INVESTIGATING HOME, IDENTITY AND BELONGING: DUAL CITIZENSHIP APPLICATIONS OF TURKISH MIGRANTS FROM BULGARIA AND THEIR CHILDREN

by
DENİZ TAŞYÜREK

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabancı University
August 2020

INVESTIGATING HOME, IDENTITY AND BELONGING: DUAL CITIZENSHIP APPLICATIONS OF TURKISH MIGRANTS FROM BULGARIA AND THEIR CHILDREN

Approved by:

Asst. Prof. Ayşecan Terzioğlu . . . .
(Thesis Supervisor)

Prof. Leyla Neyzi . . . .

Assoc. Prof. Zeynep Kadirbeyoğlu . . . .

Date of Approval: August 5, 2020

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATING HOME, IDENTITY AND BELONGING: DUAL
CITIZENSHIP APPLICATIONS OF TURKISH MIGRANTS FROM BULGARIA
AND THEIR CHILDREN

DENİZ TAŞYÜREK

CULTURAL STUDIES M.A. THESIS, AUGUST 2020

Thesis Supervisor: Asst. Prof. AYŞECAN TERZİOĞLU

Keywords: migration, intergenerational transmission, home, belonging, community

This thesis study investigates the idea of home and the sense of belonging from an intergenerational perspective by focusing on dual citizenship applicants among Bulgaria-born Turks who migrated to Turkey between 1969-1978 and their Turkey-born children. It relies on oral history research conducted with migrants/applicants and their children. It argues that dual citizenship applications create room for applicants to negotiate the conceptions of home and belonging by requiring regular visits to Bulgaria. By focusing on this negotiation, it explores the material and symbolic components of the idea of home, the ruptures and continuities in the relationship between Bulgaria-born migrants/applicants and their Turkey-born children, and community formation practices. In addition to past experiences and present circumstances, it introduces the notion of the future as a significant component of these processes.

ÖZET

EV, KİMLİK VE AİDİYET ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME: BULGARİSTAN GÖÇMENİ TÜRKLERİN VE ONLARIN ÇOCUKLARININ ÇİFTE VATANDAŞLIK BAŞVURULARI

DENİZ TAŞYÜREK

KÜLTÜREL ÇALIŞMALAR YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, AĞUSTOS 2020

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi AYŞECAN TERZİOĞLU

Anahtar Kelimeler: göç, kuşaklararası aktarım, ev, aidiyet, cemaat

Bu tez, 1969-1978 yılları arasında Bulgaristan'dan Türkiye'ye göç eden ve şu anda Bulgaristan'a çifte vatandaşlık başvurusu yapan Türklere ve onların Türkiye doğumlu çocuklarına odaklanarak ev fikrini ve aidiyet hissini kuşaklararası bir perspektiften ele almaktadır. Göçmenler/başvuranlar ve onların çocuklarıyla yürütülen bir sözlü tarih araştırmasına dayanmaktadır. Prosedürler gereği Bulgaristan'ı düzenli olarak ziyaret etmeyi gerektiren çifte vatandaşlık başvurularının ev ve aidiyet kavramsallaştırmalarını başvuranlar açısından tartışmaya açtığını öne sürmektedir. Bu tartışmaya odaklanarak ev fikrinin materyal ve sembolik bileşenlerini, göçmenler/başvuranlar ile onların Türkiye doğumlu çocukları arasındaki ilişkilerin barındırdığı kopuşları ve süreklilikleri ve cemaat inşa pratiklerini incelemektedir. Geçmiş deneyimlere ve mevcut koşullara ilaveten gelecek olgusunu da bu süreçlerin önemli bir bileşeni olarak tartışmaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I cannot complete my acknowledgments without mentioning my colleagues. Burak has been the most understanding and supportive director one could only hope for. Ahmet has been a fantastic coworker who took up a bigger share of our tasks after I switched to part-time to focus on my thesis. I thank them sincerely.

