and Citizenship in Turkey: Actors, Boundaries and Discourses," *Citizenship Studies*, Vol.7, No.2:219-234.
- Kızılyürek, N., (2002) *Milliyetçilik Kıskaçında Kıbrıs*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kızılyürek, N., (2005) *Doğmamış bir Devletin Tarihi, Birleşik Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti* [History of an Unborn State: The Republic of United Cyprus], İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kirişçi, K., (2000) "Disaggregating Turkish Citizenship and Immigration Practices," *Middle Eastern Studies*, July, Vol.36, No.3:1-22.
- Kymlicka, W., (2000) "Nation-building and minority rights: comparing West and East," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol.26, No.2:183-212.
- Laclau, E., (1994) *The Making of Political Identities*, London and New York: Verso.
- Linz, J. J., (1993) "State Building and Nation Building," *European Review*, Vol.1, No.4:355-369.

- Marshall, T.H. [and Bottomore, T.] (1992 [1950]) *Citizenship and Social Class*, London: Pluto.
- Massey, S. D., (1999) "Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis," in Hirschman, C., Kasinitz, P., and DeWind, J (eds.), *The handbook of international migration: the American experience*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McAfee, N., (2000) *Habermas, Kristeva and Citizenship*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Messina, A. M. and Lahav, G., (2006) *The Migration Reader: Exploring Politics and Policies*, Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder London.
- Morris, L., (2002) *Managing Migration: civic stratification and migrant's rights*, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Mulder, C. H., (1993) *Migration Dynamics: A Life Course Approach*, PDOD Publication Series: Thesis Publishers and the Netherlands Graduate School of Research in Demography.
- Nagel, J., (1994) "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture," *Social Problems*, February, Vol.41, No: 1:152-169.
- Nurcan, Ö., (1999) *Etnik Sorunların Çözümünde Etnik Parti: Hak ve Özgürlükler Hareketi 1989-1995*, İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Offe, C., (1991) "Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe," *Social Research*, Vol.58, No.4:865-892.
- Ong, A., (1999) *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Pilkington, H., (1998) *Migration, Displacement and Identity in Post-Soviet Russia*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Pridham, G. and Gallagher, T., (2000) *Experimenting with Democracy: Regime Change in the Balkans*, London and New York: University of Bristol (In association with the Centre for Mediterranean Studies).
- Ramet, P., (1978) "Migration and Nationality Policy in Soviet Central Asia," *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, Vol.6, No.1: 79-101.
- Roche, M., (1992) *Rethinking Citizenship: Welfare, Ideology, and Change in Modern Society*, Polity Press (in association with Blackwell Publishers).

- Roosens, E. E., (1989) *Creating Ethnicity: The Process of Ethnogenesis*, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Safa, H. I. and Du Toit, B. M., (1975) *Migration and Development, Implications for Ethnic Identity and Political Conflict*, Paris: Monton Publishers, the Hague.
- Safran, W., (1991) "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myth of Homeland and Return," *Diaspora*. Spring, P.83.
- Slezkine, Y., (1994) "The USSR as a Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism," *Slavic Review*. Vol.53, No.2, Summer.
- Soysal, Y. N., (1997) "Changing Parameters of citizenship and claims-making: Organized Islam in European public spheres," *Theory and Society*, Vol.26: 509-527 (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Printed in Netherlands).
- Standing, G., (1984) "Conceptualising Territorial Mobility," in Bilsborrow, R. E., Oberai, A.S. and Standing, G., (eds), *Migration surveys in low-income countries: guidelines for survey and questionnaire design*, London: Dover, N.H., USA: Croom Helm, Chp.3.
- Şimşir, B. N., (1986) *Bulgaristan Türkleri 1878-1985*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Tahir, T., (2003) *Minority Policies in Bulgaria: Continuity and Change*. (METU, M.S. Thesis)
- Tishkov, V., (1997) *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict in and After the Soviet Union-The Mind Aflame*, London: Sage.
- Todorova, M., (1997) "Identity (trans)formation among Pomaks in Bulgaria," in L. Korti and J. Langman (eds.) *Beyond Borders*, Boulder, Co: Westview Press, pp.63-82.
- Tomiak, J. J., (1972) *The Soviet Union*, World Education Series, David & Charles, Newton Abbot.
- Turan, Ö., (1998) *The Turkish Minority in Bulgaria (1878-1908)*, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, VII. Dizi-Sayı 165.
- Turner, B. S., (2001) "Outline of a General Theory of Cultural Citizenship," in Stevenson, N. (eds), *Culture and Citizenship*, Politics and Culture: A Theory, Culture and Society Series, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

