

THE IMAGE OF TURKEY FOR THE TURKISH IMMIGRANTS FROM BULGARIA

Seda ÇAKAR MENGÜ*

Abstract

The Turkish minorities who came to Turkey after the immigration in 1989 form the corpus of this study. In the same way, their impressions about Turkey, whether they suffered alienation after that immigration and probable reasons for it are the main issues in this study. The questionnaire formulated accordingly is intended to find out the problems that these immigrants encountered in Bulgaria along with their reasons for immigration, as well as social, economic and political situations that they have experienced in Turkey. The aim of this study is also to analyze whether there was a change in the impressions of the immigrants about Turkey before and during the immigration and, if there were, any probable causes of it. By the same token, the feelings of Bulgarian Turks about belonging to the Turkish land, society and nation as well as their level of consciousness with regard to national identity as a community suffered from otherness and assimilation has been studied. The respective questionnaire consisting of 42 items were implemented to 70 of the members of Balkan Migrants Society, who immigrated to Turkey between 1989 and 1992. The questionnaires were evaluated with SPSS program. According to the findings, the immigrants feel themselves belonging to the Turkish society with respect to history, culture and even language; nevertheless, consider themselves different from social point of view. The government has to develop strategies to improve the consciousness of citizenship, to make people sensitive about the problems of a society and also support all these with public relations activities.

Key words: Immigration, image, national identity.

Öz: Türkiye'nin Bulgaristan Göçmenlerindeki İmajı

Türk azınlıklardan 1989 göçünden sonra Türkiye'ye gelenlerin Türkiye ile ilgili nasıl bir izlenime sahip olduklarının araştırılması, göçten sonra ikinci bir yabancılaşma yaşayıp yaşamadıkları ve buna neden olan etkenler bu çalışmanın amacını oluşturmaktadır. Bu amaca yönelik oluşturulan sormaca, Türk göçmenlerin Bulgaristan'da karşılaştıkları sorunları ve göç nedenlerini, Türkiye'de karşılaştıkları sosyal, ekonomik ve politik durumları ve tüm bunların etkisine bağlı olarak göç öncesi ve sonrası Türkiye'ye yönelik bir izlenim değişikliğinin olup olmadığını; varsa bunun nedenlerini sorgulamayı amaçlamıştır. Bu bağlamda, Bulgaristan Türkleri'nin Türk toprağına ve Türk toplumuna, ulusa yönelik aidiyetlik duyguları, ulus-kimlik bilinçlerinin düzeyi ve bunu etkileyen faktörler incelenmiştir. 42 sorudan oluşan anket, Bulgaristan Göçmenleri Derneği'nin 1989-1992 yılları arasında Türkiye'ye göç etmiş olan 72 üyesine uygulanmıştır. Anket sonuçları SPSS programı ile değerlendirilmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, göçmenler tarih, kültür ve hatta dil açısından kendilerini Türk toplumuna ait hissetmekte, ancak sosyal açıdan kendilerini farklı olarak görmektedirler. Bu farklılıklar bakış açıları, yaşam felsefeleri ve yaşam tarzları bağlamında farkedilmektedir. Genel olarak hükümet kurumlarına karşı güvensizlik duymaktadırlar. Burada medyanın oynadığı rol ve devletin kamusal iletişim strateji-

*Doç.Dr. İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, sedamengu@yahoo.com.

leri önemlidir. Devletin yurttaşlık bilincini geliştirici ve yurttaşları toplumun sorunlarına duyarlı duruma getirmesi konusunda stratejiler geliştirmesi ve bunu halkla ilişkiler çalışmalarıyla desteklemesi gerekmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Göç, imge, ulusal kimlik

.....

INTRODUCTION

Beginning from the 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian War, Bulgaria tried to make the Turkish minorities give up their real identities and adopt Bulgarian identities especially during and after the nationalization process by exposing them to social, economic, political and psychological pressures. Although the ratio of the Turkish minorities in Bulgarian population was not high, the real number was not declared and they were considered to be nonexistent. Therefore, being treated as others in their homeland, the Turkish minorities faced the danger of losing their all their contact with Turkey. "Such a situation usually emerges due to the fact that cultures are defined in mutual relation with neighboring cultures considered to be radically different as well as so called otherness leads to an exclusion which quickly turns to an ethnic cleansing as a logical result" (Bayart, 1997: 47).

Regarding themselves as the descendants of the Ottoman State and adopting attitudes suitable to their real identities, the Turkish minorities who came to Turkey after the immigration in 1989 are the corpus of this study. In the same way, their impressions about Turkey, whether they suffered alienation after that immigration and probable reasons of it are the main issues in this study. The questionnaire formulated accordingly is intended to find out the problems that these immigrants encountered in Bulgaria along with their reasons for immigration, as well as social, economic and political situations that they experienced in

Turkey. Moreover, with respect to the results of all these, the aim of this study is also to analyze whether there was a change in the impressions of the immigrants about Turkey before and during the immigration and, if there were, probable reasons for it.

The attempts of the Bulgarian Government to eliminate the customs, traditions, beliefs, language, educational opportunities etc. of the Turkish minorities were a wanton attack against Turkish nationalism. People can experience welfare only when certain rights and freedoms are granted. National sovereignty and the power of the state can be achieved with such a system that is provided for the citizens. The question at this point is that against all oppressions that deprive them of their freedom of existence, how the Turks living there with communal spirit could express and realize themselves when they came to Turkey and what kind of an impression was created in their minds. Whether or not they have also exercised the common feelings and expectations in Turkey that they used to experience in Bulgaria is also questioned. By the same token, the feelings of Bulgarian Turks about belonging to the Turkish land, society and nation as well as their level of consciousness with regard to national identity as a community suffered from otherness and assimilation has been studied. Meanwhile, the sense of belonging of the Bulgarian Turks to Turkey along with the Turkish society, the level of nation-state consciousness and the factors affecting it have been analyzed. A

questionnaire consisting of 42 items have been implemented to 72 members of the Bulgarian Immigrants Society, who immigrated to Turkey between 1989 and 1992. The results have been evaluated with the SPSS program.