To very dear people who have been home to me

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.   INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Statement

Between 1984-1989, the Bulgarian government conducted an assimilation campaign against Bulgaria's Turkish minority by forcing them to change their names and eventually deporting them out of Bulgaria. After the collapse of the socialist regime in Bulgaria in 1989, the new government attempted to redress the past crimes. Consequently, in 1998, Bulgaria officially recognized dual citizenship and, in 2001, enabled the restoration of citizenship for people whose Bulgarian citizenship had been renounced after their permanent leave from Bulgaria. Through this change in Bulgaria's citizenship regime, it became possible to apply for the restoration of Bulgarian citizenship not only for Bulgaria-born Turks who were deported in 1989 but also the ones who migrated to Turkey throughout the 20th century. Whereas the migrants of 1989 made mass applications for the restoration of their citizenship right after the regulation in Bulgaria's citizenship law, earlier migrants' applications appear to be a relatively recent phenomenon increasing with Bulgaria's membership to European Union in 2007. This thesis focuses on the mass movement of people from Bulgaria to Turkey between 1969-1978 within the scope of a migration agreement between Turkey and Bulgaria as well as these people's applications for the restoration of their Bulgarian citizenship.

In this thesis study, I investigate the sense of belonging, the conceptions of home, and the formation of the community from an intergenerational perspective through oral history research conducted with dual citizenship applicants who had migrated to Turkey between 1969-1978 and their Turkey-born children. The conceptions of home are closely related to future possibilities as well as past experiences. In other words, the meanings of "home and homeliness are constantly shifting," and a place called home might cease to be home in the absence of "possibilities of flourishing in

1

the future" (Thiranagama 2007, 37). At the very beginning of this research, I was curious about how the applicants were motivated to become a Turkish-Bulgarian dual citizen, whether they are planning to live abroad, and how their relations to Turkey changed. I was speculating over whether they feel less homely in Turkey and what factors initiated these feelings. Therefore, I was planning to concentrate on the dynamic and shifting character of the concept of home by embracing a binary perspective and searching for an answer to the question of "Where is home? Bulgaria or Turkey?"

However, my preliminary interviews showed that such an approach would be too unidimensional and superficial to cover the more nuanced and sophisticated qualities of migration- and application-related experiences. There was no clear-cut answer to any home-related question. Instead, people's homely feelings were significantly intertwined with their daily practices of working, building houses, forming families, raising children, creating social circles, and traveling between Turkey and Bulgaria. Additionally, the motives regarding the dual citizenship applications appeared to be in a very close relationship with consideration of wellbeing and the future of children. Therefore, at the beginning of my fieldwork, I decided to include applicants' Turkey-born children into my research as well and revised my research questions. By doing so, I have kept relying on my argument that the application for the restoration of Bulgarian citizenship opens up a wide room to pursue these notions of home, identity, and belonging since the application processes themselves brought about negotiations regarding these matters.

My revised research questions go as follows: What are the material and symbolic aspects of home? How are these elements situated within a spatial relation to Turkey and Bulgaria in the narratives of applicants? How do official or community-based discourses influence people's conception of home and the sense of belonging, particularly in the context of migration? How do these conceptions shape and determine the decisions regarding where to live? What are the temporal elements of the experiences and narratives of homemaking processes? How are applicants' children situated in this temporality? In what ways, the narratives of applicants and their children embrace intergenerational continuities and ruptures, especially in terms of the idea of home and the sense of belonging?

1.2 Historical Background

Bulgaria's citizenship regime has intertwined history with its policies on minority groups and the history of migration from Bulgaria to Turkey. Starting with the Turnovo Constitution of 1879 of Bulgarian Principality and continuing in the period of the Kingdom of Bulgaria founded in 1908, the Bulgarian citizenship regime adopted the principle of *jus soli* by granting a right to become a citizen/subject to every person who was born in Bulgarian territory (Smilov and Jileva 2010, 3-4). After the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, the first state-regulated migration of people from Bulgaria to Turkey took place following a friendship agreement signed between two countries in 1925. Through the agreement based on the voluntary resettlement of people, thousands of Turks migrated to Turkey (Parla 2003, 562). In 1940, Bulgaria promulgated a new citizenship law highly influenced by the fascist tendencies rising in Europe during that period. Accordingly, Bulgaria adopted several elements of the principle of *jus sanguinis* citizenship, Bulgarian origin gained an ethnic meaning, and "Bulgarian subjects of non-Bulgarian origin who left the country" started to be stripped of their Bulgarian citizenship (Smilov and Jileva 2010, 6).