- Turner, B. S., (2006) "Citizenship and the Crisis of Multiculturalism," *Citizenship Studies*, (November) Vol.10, No.5:607-618.
- Turkes, M., (2004) "The Double Process: Transition and Integration and its Impact on the Balkans," in Hadjisky, I. (eds), *Towards Non-violence and Dialogue Culture in Southeast Europe*, Sofia: The Institute for Social Values and Structures Publications, pp.13-28.
- Vasileva, D., (1992) "Bulgarian Turkish Emigration and Return," *International Migration Review* Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, 26(Summer 1992) P 342-352.
- Van Gunsteren, H. R., (1998) *A Theory of Citizenship Organizing Plurality in Contemporary Democracies*, Westview Press: a Member of the Perseus Books Group.
- Verdery, K., (1991) *Therizing socialism: a prologue to the "transition"*, John Hopkins University. (Article drawn from Chp. 2)
- Vermeulen, H. and Govers, C., (1997) *From Political Mobilization to the Politics of Consciousness*, Macmillan Press: New York.
- Wallace, W.L., (1999) *The Future of Ethnicity, Race and Nationality*, Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Weber, M., (1962) *Basic Concepts in Sociology*, (Translated from German and introduced by H.P. Secher), Peter Owen Ltd.: London.
- White, S., (2003) "Rethinking Postcommunist Transition," *Government and Opposition*, Blackwell Publishing (text of the Leonard Schapiro Memorial Lecture delivered at the London School of Economics on May, 6), pp.419-434.
- Williams, C., (1999) "Imagined Democracy," in Thanasis D., Sfikas and Williams Chrostopher (eds.), *Ethnicity and Nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans*, 45-71. Ashgate Publishing Ltd.: England, USA.
- Windischer, M.R., (2003) "The European Court of Human Rights and Minority Rights," *European Integration*, Vol.25, No.3:249-271.
- Yeğen, M., (2004) "Citizenship and Ethnicity in Turkey," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.40, No.6:51-66.
- Yeğen, M., (2005) "Yurttaşlığın Dialektiği, Yurttaşlığın Trajedisi," *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Mart, Cilt 38, Sayı 1:69-87.

Zhelyazkova, A., (1998) *Between Adaptation and Nostalgia: The Bulgarian Turks in Turkey*, Sofia: International Center for Minority Studies and Intercultural Relations.

Zhelyazkova, A., (2001) "Bulgaria in Transition: The Muslim Minorities," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, (July) Vol.12, No.3:283-301.

Reports

Statistics and Research Department of the State Planning Organization of the TRNC, *Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics of Population, December 15, 1996*, Nicosia, July 1999.

Statistics and Research Department of the State Planning Organization of the TRNC, *Census of Population: Immigration Trends in Northern Cyprus by Nationality, April 30, 2006*, Nicosia, (Press conference statements about unofficial research findings announced by the Ministry undersecretary Işıl Yılmaz) April 2007.

SOPEMI, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Trends in International Migration: Continuous Reporting System on Migration*, Annual Report Editions of 1993; 1995, 2001, and 2002 (in reference to the country of Bulgaria).

Freedom House World Country Reports (on Bulgaria in terms of civil and political rights) cited in World Wide Web; www.freedomhouse.org

Newspapers (Published in Northern Cyprus, Nicosia)

Kıbrıs, 1989-1990

Yenidüzen, 1989-1990

APPENDICES

Appendix A: In-depth Interview Questionnaire

A. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

- Place of Birth
Village/City:
District:
Province:
- How many do you live in the house?
- How many children have you got? (Those living in the house, soldiers and students studying away included)
- Where do you feel you are from?
- Family Table

Family members	Age	Gender	Education	Occupation /job status	Social Security	Income (value in the year of 2006)
Interviewed male or female						
Other members of the family listed here						

B. MIGRATION NARRATIVES AND THE LIFE IN BULGARIA

- Can you tell your migration story as you can remember in details? What did you experience? Where? When? Why?
- What does come up to your mind when you think of Bulgaria?
- What language did you used to use within the family when you were in Bulgaria?
- Do you still have any kind of connections with Bulgaria? If yes, what sort of connections? Are these connections important for you? Why?
- Have you got any relatives living abroad? If yes, where?

C. LIFE IN NORTHERN CYPRUS

- Why did you choose to migrate to northern Cyprus?
- What similarities and differences had you noticed when you were first in northern Cyprus?
- What is the importance of your coming to northern Cyprus?
- How would your life be if you hadn't migrated to northern Cyprus and instead stayed in Bulgaria?
- What language do you speak in your everyday life in northern Cyprus? What language(s) would you want to know other than the one you already speak?
- Have you got any close relatives in northern Cyprus other than your own family? If yes, what advantages does this bring, if not, what disadvantages have you got?

- Where do you live in northern Cyprus, city/district? Why and how did you choose this area specifically? Would you like to move to another area/place?
- ***
- If you compare the two places, where do you think is the standard of living better? Good and bad aspects of both? Why do you think so?
 - Do you consider your life in northern Cyprus as permanent or temporary? Why?

D. WORK AND OCCUPATION

Job Activities in Bulgaria

- What was your job when you were in Bulgaria? For what profession did you get an education? How did you choose this profession, why?
- Can you tell us the place you worked for? How was its environment, the working hours, holidays?
- How long had you worked there? Retirement? Any secondary jobs? If yes, Why?
- How were you paid? Were you paid enough money to earn your living, was that enough?
- What three factors were the most important for you about your job when you were in Bulgaria? Were you satisfied about these three factors when you were in Bulgaria? Did you used to be happy when you were in Bulgaria considering your job?
- What future expectations did you used to have when you were in Bulgaria? For yourself and for your children? How did you consider yourself on economical basis? Were you exactly at where you wanted to be? What goals did you pursue?

Job Activities in Northern Cyprus

- What is your occupation in northern Cyprus? Have you got any additional training for your current job? Yes or No, then Why?
- How did you find your current job? Can you tell us about your job, working hours and holidays?
- How long have you been doing this job? Retirement? Any secondary jobs? If yes, why?
- How are you paid? How much money do you earn, is it enough?
- What three factors are the most important for you about your current job? Are you satisfied about these three factors? Are you happy considering your job?
- What future expectations have you got? For yourself and for your children? How do you think you are economically? Are at where you wanted to be? What goals have you got?