Here, the role the media play and the public communication strategies of the state are important. In fact, the public opinion limits and directs the actions of individuals. Hence, "the institutions and the techniques influencing public opinion have importance...the source of the values that public relations depends on are generally the traditions and customs. Although public opinion has a certain effect on law, it usually remains behind the changes in law" (Bottomore, 1970: 261). In the same way, the mainstream media in Turkey has a noticeable domination. "The mass media continuously increases the amount of information that individuals receive about the happenings in society. However, their ability to transform this information to action is harshly prevented" (Sennet, 1996: 352).

According to Murdoch and Golding, in most general sense, citizenship is the formation of the conditions that make the individuals in all levels become full members of a society. The purpose of the communication systems is to enable individuals to be aware of their rights and responsibilities as citizens. In the same way, individuals should have the rational and critical discussion arena for information, participation in political decisions and personal choices. However, as a result of the economic and technological developments, individuals have arisen with their identities as consumers rather than citizens. "The theorists of democracy have observed a fundamental contradiction

between the idea that public media should function as a public sphere and the fact of private ownership" (Golding and Murdoch, 2002: 77). Therefore, information flow should be maintained. An increase in entropy denotes a regression in development (Mattelart and Mattelart, 2003: 53-54). Although the activities pertaining to creating public opinion continue, the public sphere loses its meaning. In this sense, public relations may contribute to the re-creation of the public sphere away from the commercial concerns. According to Touraine, when the citizens of a country regard the public problems alien to their interests, they do not have a reason to deal with those problems; therefore, they easily accept the partial relations by passively conceding to oppression. The factors causing the immigrants to experience alienation usually appear in social, economic and political areas. Besides, these issues are also indicated as the general problems of the society. Exposing the reasons for social and political alienation, the due improvements should be introduced (determining the problems encountered while using some public services, such as health and education as well increasing the interest political participation) and these activities should not only be announced to the public correctly and continuously but also supported by public relations activities. Thus, the perceptions and views of the immigrants towards Turkey would be improved regarding the social life and political participation in addition to their historic and cultural allegiance.

Bulgarian Turks

After the Ottoman-Russian War, the Turks that used to be the Ottoman subjects before suddenly became Bulgarian vassals. Consequently, the Turkish communities

began to live under Bulgarian administration and obey the imposed rules as a minority. In the following period, the efforts of the Turkish minority to keep their national identity under a foreign administration, the policies of Bulgarian administration against Turks and migrations to Anatolia took place. In the 1920s, Bulgarian Turks underwent the process of being a conscious and organized national minority. "Education has a vital importance for a minority to keep their identity alive. Bulgarian Turks literally hugged the education in Turkish and Bulgarian government monitored it closely" (Şimşir, 1986: 11). Nevertheless, the military coup in Bulgaria in 1934 also brought about a ten-year oppression policy over the Turks.

Turkish schools were closed and many of them were converted to Bulgarian schools. Turkish students had to be contended with the courses teaching Koran in mosques...In the schools that were not closed yet; some preparations were made to introduce the Arabic alphabet again. The purpose behind that attempt was to break the ties between the Turkish education in Bulgaria and the education in Turkey. Turkish teachers were investigated and even imprisoned as Kemalists. Furthermore, local Turkish newspaper offices publishing issues with new Turkish (Latin) alphabet were closed; however, those printing their newspapers with Arabic alphabet were allowed for a while. Turkish intellectuals were beaten and even killed (Şimşir, 1986: 12).

During those years of oppressions, migrations from Bulgaria to Turkey began to take place. There were attempts to weaken the Turkish minority by forcing them to emigrate. In the same way, the Turkish schools in the socialist systems were nationalized in 1944. Consequently, Turkish

schools were united with Bulgarian schools and practically no Turkish educational institutions could continue their existence anymore. Likewise, all courses started to be given in Bulgarian. They were just the initial steps of the assimilation policy.

Communist Bulgarian administrators continued the policy of the previous governments to force the Turks to emigrate. There happened to be two major migrations between 1950 and 1951 and between 1969-1978. As a result of those migrations 286.000 people immigrated to Turkey...In 1960 Bulgarian citizens who were not native Bulgarians were obliged to take Bulgarian names (Şimşir, 1986: 12).

Later, from 1984 to 1985 the Turks were forced to change their names by force of arms. It is an interesting fact that giving Bulgarian names to the Turkish communities took place during the period that the relations between Turkey and Bulgaria was supposed to be the best on presidential level. Although Turkey did not recognize those new names and criticized that practice, it was not enough to prevent the bloodshed against the Turks. As for the economic status of the Turkish minorities in Bulgaria; between 1879 and 1949, 80% of them were farmers while the ration the Turks who were industrialists, merchants and businessmen was only 1%. It can be seen that the majority of the Turks were in agricultural sector. The Turks were reduced to second-class citizenship with the collectivization of lands between 1949 and 1956. They were also required to work more than the others; however, with the consciousness of being a minority, they were trying to keep their traditional lifestyle. On other words, they were trying to keep their own beliefs, customs, traditions and cultures alive with a

communal consciousness. "The distinctive characteristic of 'Gemeinschaft' is that the relations among individuals should depend on an emotional basis. Relations should be established naturally and continued; they should not be maintained to attain a particular objective... In 'Gessellschaft' relations are established with rationalistic reasons. Here the human actions are purposeful and objective" (Van Derloo and Reijen, 2003: 18). Having and cultivating a land is essential for a community. While 'Gemeinschaft' is associated with tradition, 'Gessellschaft' is related to modernity.