In 1944, Bulgaria went through a drastic change of regime from monarchy to a communist republic. The Constitution of 1947 of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and Law of 1948 on Bulgarian Citizenship eliminated the characteristics of previous law favoring Bulgarian origin. A shift towards the principle of *jus soli* again took place and the term "subject" was removed from the constitution and the citizenship law (Smilov and Jileva 2010, 8). Law of 1948 also presupposed the implementation of stringent rules on exit visas and rendered international migration almost impossible (Parla and Stoilkova 2013, 5). The second mass flow of people from Bulgaria to Turkey occurred in 1950 after a decree issued by the Bulgarian government and paving the way for the migration of 250.000 of Turks to Turkey (Kostanick 1955, 41). Until November 1951, approximately 150.000 people migrated to Turkey (Simsir 1986, 227). However, the government of Turkey sealed the borders twice, in 1950 and 1951, on the grounds that Bulgaria has been sending "gypsies" instead of Turks (Tünaydın 2015). In 1968, the People's Republic of Bulgaria issued its second law on Bulgarian citizenship, which maintained the provision of 1940's citizenship law that "all Bulgarian citizens from non-Bulgarian ethnicity who have permanently left the country" are stripped of their Bulgarian citizenship (Smilov and Jileva 2010, 8). This provision preventing multiple citizenship also coincided with another migration agreement signed between Turkey and Bulgaria in 1968. This family reunion

agreement enabled Turks of Bulgaria whose relatives had settled in Turkey during the migratory wave of 1950-1951 to migrate to Turkey within ten years between 1969-1978. Approximately 130.000 people left Bulgaria to go to Turkey during this period (Simsir 1986, 338). Since the citizenship law of the day precluded dual citizenship and denaturalized people who permanently left the country, the migrants of 1950-1951 and 1969-1978 lost their Bulgarian citizenship and became Turkish citizens after their migration.

The infamous "Rebirth Campaign" between 1984-1989 gave rise to the last mass migration wave from Bulgaria to Turkey. Ethnic Turks living in Bulgaria were forced to change their names into Bulgarian ones. Also, speaking Turkish in public was prohibited (Parla 2006, 545). In 1989, more than 300.000 Bulgarian citizens of Turkish ethnicity were deported to Turkey (Parla and Stoilkova 2013, 6). After the collapse of the socialist regime in Bulgaria in the same year, the new regime began to redress the previous crimes and enabled the restoration of citizenship; consequently, approximately half of the migrants of 1989 returned to Bulgaria. Dual citizenship remained unacceptable, but not for so long. While the Constitution of 1991 of the new regime paved the way for dual citizenship by not mentioning it at all, the Law of 1998 on Bulgarian Citizenship explicitly recognized multiple citizenship by stating that "Bulgarian citizen who is also citizen of another state shall be considered only Bulgarian citizen when applying to Bulgarian legislation, unless a law provides otherwise" (*Bulgarian Citizenship Act* 1998, Article 3). Additionally, a person who was released from Bulgarian citizenship has been granted the right to apply for the restoration after the third year of his/her permanent or long-term residency permit (*Bulgarian Citizenship Act* 1998, Article 26(3)).

During the application process, applicants gather several documents to prove that the former Bulgarian citizen and the applying Turkish citizen are the same person. They entrust a procuration to someone who lives in Bulgaria and who will be tracking the bureaucratic processes there. Eventually, they have their residency permit, which can be resumed by being a tenant in Bulgaria and visiting Bulgaria at least semi-annually. At the end of this three-year-period, applicants are interviewed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. If they are approved, they acquire their Bulgarian citizenship at the end of approximately five years.[1] Once the migrants themselves acquire their Bulgarian passports, their children can apply for Bulgarian citizenship too without waiting three years to be interviewed.

_____

[1]This explanation regarding the application procedures is based on the know-how of third parties in Bulgaria who professionally conduct the processes of the applicants living in Turkey. However, it should be noted that I acquired this information during my fieldwork, which was before the Coronavirus pandemic. Currently, there are several troubles with semi-annual visits to Bulgaria since international travel is mostly suspended. Also, the overall process might be longer than five years due to the delays in bureaucratic procedures.

In the previous laws on citizenship before the regime change in Bulgaria, the restoration of citizenship had not been totally rendered impossible, but it had been tied either to marriage to a Bulgarian citizen of Bulgarian origin (Özgür-Baklacioglu 2006, 323) or to the resettlement in the country and demonstrating "a positive attitude towards the state and social system" (Smilov and Jileva 2010, 8). However, what actually enables the migrants to apply for restoration appears to be the acceptance of dual citizenship in Bulgaria because they had already become citizens of Turkey following their migration and Turkey had already legalized multiple citizenship in 1981 (Kadirbeyoğlu 2007, 128). Additionally, in the amendment in 2001, the Bulgarian government entitled a one-year transitional period through which migrants of 1989 who were deported out of Bulgaria had a right to submit their applications for the restoration of their previous citizenship without waiting for three years after they acquired their residency permit (Özgür-Baklacioglu 2006, 324). Hence, there occurred mass applications for the restoration of Bulgarian citizenship by the deportees of 1989.