E. SOCIAL LIFE AND ACTIVITIES

Social Life and Activities in Bulgaria

- How was an everyday life in Bulgaria? Can you tell us a day you choose, a holiday or a day at work? Who did you used to see, talk, enjoy and meet the most often?
- Who were your neighbors with when you were in Bulgaria? How was your relation?
- Who did you choose or not choose to see when you were in Bulgaria? Why?
- How were the relations among families? Was there any solidarity between families? What kind of problems did you have the most and did you ask help for?
- How did you coordinate your weddings, funerals, circumcision feasts etc? Can you tell us your traditions and customs during these events?

- What kind of marriages was there in Bulgaria? Were the intercultural marriages acceptable between different cultures? Can you tell us the reasons?
- What culture did you like your children get married with? Can you tell considering the groups with their culture and nationality? Can you tell us the reasons?
- What TV channels did you used to watch? What TV channels did you particularly follow for the news? Why?
- Did you used to read newspapers in Bulgaria? Which papers?

Social Life and Activities in northern Cyprus

- How is your everyday life in northern Cyprus? Can you tell us a day you choose, a holiday or a day at work? Who do you see, talk, enjoy and meet the most often?
- Who are you neighbors with in northern Cyprus? How are your relations?
- Who do you choose or not choose to see in northern Cyprus? Why?
- How are the relations between families? Is there any solidarity between families? What kind of problems do you have the most and do you ask help for?
- How do you coordinate your weddings, funerals, circumcision feasts etc? Can you tell us your traditions and customs during these events?
- What kinds of marriages are there in northern Cyprus? Are the intercultural marriages acceptable between different cultures? Can you tell us the reasons?
- What culture would you like your children get married with? Can you tell considering the groups with their culture and nationality? Can you tell us the reasons?
- What TV channels do you watch? What TV channels do you particularly follow for the news? Why?
- Do you read newspapers in northern Cyprus? Which papers?

F. PERCEPTION AND SELF-IDENTIFICATION

Identity Perceptions of Turks in Bulgaria

- What group of people did you used to live with in Bulgaria within your neighborhood?
- What group of people did you get on well with and had conflicts on what kind of issues? Why?
- Did you have difficulties living together with different cultures? Yes or No, what kind of difficulties?
- Because of what kind of reasons did you feel yourself close to or different from a group of people?
- Did you feel yourself discriminated in Bulgaria? If yes, on what kind of occasions and situations? Why? If not, can you explain why?
- When you were in Bulgaria how you did define yourself the most of the following? Additionally, can you explain with reasons which one of the following define you and do not define you at all?

Foreigner	Turk
European	Immigrant
Minority	Muslim
Discriminated	Second-class citizen
Bulgarian Turk	

* As a continuation of the last question above may you answer the following two questions considering your choice of the most appropriate definition of yourself!

- What advantages and disadvantages do you think being (.....) has in Bulgaria?
- What do you think your being (.....) did affect your relations within your neighborhood?

Identity Perceptions of immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in northern Cyprus

- What group of people do you live in northern Cyprus within your neighborhood?
- What group of people do you get on well with and have conflicts on what kind of issues? Why?
- Do you have difficulties living together with different cultures? Yes or No, what kind of difficulties?
- Because of what kind of reasons do you feel yourself close or different to a group of people?
- Do you feel yourself discriminated in northern Cyprus? If yes, on what kind of occasions and situations? Why? If not, can you explain why?
- When in northern Cyprus how do you define yourself the most of the following? Additionally, can you explain with reasons, which one of the following define you and do not define you at all?

Foreigner	Turk
European	Immigrant
Minority	Muslim
Discriminated	Second-class citizen
Bulgarian Turk	Turkish Cypriot

* As a continuation of the last question above can you answer the following two questions considering your choice of the most appropriate definition of yourself!

- What advantages and disadvantages do you think being (.....) has in northern Cyprus?
- What do you think your being (.....) does affect your relations within your neighborhoods?

- Do you want your children know your migration experiences and your life in Bulgaria? If yes or not, with what aspects should it be told? Why?
- Where do you find it easier to express your religious or national identity (Muslim, Turkish, Christian, Bulgarian, Pomak, Gypsy... etc), in North Cyprus or when you were in Bulgaria? Why?

G. PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

Property Ownership in Bulgaria

- Did you own your house in Bulgaria? (The questions were asked accordingly if this item answer was YES or NO)
- Do you still own your house in Bulgaria? Explain with reasons.
- Did you buy it yourself or inherited from your family?
- Do you want to own a house in Bulgaria? Explain with reasons.

- How was your house in Bulgaria, the number of the rooms, how it looked like, with whom?
- Could you make savings in Bulgaria? If yes, how did you keep it? (bank, interest, foreign currency, gold etc.)
- Did you or your wife own any plots, arable fields or lands in Bulgaria? If yes, where and how did you own these properties? (Government gave it, bought, inherited, rented etc)
- Consumer products and vehicle ownership: Which one of these did you have in your house in Bulgaria?