Nevertheless, the melting and merging policy of the regime was consolidated as it was expanded even to the remotest villages. Consequently, the unique social life of the Turks almost disappeared. Their rights pertaining to election and decision-making were taken away and their needs were neglected.

That situation was obviously intended to suppress the desires of the Turks to emigrate. Those who wanted to migrate were considered to be the enemies of administration of Bulgarian Public Sovereignty. The Turkish media reflected a repercussion of the negative conditions that those people were experiencing in Bulgaria. However, ineffectiveness of the Turkish media to be sensitive enough over this issue while the Turkish identity was gradually eliminated took the Turkish minorities into a difficult situation and unavoidably makes them experience a tow-dimensional alienation. The problem of Bulgarian Turks should be considered within the context of the rights, authority and responsibilities of not only the Bulgarian but also the Turkish Government. In spite of the fact that Bulgarian government waived the rights of

the Turks, as a result of their devotion to their consciousness of national identity and national origin, the Turks seem to have put up determined opposition. The number of the Turks, who were beaten, tortured, imprisoned, exiled and raped in Bulgaria until the beginning of March 1985 was, estimated around 800 to 2500. According to Şimşir (1986), the thoughts of the Bulgarian Turks about Turkey and the Turkish people considerably helped them adapt themselves to their situations in Bulgaria.

Turkish government allowed the Bulgarian Turks to immigrate to Turkey in 1985 and required the Bulgarian Government to do so. Nevertheless, the only step that Turkey took was to open the border instead of pursuing a sound migration policy. Approximately 300.000 Turks immigrated to Turkey until the end of August 1989. After 1989; however, a reverse-migration took place and nearly 130.000 Turks went back to Bulgaria. Those people noticed that their houses were ruined and they had to leave their properties, families and the places where they were living once as minorities. After Jivkof administration, some initiatives were exercised between Ankara and Sofia for taking the names of the minorities back; however, the issue about rights of the Turks to use their language on the radio, television and in education was not taken into consideration (Şimşir, 1986). Thus, as the most important aspect to form national identity, the use of the Turkish language could not be achieved.

Calling each other with real Turkish names in a community and speaking Turkish were considered to be crimes. Circumcision, religious ceremonies, going to Mecca (to perform the rites of pilgrimage), daily acts of worship and funerals were discouraged and

even prevented. According to formal Bulgarian declarations there are no Turks in that country and they have the right to take Bulgarian names (Mandacı and Erdogan, 2001: 109).

Similarly, in the field of education, it was also stated that there was no place for Turkish schools in Bulgaria until 1999. In 1991, some demonstrations were staged in order to prevent the education in Turkish at the schools in Kircaali and Razgard. "Political action is obviously a cultural one. Culture is a principle of uniqueness and association; thus, it supports nationalism" (Bayart, 1997: 11). The attempt of the Bulgarian Government to rule out customs, traditions, beliefs, language and education of the Turkish minority was an attack against Turkish nationalism.

Consciousness of National Identity and Assimilation of the Bulgarian Turks

The pressure over our kinsmen in Bulgaria and the attempts to assimilate them are mainly targeted on national identity. Before prohibiting speaking Turkish, customs and traditions were prevented.

Considering the prohibitions against attire, Turkish women were forced to wear jacket and trousers instead of wearing (traditional) baggy trousers. Another issue was the nationalization of the lands owned by the Turks. The majority of the Turkish population lives in the country and makes their living with tobacco and wheat production. During the great migration before 1989, this sector was affected negatively and the Turkish minority seriously suffered that (Kamil, 1989: 57).

The Turkish minorities were subjected to discrimination in military service as well.

The Turks were not sent to military units, but employed in construction or some other menial tasks. With respect to the assimilation of the Turks, military service, naming their children and the traditions practiced in wedding ceremonies were forbidden. In addition, Turkish folk dances, songs and ballads were prohibited; the Turks were encouraged to learn the Bulgarian dances. Similarly, listening to the Turkish radio was forbidden. Therefore, the aspects of Turkish national identity were gradually eliminated. "Changing names refers to leaving one's language, religion, culture in addition to relinquishing individual rights and freedoms. Thus, it deprives them of the rights and the aspects forming an individual's identity" (*Bulgaristan'da Türk Varlığı*, 1992: 17). Moreover, impossibility for the Turks to work anywhere they wanted, but the factories and fields can be given as another example for discriminatory attitudes. The right of education was granted only to the small group who joined the communist party. Besides, the Turkish minorities could not work in the offices of ministers and the armed forces. "From a liberal democratic perspective, an individual has the right to be recognized as equal. While acquiring that right, individuals will initially depend on human identity and the power of being human" (Yıldırım, 2002). Hence, the Turks felt the obligation to immigrate to Turkey in 1989 under such a constraint. That situation was a return to their real identity and culture. Nationalization also means likeness in culture.

The process of nationalization includes the acquisition of national culture and achieving harmony with it. However, the social reality that those who share a common culture form is a nation. Thus,

national culture is a harmonious whole of a nation's religion, ethics, reason, aesthetic, language and economic life. In the same way, the source of national culture is the people and national culture is the value system that people create (Türkdoğan, 1999: 117-118).

According to Tonnies, while identity acquisition is strong in communities, it is rather weak in societies. This situation explains how nation consciousness of Bulgarian Turks was created before their immigration to Turkey. The main issue at this point is to display the nation consciousness of Bulgarian Turks and the image of Turkey with regard to the cultural, economic and social conditions in Turkey in 1989. After the 1980s, atomization of Turkish social structure as well as the emergence of ethnic groups and sub-cultures is regarded as corrosive factors for national identity. For the formation of a national state, all individuals in a society should consider themselves as the members of that state. Only then, responsibilities, rights and duties can be realized with regard to national problems. "Being a power in political and economic areas and as a comparison between cultures, identity shows equivalence with the process of a nation's displaying own power" (Ergun, 2000: 111). Here the powerful part is the one who defines; the weak part is the one who is defined. Within the context of this definition, the actors of both parts internalize the roles attributed to them. The Turkish minorities in Bulgaria were forced to assume the language, culture and history of the defining part as the defined ones.

"In classed societies, culture is the culture of organizing social structure. Organizing social structure necessitates an instrument

arranging this organization. This instrument is the state and the types of state. Hence, culture is 'the state ideology' (Lefebvre qtd. in Ergun, 2000: 126). Social and political identities are shaped by the state. In other words, the state shapes, defines and limits the identities.

It is valid particularly for national and ethnic identities that are located in a different way than the borders, which are the less peripheral areas of state...if they do not have a country; they are the politicized ethnic groups pursuing their goals related to autonomy and political independence. Therefore, not considering how we consider the ethnic or national groups without land, every national identity includes unique and firm opinions related to the fact that there is a strong link between a nation and land (Donnan & Wilson, 2002: 116).

When oppressed, people usually find solace in religious or secular rituals in order to maintain their will to resist. Rituals bring those who have authority and those who do not together. Such relations make a notable contribution when a state tries to build a nation from different cultures by means of media and social sciences, education and political socialization programs.

Despite everything, anthropologists have been trying to prove at least for ten years that people have to re-consider the relations among culture, identity and place by integrating themselves with the deficiencies, contradictions and paradoxes of wherever they are living in. Therefore, it is not proper to consider leaving one's homeland and crossing the border as integration by leaving one's roots' (Sorensen, 1997: 146) and a semi-limited experience. Because the identity and culture of individuals is just an occurrence

both in the new world they are entering and also the one they have left. In addition to identity and sense of community, belonging is an infinite historical project and it should be studied accordingly (Donnan & Wilson, 2002: 205).

Belonging to a nation is the uniting consequence of the confidence in the institutions of the state, the desire of sharing without any conflicts and the consciousness of expressing and realizing oneself in all situations.

After 1993, Bulgarian Turks began to be represented by The Rights and Freedoms Party in the Bulgarian Parliament and this party became the third political power with 15 members of parliament. At present, there are 27 Turkish mayors and 653 village headmen. The state controls the religious institutions and directs the religious affairs. Bulgarian Turks became a considerable political power with 30 members of parliament after the elections in 2001 (Kutlu, 2003:4).

Very complicated ethnic, religious and cultural structure in the Balkans and the multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-religious aspects of peoples along with their belonging to different ethnicities makes the solution of the problems very difficult. As a result of declining in working out international treaties and giving the due importance to the minorities in their countries along with pursuing erroneous policies and failure in protecting their cultural heritages problems cannot be solved.

Another problem in the Balkans is unwillingness in participating in political activities, social life and living like 'the

others' or in 'ghettos'. Whatever their ethnic identity, language, religion, gender is, all arrangements should be worked out in order to let each Turk and even all Turkish speaking communities lead a humanly life. The third problem is to protect and keep the Ottoman-Turkish cultural heritage alive. Unfortunately, Ottoman-Turkish works of art in the Balkans are destroyed and historic bridges; caravanserais, baths, mosques and fountains are not protected properly. The fourth problem is the establishment of TV and radio stations, Turkish teaching centers, special museums, theatres, libraries, banks, hospitals culture centers for the Turkish minority, the number of whom has risen up to 12 million (Karayerli, p. 2). Consequently, the migration of the Bulgarian Turks has begun in order to escape from all these problems and live in the land that they belong to.

RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire consisting of 42 items were implemented with random sampling method through face-to-face interview technique to 70 of the members of Balkan Migrants Society, who immigrated to Turkey between 1989 and 1992. The questionnaires were evaluated with SPSS program.

FINDINGS

72 % of the participants live in Yeni Bosna, 10% in Günesli. 64% of the subjects emigrated from Bulgaria in 1989 and 30% of them came to Turkey in 1992. 100% of the immigrants feel themselves belonging to the Turkish society culturally and historically. In the same way, 66% of the participants think that they belong to the Turkish society historically, while 34% of them consider language as a uniting factor. 90% of the subjects stated that the most important prob-

lem that they had in Bulgaria was the change of names.

While they were living in Bulgaria, 92% of the subjects managed to obtain knowledge about the Turkish culture; however, 8% of them could not have that opportunity. 90% of the participants obtained knowledge about the Turkish history and culture from senior members in their families. 2% of them had that information from archives, books and the visitors from Turkey.

66% of the immigrants think that the life style in their quarters is suitable to the Turkish customs and traditions. On the other hand, for 32 % of them, there is a rather modern life style.