Automatic Washing Machine	Yes-No
Multiple Televisions	Yes-No
VCD/DVD	Yes-No
Video camera	Yes-No
Car	Yes-No

Property Ownership in northern Cyprus

- Do you own your house you live in northern Cyprus? (The questions were asked accordingly if this item answer was YES or NO)
- If you did, for how much would you rent your house?
- How much is your rent?
- Have you got a second house on rent other than the one you live in? (If YES or NO)
- How many and where? How do you benefit of the rent?
- How is your house, How many rooms have you got, how does it look like, and with whom?
- Can you make savings in northern Cyprus? If yes, how do you keep it? (Bank, interest, foreign currency, gold etc.)
- Do you or your wife own any plots, arable fields or lands in northern Cyprus? If yes, where and how did you own these properties? (Government gave it, bought, inherited, rented etc)
- Consumer products and vehicle ownership: Which one of these do you have in your house in northern Cyprus at the moment?

Automatic Washing Machine	Yes-No
Multiple Televisions	Yes-No
VCD/DVD	Yes-No
Video camera	Yes-No
Car	Yes-No
Personal Computer	Yes-No
Internet Connection	Yes-No
Dishwasher	Yes-No

H. OPINIONS ABOUT ASSOCIATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Opinions About Associations and Organizations in Bulgaria

- What do you think about taking part in associations and civil organizations? Do you think it has positive and negative aspects? Explain?
- Did you used to be a member of an association, trade union or a chamber when you were in Bulgaria? (The questions were asked accordingly if this item answer was YES or NO)

- What was its name? When and why did you become a member?
- How did it help you in your everyday life being a member?
- Were you happy with the activities of the organization?
- Did you ever consider of joining to an association when you were in Bulgaria? Yes or No, Why?

Opinions About Associations and Organizations in northern Cyprus

- What do you think about taking part in associations and civil organizations? Do you think it has positive and negative aspects? Explain?
- Are you a member of an association, trade union or a chamber in northern Cyprus? (The questions were asked accordingly if this item answer was YES or NO)
- What is its name? When and why did you become a member?
- How does it help you in your everyday life being a member?
- Are you happy with the activities of the organization?
- Did you ever consider of joining to an association in northern Cyprus? Yes or No, Why?

I. FINAL COMMENTS

- What are you happy with in northern Cyprus? What do you think comes the first as a good aspect?
- What things are you unhappy with in northern Cyprus? What do you think comes the first as a bad aspect?
- What positive things have you and your family achieved from the migration experiences you have undergone?
- Have your family lost from the migration experiences you have experienced?

THE INTERVIEW ENDS HERE! THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND
CONSIDERATIONS.

Appendix A: Turkish Version of In-depth Interview Questionnaire

A. KONUŞULAN AİLELERLE İLGİLİ SOSYO-DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİLER

- Doğum yeri
Köy/Şehir:
İlçe (Obshtina):
İl (Obsat):
- Hanede kaç kişi yaşıyorsunuz?
- Kaç çocuğunuz var? (Hanede yaşayan. Asker ve uzakta olan öğrenciler dahil)
- Kendinizi aslen nereli hissediyorsunuz?
- Aile Tablosu

Hanedeki ev halkı üyeler	Yaş	Cinsiyet	Eğitim Durumu	Meslek/iş ve işteki statüsü, işçi-işveren v.b.	Sosyal güvencesi	Gelir
Görüşülen kimse						
Hanedeki diğer üyeler sıralanacak						

B. GÖÇ BİLGİLERİ VE BULGARİSTAN'DAKİ YAŞAM

- Yaşadığınız ve hatırladığınız kadarı ile kendi göç öykünüzü detaylı anlatır mısınız? Nereden geldiniz? Ne zaman? Neden?
- Bulgaristan'ı, ya da Bulgaristan'la ilgili anlatılanları düşününce, aklınıza ilk gelen nedir?
- Bulgaristan'da aile içinde hangi dilde konuşulurdu?
- Bulgaristan ile halen bağlantılarınız var mı? Evet ise, ne şekilde devam ediyor? Bulgaristan'la olan bağlantılarınız sizin önem taşıyor mu, taşıyor mu? Neden?
- Yurtdışında veya başka nerelerde akrabalarınız var? Var ise, aklınıza ilk gelen yerleri sayar mısınız?

C. KIBRIS'TAKİ YAŞAM

- Neden ve nasıl tercihiniz Kıbrıs oldu?
- Kıbrıs'ta Bulgaristan'a göre ne gibi farklılıklar ve benzerliklerle karşılaştınız?
- Buraya gelmenin sizin yaşamınızda yeri ve önemi ne oldu?
- Bulgaristan'da kalsaydınız buraya hiç gelmemiş olsaydınız, hayatınız nasıl olurdu?
- Şimdi Kıbrıs'ta hangi dili konuşuyorsunuz? Şimdi konuştuğunuz dile ek olarak hangi dili bilmek isterdiniz ve neden?
- Kıbrıs'ta sizin ailenizden başka yakın derece akrabalarınız var mı? Akraba olması nasıl bir avantaj sağlıyor, yoksa hangi durumlarda eksikliklerini hissediyorsunuz?
- Kıbrıs'ta oturduğunuz semt/bölge nedir? Neden ve nasıl bu bölgeyi seçtiniz? Buradan başka bir yere taşınmak ister misiniz?
- ***
- Bulgaristan ile Kıbrıs'ta şu an yaşadığınız yeri karşılaştırırsanız hangisinde yaşam şartlarınız daha iyi? İyi ve kötü yönleri? Neden öyle düşünüyorsunuz?
- Burada Kıbrıs'taki yaşantınızı kalıcı veya geçici mi görüyorsunuz? Neden?