76 % of the participants in this study prefer to socialize with their neighbors. While 12% of the participants neither know nor trust any of their neighbors, equally 12% of them know most of their neighbors and rely on them. As the biggest minority from political point of view, the Turks were settled in the north eastern and southwestern parts of Bulgaria. Leading a communal life made has enabled the Turks to lead a rather homogeneous and solitary life as well as protect their ethnic consciousness (Özgür, 2002: 2).

Related to the educational institutions in Turkey, 50 % of the participants think that the educational opportunities are limited due to their level of income in the society. 24 % of them consider the private education in Turkey as a negative factor. Likewise, 22 % of the participants think that they cannot get quality education in Turkey. They state that although Turkish was not used in education during the time they were in Bulgaria, the quality of education was much higher there.

Even if they were exposed to persecution for the use of Turkish, they criticize the educational system in Turkey. It appears quite obvious that not only the language, but also the broadness, quality and publicity of education are considered to be important.

As for the health care service in Turkey, 70 % of the participants think that the health sector is a major problem. Similarly, 30 % of them believe that they cannot benefit from health service sufficiently. They expressed that before the persecutions against them began they did not have any health problems, the government provided all kinds of health facilities, each household was provided with a doctor and they were given regular checkups in Bulgaria. Therefore, the health problem they encountered in Turkey seriously disappointed them. Their low-income level along with the inefficiency to locate them after they immigrated to Turkey disabled them to benefit from private health service.

On the other hand, 16% of them did not have that problem.

According to a declaration of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 258,000 of Bulgarian Turks who were forced to immigrate between 1989-1990 were conferred the right of citizenship between 1989-2001 according to the Article 2510 of Residence Regulations...Moreover, 20,139 of them were transferred to Turkish citizenship (*Göçmenlere Yardımcı Oluyoruz*, 2004: 1).

Bureaucratic problems arising in employment, acquiring property, settling down as well as education and health are the factors causing alienation of the immigrants.

70% of the participants expressed that they had problems about settling down. For 44% of them, it is employment and for 10%; acquiring property and education.

While 78% of them stated that they might immigrate to another country if they had a chance, 22% of the participants expressed that they would not leave Turkey.

As a reason for immigrating to Turkey, 54% of the participants indicated the obligation to escape from the persecutions in Bulgaria. On the other hand, 32% stated that they felt themselves belonging to Turkey as the descendant of the Ottoman State and 10% wanted to live with their Turkish identities.

74% of the participants feel that the Turkish flag represents independence for them. For 24% of them, it is the representation of national unity; 2% think that it symbolizes liberty.

76% of them think that the immigrants lead a united but isolated life from the rest of the society, which denotes that they meet their economic and social requirements with the help of the other immigrants. Thus, it seems that the communal consciousness they exercised in Bulgaria still continues. 16% of the participants expressed that they were uninterested in the political and social activities in Turkey because they believed that they could not make any changes about them. Only 8% of the participants monitor the social and political activities in Turkey very closely and they also stated that they could express themselves. These ratios indicate that they are usually away from the problems in society. The most important reason for that they are distant from the institutions in which the social and political practices take place. "Body is directly

involved within the political sphere; there is an indirect effect of political power relations on it. Power relations invest in body; they balance, train, torture and force it to execute the assigned tasks and display ceremonies" (Rabinow qtd. in Donnan & Wilson, 2002: 225).

Even if the immigrants are an isolated and powerful community within themselves, 96 % of them voted in the elections in Turkey. Voting is the most important indicator of the resolution in public sphere. Confirming decisions refers to self-expression through sharing. Thus, the concern of the immigrants about voting denotes that they give importance to participation in politics. In the same way, it is also possible to infer that they are in fact involved and interested in social issues.

All of the participants (100%) stated that they were exposed to prejudice against them right after they immigrated to Turkey.

The replies to the question about the category they find the most suitable for themselves are as follows: 54 % secular, 10 % modern, 6 % traditional and 4% conservative. As seen, most of the immigrants regard themselves as secular and modern. They consider the majority of the Turkish society as conservative and traditionalist. While most of the immigrants see themselves as the descendants of the Ottoman State, they also indicate that they are different from the Turkish society. They explain the reason why they are closer to the other immigrants as the conflict with their social environment. Such conflicts usually arise from the prejudice of the local people against them as well as the psychological state of the immigrants. Migration is an important risk factor, which may produce

adverse effects on mental health. Therefore, the immigrants or those who were forced to immigrate form a serious risk group. There are many research studies on migration and mental health. According to those studies, it has been determined that particularly some abnormalities, emotional disturbances and anxiety are more frequently observed in immigrants with regard to the population in general. Going through orientation in a society, having a new identity, in other words integration and assimilation is a hard and long-term process (Özgür, 2002: 1).

68% of the participants consider themselves different from the Turkish society from social point of view, whereas 38% of them do not state such a difference.

The ratio of those who think that there are insufficiencies in education, health, employment, housing and participation in political activities is 76%. More specifically; 10% of them think that there are problems in housing, for 8%, participation in political activities is insufficient and for 6%, there are problems pertaining to employment. The majority of the immigrants expressed that as the requisites of civil rights, the institutions for education, health service and employment are not efficient in Turkey. In fact, belonging to a nation necessitates that the state meet the requirements of the citizens the best way possible. Poverty, unemployment, slums or shantytowns are the problems, which distort the consciousness national identity.

According to 78% of the participants, the most important problem they encounter in Turkey is unemployment. It is economy for 20% and national esteem of Turkey abroad for 2%. Moreover, 94% of them assume that the most important factor for national

identity is the flag. Similarly, for 82% of them, it is the language. Only for 4% of the participants, this factor is religion.

For the prevailing problems in Turkey, 58% of the participants indicated the slums and 54% of them denoted the lack of a consciousness of history. As for the rest, %46; degeneration in language, 44%; poverty, 22%; over consumption, 12%; diversification in education. While the ration of those who state that these factors influence the nationalization process negatively is 50% those think just the opposite are 18%. In addition, 18% of the participants assume that they produce no effect at all. Here the majority stated that those factors produced unpleasant consequences, whereas a noticeably high ratio of them thought that those factors practically had no or a little influence. These results might be considered as the indications of unawareness or indifference.

As for the problems they encountered after the immigration to Turkey, 58% of the participants stated the trouble they had for equivalence formalities. In the same way, for 28%; the high fees for residence license, 6%; transfer of social rights from Bulgaria to Turkey and equally 4% for social security, housing, employment and inability to get residence license for those who immigrated to Turkey illegally. As a result of the bureaucratic problems they encountered in Turkey, the immigrants became alienated from government institutions. During the interviews with them, it was noticed that they usually try to solve the problems among themselves by aiding each other. In the quarters they live, the residents know each other very well and a foreigner is easily noticed. The problems they faced with when they first came to Turkey and the inability to

have assistance from the institutions individually brought them close to each other. Although it is quite desirable with respect to solidarity, their being away and alienating themselves from the other segments of the society and thinking that they are unable to change the undesirable things they have to experience affect their sense of belonging to a nation negatively. After all, what is important for them now is living in their homeland as well as exercise their own culture and use their own language.

86% of the participants had a conflict with the people around them after they immigrated to Turkey. In addition, 12% of them felt pessimism and hopelessness. Likewise, 10% of them experienced a sense of loneliness and lack of confidence. 8% of the participants found solace in alcohol, drugs, smoking and gambling.

42% of the participant trust the government institutions, 38% partly trust, 18% do not have confidence in them. It should be noted that the ratio of those who trust these institutions and those who do not are almost equal. On the other hand, the problem that the immigrants suffered most was the conflict and disaccord with the people around them. As the major reason for that, they indicate the prejudice of the Turks against the immigrants. This prejudice stems from their coming from a different cultural structure, lifestyle, system and even a different psychological state.

While 62% of the immigrants believe the existence of the sense of integration and unity in the Turkish society, 20% of them believe it partly and %18 do not think that it exists at all. They seem to find social unity credible; however, they also tend to live

together with other immigrants and display a lifestyle rather close to the overall society, which have arisen from the fact that the persecutions before the immigration brought them closer and also made them retire into themselves.

Although 84% of the participants think that the problems in Turkey are common to the majority of society, 16% of them do not believe that. It is quite obvious that consciousness of citizenship necessitates diversity in the ways to express political, ethnic and religious ideas. Hence, a radical solution to the national and ethical problem in Bulgaria involves the rights and freedoms of cultural communities in Bulgaria.

42% of the immigrants do not believe the policy of the parties in Turkey. The ratio of those who partly believe their policy is 36%. It is only 20% for those who completely believe their policies. Even though the participants partly trust the government institutions, they do not count on the political parties. Similarly they do not find the politicians reliable and sensitive enough.

92% of the participants indicated that the medium of education should be a foreign language other than Turkish in (Turkish) schools while 6% of them stated that it should partly be used. Although they denote that the problem they suffered most in Bulgaria was the change of their names and the prohibition against the use of Turkish, they want foreign languages to be taught at the schools in Turkey. Considering the fact that language is one of the most significant factors for national consciousness, the acceptance of such a practice includes the risk of alienation, misuse and corruption of a language. Language, education and history were instruments of state to legitimize its

governance in modern society. Nationalism through mass education and language gave rise to shared identities and a feeling of belonging to the same community and nation. Thus, instrumentalism assumes that nationalism leads to the existence of nations. Gellner, as the prophet of instrumentalism, emphasizes mostly the high culture during the nation formation process. The high culture is tied to the state. He formulates it as state-one culture. Gellner adds that every state is legitimized by its role as a protector of the high culture (Ekiz, 2004: 2).

It is an undeniable fact that the Turkish language in the reality of Turkey will lead the people to better social interests. Thus, whatever their mother languages other than Turkish are, teaching Turkish to all individuals without exception for having more social interests emerges as a necessity. This issue appears as a national priority. It has already been discussed that bilingualism should be evaluated with regard to the function of social interests. It can be realized quite easily that such an evaluation has a sociological characteristic apart from the linguistic reality of language; in other words it is an evaluation the reason of which is sociological.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Considering the Bulgarian Turks as 'the others' took a different shape after the migration. The Turkish immigrants simply experienced an alienation, whereas, this situation stemmed from the political and social attitude of Turkey.

Ironically, one of the most offensive attitudes towards the Bulgarian Turks came from Turkey. Ankara (the government) decided to send 400,000 ille-

gal immigrants back to Bulgaria. Expiration of their visas was shown as a justification or rather a legal ground for that action (Mandacı & Erdoğan, 2001: 121).