D. MESLEK-İŞ SORULARI

Bulgaristan'daki iş durumu ve memnun olma/olmama durumu

- Geldiğiniz yerde mesleğiniz ne idi? Yani hangi meslek üzerine eğitim aldınız? Bu mesleğe neden yöneldiniz/nasıl seçtiniz?
- Çalıştığınız yeri kısaca anlatır mısınız, yani genel olarak çalışma ortamı ne idi? Çalışma saatleri/ tatil günleri nasıldı?
- Kaç yıl bu işi yaptınız? Emeklilik durumu? Başka ek işler yaptınız mı? Evet ise neden?
- Maaş ödeme koşulları ne idi? Geçinecek kadar para kazanıyor muydunuz/ yeterli miydi?
- Bulgaristan'dayken sizin için bir işte en önemli 3 faktör ne idi? Bulgaristan'dayken bunları bulabiliyormuydunuz? Yaptığınız işten memnun muydunuz?
- Bulgaristan'dayken gelecekte beklediğiniz nelerdi? Kendiniz ve çocuklarınız için? Kendinizi ekonomik olarak nasıl görüyordunuz? Bulunmak istediğiniz yerde miydiniz? Hedefleriniz nelerdi?

Kıbrıs'taki iş durumu ve memnun olma/olmama durumu

- Kıbrıs'ta şu an mesleğiniz nedir? Yani, daha önce almış olduğunuz eğitime ilaveten başka bir alanda eğitim aldınız mı? Evet, ise neden? Hayır, ise neden?
- Bu işi nasıl buldunuz? Kısaca çalıştığınız yeri anlatır mısınız, çalışma saatleri, tatil günleri?
- Kaç yıl bu işi yaptınız? Emeklilik durumu? Başka ek işler yaptınız mı? Evet ise neden?
- Maaş ödeme koşulları ne idi? Geçinecek kadar para kazanıyor musunuz/ yeterli mi?
- Sizin için Kıbrıs'ta bir işte en önemli 3 faktör nedir? Şu an çalışıyorsanız işinizde bunları bulabiliyor musunuz? Yaptığınız işten memnun musunuz?
- Şimdi Kıbrıs'a göç ettikten sonra gelecekte beklediğiniz ne oldu? Kendiniz ve çocuklarınız için? Şu an kendinizi ekonomik olarak nasıl görüyorsunuz? Bulunmak istediğiniz yerde misiniz? Hedefleriniz neler?

E. SOSYAL YAŞAM VE AKTİVİTELER

Bulgaristan'daki Gündelik Yaşam ve Aktiviteler

- Sizin Bulgaristan'da bir gününüz nasıl geçerdi? Kendi seçtiğiniz bir gününüzü anlatabilirmisiniz iş günü veya tatil günü olabilir. Kimlerle en çok görüşür, konuşur, eğlenir ve ziyaretlere giderdiniz? Neler yapardınız? (ayrıntılar çok önemli)
- Bulgaristan'da kimlerle komşuluk yapardınız? İlişkileriniz nasıldı?
- Kimlerle görüşmeyi tercih ederdiniz, veya etmezdiniz? Neden?
- Bulgaristan'da yaşadığınız yerde aileler arasında ilişkiler nasıldı? Dayanışma var mıydı, kimler arasında? Yoksa herkes kendi başının çaresine mi bakardı? Sizin hangi konularda ne gibi sıkıntılarınız olurdu mesela, kimlerden yardım alırdınız?
- Göç etmeden önce Bulgaristan'dayken, düğün, cenaze, sünnet, vb. toplumsal faaliyetleri nasıl gerçekleştirirdiniz? Bu konulardaki adetlerinizi, gelenek ve göreneklerinizi anlatır mısınız?
- Bulgaristan'da yaşadığınız toplumda evlilikler nasıl olurdu? Kimler arasındaki evlilikler tercih edilirdi veya edilmezdi? Nedenlerini anlatırmısınız?

- Bulgaristan’da olsaydınız kendi çocuklarınızın kimlerle evlilik yapmasını isterdiniz veya istemezsiniz? Kültür veya milliyet olarak ayırım yapabildiniz mi? Nedenlerini açıklarmısınız?
- Bulgaristan’da hangi TV kanallarını seyrediyordunuz? Özellikle haberleri hangi TV kanallarından takip etmeyi tercih ederdiniz? Neden?
- Bulgaristan’dayken gazete okuyormuydunuz? Hangi gazeteleri? Neden?

Kıbrıs’taki Gündelik Yaşam ve Aktiviteler

- Sizin şimdi Kıbrıs’ta bir gününüz nasıl geçiyor? Kendi seçtiğiniz bir gününüzü anlatabilirmisiniz iş günü veya tatil günü olabilir. Kimlerle en çok görüşür, konuşur, eğlenir ve ziyaretlere gidersiniz? Neler yaparsınız? (ayrıntılar çok önemli)
- Kıbrıs’ta kimlerle komşuluk yapıyorsunuz? İlişkileriniz nasıl?
- Kimlerle görüşmeyi tercih edersiniz, veya etmezsiniz? Neden?
- Şimdi Kıbrıs’ta yaşadığınız yerde aileler arasında ilişkiler nasıl? Dayanışma var mı, kimler arasında? Yoksa herkes kendi başının çaresine mi bakıyor? Sizin hangi konularda ne gibi sıkıntılarınız oluyor mesela, kimlerden yardım alırsınız?
- Şimdi göç ettikten sonra, Kıbrıs’ta düğün, cenaze vb. toplumsal faaliyetleri nasıl gerçekleştiriyorsunuz? Bu adetleriniz göçle değişti mi? Değiştiyse ne gibi değişiklikler oldu?
- Şimdi, Kıbrıs’ta yaşadığınız toplumda evlilikler nasıl oluyor? Kimler arasındaki evlilikler tercih ediliyor veya edilmiyor? Nedenlerini anlatırmısınız?
- Şimdi Kıbrıs’ta kendi çocuklarınızın kimlerle evlilik yapmasını istiyorsunuz veya kimlerle istemiyorsunuz? Kültür veya milliyet olarak ayırım yapabildiniz mi? Nedenlerini açıklarmısınız?
- Kıbrıs’ta hangi TV kanallarını seyrediyorsunuz? Özellikle haberleri hangi TV kanallarından takip etmeyi tercih edersiniz? Neden?
- Şimdi Kıbrıs’ta gazete okuyormusunuz? Hangi gazeteleri? Neden?