Consequently, the immigrants wreaked under heavy economic conditions and unemployment. "In the case of the assimilation and mandatory emigration of the Turks between 1984 and 1989, no improvement was observed" (qtd. in Mandacı & Erdoğan, 2001: 111). Although the Bulgarian Constitution prohibits the establishment of other parties, the Turks attempted to protect the rights of minorities by forming the Rights and Freedoms Party. The activities of Turkish mass media have noticeably improved since 1989. The newspaper called *Yeni Işık* supports the thesis about the membership of Bulgaria to NATO and EU as well as maintaining good relations with Turkey. Turkey did not care the requirements of the Bulgarian Turks along with educational, cultural and social conditions that were imposed when they were still in Bulgaria. Moreover, their aptitudes, limits and potentials were not evaluated. Therefore, those who immigrated to Turkey were unable to receive the welcome they had expected; they were somehow left alone. Besides, they encountered occupational, educational and economic problems and they tried to cope with them individually. Inability of individuals to get into a real interaction with their social environment and experiencing lack of communication is directly related to the existence of bureaucratic organizations. The relations of individuals with these organizations are formal. Metaphorically speaking, Turkey took action by leaving the door ajar depending on the migration agreements to those who wanted to

immigrate or were forced to immigrate. While the Turks were trying to survive in Bulgaria, a negative one unfortunately replaced the positive image of Turkey in their minds.

According to Geray, it was thought that scattering the majority of the immigrants in cities, towns and villages would be less disadvantageous with regard to their adaptation and assimilation to the society. For the purpose of offering employment opportunities to the immigrants and improving their work conditions, real and pecuniary aids were provided. Therefore, farmers were given credit for lands, seed and equipment. In the same way, those who were craftsmen were provided with credits from the funds apart from the estates (Doğanay, n.d.: 6).

In addition to the conflicts with the local people, inability to solve their housing and employment problems somehow obliged them to migrate again within Turkey. A new approach particularly to the settling and housing problems of the immigrants was observed starting from the 1980s. It was noticed that current regulations for settlement were far from meeting the requirements of the immigrants. Despite the positive consequences of globalization with regard to securing human rights, the dimension of its deterioration particularly on social rights is really great. Without guaranteeing the social rights, it is impossible to enable everyone to benefit from human rights effectively and equally. Therefore, plausible solutions are needed to get rid of the undesirable consequences of globalization. The first condition for a solution is the through analysis of the current process. It is true that globalization is an unstoppable process, whereas it can be

controlled and directed. This process should be controlled according to not only the requirements of the markets but also the realization of human rights. As the repercussion of the destroying effect globalization in developing countries and favoring individualism instead of socialism, the process experienced after 1980s and later in Turkey prevented the integration of the immigrants with the society. Nevertheless, they keep on their co-operation and integration among themselves with communal spirit.

This study is intended to find out how the Bulgarian Turks who immigrated in 1989 could express and realize themselves when they first came to Turkey, what kind of an impressions they gained accordingly and whether they found the common feelings and expectations in Turkey as well after having been deprived of their freedom of existence in Bulgaria and surviving with a communal spirit despite all persecutions. Hence, their sense of belonging to the Turkish land, society and society along with their level of national identity and the factors affecting it has been analyzed in this study.

The impression of Turkey for the immigrants can be summarized as follows: They consider themselves belonging to the Turkish society with respect to history, culture and also language; however they consider themselves different from social point of view. These differences are perceived within the context of their perspective, philosophy of life and lifestyle. Generally speaking they feel mistrust against government institutions. However, they do not appear to be against neither privatization as one of the consequences of globalization nor the activities of multinational companies in Turkey. The majority of them state that

they can partly exercise their cultural and religious activities freely. Furthermore, the participants in this study express that people are not sensitive enough to each other. Again, most of them consider acquiring the citizenship of a developed country. They also think that unemployment and economic troubles are the major problems of Turkey. It seems that they are generally happy about living in Turkey, where they can speak their own language freely, they are not forced to assume different names and capitalist systems and free enterprise provide opportunities for individuals to win.

Another important point here is that these people feel themselves belonging to the Turkish society historically and culturally. However, the difficulties they encounter due to the social, economic and political conditions have caused them to exercise alienation. This alienation brings about negative consequences with respect to national identity and consciousness. Although the immigrants generally have allegiance and loyalty to the Turkish culture as a result of their historic background or past, inefficiency of daily social and political practices to meet their requirements causes them to experience meaninglessness, alienation from the problems and lead a rather secluded life together with other immigrants. Furthermore, it is possible to infer that the Turkish society has created the sense of 'we' in these immigrants with its values, traditions, culture and lifestyle. What is important is to spread this feeling to the society in general. It can be achieved by spreading the feelings of unity and integration to the whole society. Alleviating the sufferings they had in Bulgaria has taken some time. From now on, as the citizens of Turkey, the immigrants are expected to get involved in and monitor the realities of

Turkey more as well as to be more powerful and concerned in realization of social, political and all kinds of practices in Turkey as the community who experienced and suffered the oppression of another country for a long time. Bureaucratic problems arising in employment, acquiring property, settling down as well as education and health are the factors causing alienation of the immigrants.

Thus, the perceptions and views of the immigrants towards Turkey would be improved regarding the social life and political participation in addition to their historic and cultural allegiance. While the culture of a country affects the public relations activities in that country, the public relations activities also affect the culture of that country. The policies towards the immigrants are also the parts of culture policies. In fact, the culture policies are shaped and generalized with public relations activities.

Culture policy is the creation of the convenient conditions to enable people to participate in the cultural life. The measures taken to let each individual to put forth and improve his or her creativity, the organizations established for these purposes as well as the economic and social facilities compose the culture policy...Maheu states that 'one day in the future, people will understand that real democratic policies depend on culture and they will also realize the superiority of culture in development' (Topuz, 1998: 8-10).

Cultural democracy is needed for providing opportunity for everyone In a society to obtain culture and experience the freedom of communication In order to realize this, democratization of a society is necessary.