F.KİMLİK SORULARI

Bulgaristan Türkleri’nin Bulgaristan’daki Kimlik Algıları

- Bulgaristan’da (yaşadığınız yerde) hangi topluluktan insanlarla yaşıyordunuz?
- Bulgaristan’da yaşadığınız toplumda kimlerle hangi konularda anlaşabiliyordunuz, kimlerle anlaşamıyordunuz? Neden?
- Farklı kültürden topluluklarla bir arada yaşamak sıkıntılara yol açıyor muydu? Evet veya Hayır ise ne şekilde?
- Bulgaristan’da yaşadığınız toplumda kimleri, hangi sebeplerden dolayı kendinize yakın, kimleri uzak hissediyordunuz?
- Bulgaristan’dayken kendinizi dışlanmış hissediyormuydunuz? Evet ise hangi durumlarda ve ortamlarda? Neden? Hayır ise hangi sebeplerden dolayı, açıklarmısınız?
- Bulgaristan’da yaşarken kendinizi aşağıdaki seçeneklerden hangisi ile **en çok** tanımlıyordunuz? Ayrıca, aşağıdaki hangi seçeneklerin sizi tanımladığını, ve hangilerinin sizi tanımlamadığını nedenleriyle birlikte kısaca açıklayabildiniz mi?

Yabancı	Göçmen
Avrupalı	Müslüman
Azınlık	Dışlanmış
Bulgaristan Türkü	İkinci sınıf vatandaş
Türk	

Yukarıdaki son sorunun devamı olarak, yukarıdaki seçeneklerden sizi en çok tanımlayan tek seçeneği göz önünde bulundurarak aşağıdaki soruları cevaplamısınız!

- Sizce Bulgaristan'da (.....) olmanın avantajları veya dezavantajları nelerdir?
- Sizce (.....) olmanız, Bulgaristan'da yaşadığınız toplumda çevrenizle ilişkilerinizi nasıl etkiliyordu?

Bulgaristan Türkleri'nin Kıbrıs'taki Kimlik Algıları

- Şimdi Kıbrıs'ta (yaşadığınız yerde) hangi topluluktan insanlarla yaşıyorsunuz?
- Kıbrıs'ta yaşadığınız toplumda kimlerle hangi konularda anlaşabiliyorsunuz, kimlerle nlaşıyorsunuz? Neden?
- Farklı kültürden topluluklarla bir arada yaşamak sıkıntılara yol açıyor mu? Evet veya Hayır ise ne şekilde?
- Kıbrıs'ta yaşadığınız toplumda kimleri, hangi sebeplerden dolayı kendinize yakın, kimleri uzak hissediyorsunuz?
- Kıbrıs'ta kendinizi dışlanmış hissediyormusunuz? Evet ise hangi durumlarda ve ortamlarda? Neden? Hayır ise hangi sebeplerden dolayı, açıklarmısınız?
- Şimdi Kıbrıs'ta yaşarken kendinizi aşağıdaki seçeneklerden hangisi ile **en çok** tanımlıyorsunuz? Ayrıca, aşağıdaki hangi seçeneklerin sizi tanımladığını, ve hangilerininin sizi tanımlamadığını nedenleriyle birlikte kısaca açıklayabilirmisiniz?

Kıbrıslı	Türk Türk
Yabancı	Göçmen
Avrupalı	Müslüman
Azınlık	Dışlanmış
Bulgaristan Türkü	kinici sınıf vatandař

Yukarıdaki son sorunun devamı olarak, yukarıdaki seçeneklerden sizi en çok tanımlayan tek seçeneği göz önünde bulundurarak aşağıdaki soruları cevaplamısınız!

- Sizce Kıbrıs'ta (.....) olmanın avantajları veya dezavantajları nelerdir?
- Sizce (.....) olmanız, Kıbrıs'ta yaşadığınız toplumda çevrenizle ilişkilerinizi nasıl etkiliyor?

- Geçmişte yaşadığınız göç tecrübeleri, ve Bulgaristan'daki yaşam kendi çocuklarınız tarafından bilinmesini istermisiniz? Cevabınız Evet veya Hayır ise hangi yönleriyle anlatılmalıdır? Neden?
- Siz kendinizi tanımlamak için kullandığınız kimliği, din kimliğiniz veya milliyet kimliğiniz gibi (Türk, Müslüman, Hristiyan, Bulgar, Pomak, Çingene v.b.) Bulgaristan'da mı daha rahat ifade edebiliyordunuz, yoksa burada Kıbrıs'ta mı? Neden?