According to Topuz, culture democracy is to enable people to participate in the creation cultural products and also to benefit from all those products. In this context, our degree of defining our needs also indicates how free we are. By assuming the conception of the social state, the government should introduce the projects to obviate the negativities of bureaucracy and also generalize and develop these projects through public communication strategies. The purpose of public relations is to prepare the due interaction areas to meet the requirements. For the purpose of directing the masses by persuading them, the expectations should be known and the methods should be determined accordingly. The expectations of human beings from the life and the future form an important part of their ideology (Kongar, 2000: 369).

The immigrants already feel themselves belonging to the Turkish society historically, culturally and traditionally. Moreover, they follow the mass media regularly. Regulation of the social and political conditions of the immigrants and their defining their needs respectively and expressing themselves freely in the society that they feel themselves belonged to will also improve their citizenship consciousness. Inability to criticize and express oneself as well as lack of confidence and knowledge posit a serious burden between the administration and the

public. Consequently, it gets more difficult for people to understand and fulfill the rules introduced by the administration. In fact, the immigrants who can contribute to the vision of the society they live in will not isolate themselves intellectually and physically from the rest of the society as long as their citizenship consciousness improves. Therefore, their perspective related to Turkey will positively change.

Culture shapes public relations and public relations help change culture .By directing the public policy, public relations shapes the society. Public relations culturally strengthens present values or shapes the new ones through persuasion instead of obligation. Culture is related to public relations activities. Culture has direct and indirect effects on the public relations practiseses. Culture is the ideas and modes of thought that are made public to the self and others through various forms of externalization, including the mass media. This leads to social distribution of the ways in which the collective cultural inventory of meanings and meaningful external forms are spread over a population and its social relationships.As a last word, the government has to develop strategies to improve the consciousness of citizenship, to make people sensitive about the problems of a society, to reshape its image and also support all these with public relations activities.

REFERENCES

- Bayart, J. F. (1999). *Kimlik Yanılsaması*. M. Moralı (Translated by). İstanbul: Metis.
- Bulgaristan'da Türk Varlığı. (1985) Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Bottomore, T.B. (1970). *Toplumbilim*. U. Oskay (Translated by). İstanbul: Der.
- Doğanay, F. (n.d.). Türkiye'ye Göçmen Olarak Gelenlerin Yerleşimi. September. 15, 2004, <http://genet.sitemynet.com/tarih34.htm>,
- Donnan, H. & Wilson, T. M. (2002). *Sınırlar*. Z. Yas (Translated by). Ankara: Ütopya.
- Ekiz, V. (2004). Turkish Nationalism: State vs. People. August 20, 2006 <http://f27.parsimony.net/forum67368/messages/1279.htm>.
- Ergun, D. (2000). *Kimlikler Kısılcacında Ulusal Kişilik*. Ankara: İmge.
- Göçmenlere Yardımcı Oluyoruz. (2004). *Türkiye İçişleri Bakanlığı*, Eylül 6, 2004, <http://rumeliturk.tripod.com/haber/kimlik.htm>.
- Golding, P. and Murdoch, G. (2002). Kültür, İletişim ve Ekonomi-Politik. B. Kejanlıoğlu (Translated by). S. İrvan (Edited by). Ankara: Alp Yayınevi
- Kamil, I. (1989). *Bulgaristan'daki Türklerin Hakları*. Ankara: Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu Matbaası.
- Karayerli, M. (2004). Balkanlar'da Barış, İstikrar, Güvenlik ve Demokrasi. August 25, 2006, <http://www.aygazete.com/yazarlar/?yazarid=22&yaziid=1033>.
- Kongar, E. (2002). *Toplumsal Değişme Kuramları ve Türkiye Gerçeği*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi
- Kutlu, A. (2003). Türk Topluluklar. Eylül 10, 2005, http://kutlualtay81.sitemynet.com/t_rk_topluluklar_.htm,
- Manço, U. (2003). Avrupa'yı Korkutan Din: İslam, August 23, 2004, <http://www.turkstudent.net/art/3032>.
- Mandacı, N. & Erdoğan, B. (2001). Balkanlarda Azınlık Sorunu: Yunanistan, Arnavutluk, Makedonya ve Bulgaristan'daki Azınlıklara Bir Bakış, *SAEMK Stratejik Araştırmalar ve Etüdler Milli Komitesi Araştırma Projeleri Dizisi*, 5, 109.
- Mattelart, A. & Mattelart, M. (2003). *İletişim Kuramları Tarihi*. M. Zillioğlu (translated by). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Özgür, H. (2002). Bulgaristan Göçmenlerinde Ruhsal Durum Değerlendirmesi. I.U. Institute of Medical Sciences, Department of Psychiatric Nursery, İstanbul: Unpublished Masters Thesis.

- Sennett, R. (1996). *Kamusal İnsanın Çöküşü*. S. Durak ve A. Yılmaz. (Translated by). Ayrıntı, İstanbul.
- Şimşir, B. (1986). *Bulgaristan Türkleri*. İstanbul: Bilgi.
- Türkdoğan, O. (1999). *Milli Kimliğin Yükselişi*. İstanbul: Alfa.
- Topuz, H. (1998). *Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Kültür Politikaları*, İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
- Uygun, O. (n.d.). Kuresellesme ve Degisen Egemenlik Anlayısının Sosyal Haklara Etkisi. August 31, 2006, www.anayasa.gov.tr/anyarg20/uygun.pdf
- Van Derloo, H. & Van Reijen W. (2003). *Modernleşmenin Paradoksları*. K. Canatan (translated by). İstanbul: İnsan.
- Yıldırım, H. (2002). *Kimliğini Arayan Türk Devrimi*. August 8, 2004 http://historicalsense.com/Archive/Turk_kim_3.htm