G. MAL MÜLK SORULARI

Bulgaristan'daki Mal Mülk Sahipliği

- Bulgaristan'da oturduğunuz ev size mi aitti?(Cevapların Evet veya Hayır olması halinde belli bir sıraya göre aşağıdaki soruların devamı sorulmuştur)
- Şu an hala duruyor mu? Evet veya Hayır ise nedenleri?
- Aile büyüklerinden mi size kaldı, kendiniz mi satın aldınız?

- Bulgaristan'da kendinize ait evinizin olmasını ister miydiniz? Evet ise hangi sebeplerden dolayı?
- Nasıl bir evde oturuyordunuz, kaç odalı, dış görünüş, ve kimlerle?
- Bulgaristan'da tasarruf yapabiliyor muydunuz? Evet ise, bunu nerelerde değerlendiriyordunuz? (banka, faiz, döviz, altın vs.)
- Bulgaristan'da size ve/veya eşinize ait arsa, tarla, bahçe sahipliğiniz var mıydı? Varsa: Nerede ve mülkü/ mülklere nasıl sahip oldunuz? (Devlet verdi, satın alındı, miras, kira)
- Tüketim malları ve araç sahipliği listesi: Bulgaristan'dayken evinizde aşağıdakilerden hangileri var yada yok?

O.Çamaşır makinesi	V-Y
Birden fazla TV	V-Y
VCD/DVD	V-Y
Video kamera	V-Y
Araba	V-Y

Kıbrıs'taki Mal Mülk Sahipliği

- Şu an Kıbrıs'ta oturduğunuz ev size mi ait? (Cevapların Evet veya Hayır olması halinde belli bir sıraya göre aşağıdaki soruların devamı sorulmuştur)
- Evinizi kiraya vermek isteseyiz ne kadara verirdiniz?
- Ne kadar kira veriyorsunuz?
- Şu anda oturduğunuz eviniz dışında, kirada eviniz var mı? VAR YOK
- Varsa kaç tane? Nerede? Nasıl yararlanıyorsunuz geliriyle?
- Nasıl bir evde oturuyorsunuz, kaç odalı, dış görünüş, ve kimlerle?
- Tasarruf yapabiliyor musunuz? Yapabiliyorsanız bunu nerelerde değerlendiriyorsunuz? (banka, faiz, döviz, altın vs.)
- Şu an size ve/veya eşinize ait taşınamayan mallar olarak ev, arsa, tarla, bahçe sahipliğiniz var mı? Varsa: Nerede? Bu mülkü/ mülklere nasıl sahip oldunuz? (Devlet verdi, satın aldı, miras, kira)
- Tüketim malları ve araç sahipliği listesi: Evinizde şu aşağıdakilerden hangileri var yada yok?

O. Çamaşır makinesi	V-Y
Bulaşık makinesi	V-Y
Birden fazla TV	V-Y
Bilgisayar	V-Y
İnternet bağlantısı	V-Y
VCD/DVD	V-Y
Video kamera	V-Y
Araba	V-Y

H. DERNEKLEŞME

Bulgaristan'da Dernekleşme

- Örgütlenme, dernekleşme hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz? Sizce olumlu, olumsuz yanları var mı? Açıklar mısınız?
- Bulgaristan'da herhangi bir derneğe, odaya, sendikaya üye miydiniz? (Cevapların Evet veya Hayır olması halinde belli bir sıraya göre aşağıdaki sorular sorulmuştur)
- İsmi ne idi? Ne zaman, neden üye oldunuz?

- Üye olmak size hangi konularda ve durumlarda kolaylık sağladı?
- Üye olduğunuz derneğin faaliyetlerinden memnun muydunuz?
- Bulgaristan'dayken herhangi bir derneğe üye olmayı düşündünüz mü? Evet veya Hayır ise neden?

Kıbrıs'ta Dernekleşme

- Kıbrıs'ta örgütlenme, dernekleşme hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz? Sizce olumlu, olumsuz yanları var mı? Açıklar mısınız?
- Hangi bir derneğe, odaya, sendikaya üye misiniz?
- Hangisi, ismi nedir? Ne zaman, neden üye oldunuz?
- Kıbrıs'ta derneğe üye olmak size hangi konularda ve durumlarda kolaylık sağladı?
- Üye olduğunuz derneğin faaliyetlerinden memnun musunuz?
- Kıbrıs'a gelince herhangi bir derneğe üye olmayı düşündünüz mü? Evet veya Hayır ise neden?

İ. SON DURUM DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

- Kıbrıs'ta nelerden memnunsunuz? İlk aklınıza gelen, iyi ve memnun olduğunuz yönler.
- Kıbrıs'ta nelerden memnun değilsiniz? İlk aklınıza gelen, olumsuz yönler?
- Yaşamış olduğunuz göç tecrübeleri size ve ailenize neler kazandırdığına inanıyorsunuz?
- Yaşamış olduğunuz göç tecrübeleri size ve ailenize neler kaybettirdiğine inanıyorsunuz?

MÜLAKATIMIZ SONA ERMİŞTİR! AYIRMIŞ OLDUĞUNUZ ZAMAN İÇİN
TEŞEKKÜR EDERİM.

Appendix B: Interview Respondent Profile of Immigrant Turks from Bulgaria in Northern Cyprus

<u>Years of migration from Bulgaria</u>	<u>Namesⁱ (Gender)</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Household number</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Occupation-workⁱⁱ in Bulgaria</u>	<u>Occupation in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Social Assurance in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Accommodation in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Income</u>	
1	1996	C. (Male)	44	4	Specialized Higher School (5 yrs)	Instrument technician-Village headman	Driver distributor	Yes	Rented accommodation (detached house)	1200YTL
2	1995	T. (Male)	53	4	Technical High School (4 yrs)	Mechanical technician-Driver	Manufacture employee	Yes	Rented accommodation (Apartment flat)	1500YTL
3	1996	E. (Male)	40	4	Vocational-technical High School (3 yrs)	Farm machinery technician	Firm owner in the construction sector	Yes	Rented accommodation (semi-detached house)	1200YTL
4	1994	S. (Male)	41	3	Vocational-technical High School (3 yrs)	Turner	Driver	Yes	Rented accommodation (Semi-detached house)	1500YTL
5	1994	A. (Male)	56	4	Specialized Higher School (5 yrs)	Nursing staff employee in the village	Nursing staff-Civil servant	Yes	Rented foundational accommodation	1700YTL
6	1996	R. (Male)	43	3	Vocational-technical High School (3 yrs)	Electricity technician	Electricity technician	Yes	Rented accommodation (Semi-detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above
7	1996	A. (Male)	46	4	Basic High School (4 yrs)	Employee in the tourism sector	Insulation employee	Yes	Rented accommodation (Apartment flat)	Minimum wage of 780YTL
8	1994	S. (Male)	33	4	Basic High School (4 yrs)	Barman	Marketer, driver-distributor	Yes	Rented accommodation (Apartment flat)	1200YTL+prim
9	1990	K. (Male)	52	4	Basic High School (3 yrs)	Electricity technician	Firm owner in the cleaning sector	Yes	Detached house owner	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above

<u>Years of migration from Bulgaria</u>	<u>Namesⁱ (Gender)</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Household number</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Occupation-workⁱⁱ in Bulgaria</u>	<u>Occupation in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Social Assurance in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Accommodation in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Income</u>	
10	1992	S. (Male)	47	4	Vocational-technical High School (3 yrs)	Mechanical technician-Driver	Security guard	No	Detached house owner	Minimum wage of 780YTL
11	1992	R. (Male)	40	4	Secondary School	Mechanical technician	Foreman-Civil servant	Yes	Detached house owner	1600YTL
12	1995	S. (Female)	45	4	Basic High School (4 yrs)	Tailor	Caretaker in a service sector enterprise	Yes	House owner (semi-detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL
13	1992	İ. (Female)	45	4	College-Vocational training (3 yrs)	Nursery school teacher	Salesclerk	Yes	Rented accommodation (detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above
14	1995	B. (Female)	35	4	Vocational technical High School (4 yrs)	Livestock breeding-Weaver in the village cooperative state institution	Baby-sitter	No	Rented accommodation (semi-detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above
15	1994	E. (Female)	32	3	Basic High School (4 yrs)	Tailor	Domestic cleaner	No	Rented accommodation (semi-detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above
16	1997	N. (Female)	49	6	Vocational-technical High School(3 yrs)	Tailor	Office cleaner	Yes	Rented accommodation (apartment flat)	Minimum wage of 780YTL
17	1995	U. (Female)	42	5	Vocational-technical High School (3 yrs)	Confectionery-bakery owner	Tea-coffee maker	Yes	Rented accommodation (Semi-detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above
18	1995	N. (Female)	51	3	Specialized Higher School (5 yrs)	Nursery school teacher	Domestic cleaner and keeper of an elder	Yes, investing on her own	Rented accommodation (Semi-detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL

<u>Years of migration from Bulgaria</u>	<u>Namesⁱ (Gender)</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Household number</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Occupation-workⁱⁱ in Bulgaria</u>	<u>Occupation in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Social Assurance in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Accommodation in N. Cyprus</u>	<u>Income</u>	
19	1995	A. (Female)	33	3	Basic High School (4yrs)	Civil servant in the post office	Tea-coffee maker-Civil Servant	Yes	Apartment flat owner	980YTL
20	1991	F. (Female)	55	3	Basic High School (4 yrs)	Factory employee	Information official-Civil servant	Yes	Rented accommodation (detached house)	1600YTL
21	1994	N. (Female)	39	4	Vocational-technical High School (3 yrs)	Tailor	Classroom caretaker	Yes	Rented accommodation (detached house)	Minimum wage of 780YTL
22	1994	C. (Female)	43	6	Secondary School	Tailor	Domestic cleaner	No	Apartment flat owner	1200YTL
23	1992	G. (Female)	45	3	Basic High School (4 yrs)	Nursery school teacher	Domestic cleaner	No	Detached house owner	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above
24	1992	N. (Female)	51	3	Secondary School	Cooker in the kindergarten	Domestic cleaner	Yes, investing on her own	Detached house owner	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above
25	1992	G. (Female)	43	4	Basic High School (4 yrs)	Tailor	Cleaner-Civil servant	Yes	Detached house owner	Minimum wage of 780YTL and above

ⁱ The interview respondent names are all given as italics of pseudo-names in order not to reveal the real names. The intention of this is the priority over ethical reasons prominent in the qualitative researches in the social sciences.

ⁱⁱ Table information based on “Occupation-work in Bulgaria and northern Cyprus” indicates the type of job, which is performed within the long-lasting time period, and not the last performed one. This was because the interviewees usually have preferred to cite their work activity which was done at least for 5-10 years while they were in Bulgaria, and the 1-5 workable years have been considered for the job types and work activities in the place of destination northern Cyprus.