Probably under the influence of Bulgaria's membership to the European Union in 2007, it becomes possible to see a current and ongoing trend of applying for the restoration of Bulgarian citizenship by earlier migrants, an occurrence worth investigating more deeply. However, among migrants of 1950-1951, the youngest person born in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey is probably 70 years old. Since the age factor might directly affect the willingness to pursue the procedures of dual citizenship applications, it might narrow down the scope of possible participants to a significant extent. Additionally, migrants' pre-migration experiences in Bulgaria are closely related to the year of migration. Widening the scope of this study in a way to encompass both the migrants of 1950-1951 and of 1969-1798 would complicate the analysis of the decision of migration. Therefore, this study sticks solely to the experiences of the migrants of 1969-1978 and their children.

The experiences of the migrants of 1969-1978 stand apart from the later migrants in the sense that they did not experience deportation but signed up voluntarily to have an exit visa from Bulgaria and an entrance visa to Turkey. I do not describe a strict line between forced and voluntary migrations by having in mind that voluntary migrations might be preceded by certain processes that might make people feel forced, as I will explain in detail in the following chapter. However, I attach importance to the necessity not to undermine the differences between the experiences of instant deportation by the Bulgarian government on the one hand, and of migrating as part of an agreement between states of Turkey and Bulgaria on the other. Hence, I describe the migration wave which I focus on as a matter of choice in order not to confine myself to the discursive limits of the duality between being forced and

volenteering.

Here, it becomes significant to address a gap in the literature on the migrants of 1969-1978 besides the descriptive studies focusing on the history of Bulgaria in general, the history of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria, and the history of migration from Bulgaria to Turkey, which are mainly based on written documents, legal changes and regulations, and agreements between two states (Crampton 2007; Eminov 2002; Kostanick 1955; Simsir 1986). Since they rely on different (Turkish or Bulgarian official) sources and reproduce different official discourses, they contradict with each other on several accounts such as the numbers of migrants or the motivations of states to make migration agreements. The reproduction of nationalist discourses becomes embedded in the understanding that the Turkish culture and minority in Bulgaria "naturally" belong to the territories of Turkey. Hence, the migration of Turks from Bulgaria to Turkey is addressed as a "return migration" and "homecoming" in the respective studies based on Turkish official discourse, as Parla (2006, 546) points out. Similarly, the Bulgarian word of *izselnitsi* (re-settlers) appears as "'a brand name' for a particular group of people – ethnic Turks, born in Bulgaria, facing mass migration to Turkey in the summer of 1989 as a result of the policies of the 'Revival Process'" as Elchinova (2012, 25) addresses. These discourses become problematic since these so-called "return migrants" or "re-settlers" have never lived or settled in Turkey prior to the exodus in 1989. Whereas these nationalist discourses are analyzed, discussed, and questioned with a focus on the case of migration in 1989, the earlier migration waves remain unexamined especially from an anthropological perspective. The points addressed by Parla and Elchinova regarding the deportation in 1989 are illuminating and inspiring. However, the migration wave between 1969-1978, as an example of migrating by choice, is likely to embrace different discourses, practices, and encounters. When this situation is combined with the relatively recent phenomenon of dual citizenship applications, this study addresses this gap of a seemingly voluntary migration wave by digging deeper into the conceptions of home and belonging for the community at stake.

1.3 Fieldwork

In order to find answers to my research questions, I conducted semi-structured, in-depth oral history interviews with 18 people about whom I will provide more detailed information in the following section. The first interview took place in May

2018 as part of one of my final projects and as preliminary work for my forthcoming thesis, which was extremely tentative at the moment. I made the second interview in October 2018, while I was also preparing the proposal for this study. My official fieldwork was between February 17, 2019, and April 29, 2019, in Bursa and Istanbul.

Additionally, I once traveled to Bulgaria, to be more specific, to Kardzhali (*Kırcaali*) and Sofia, in May 2019 with my mother, who also migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1978 and currently is a dual citizenship applicant. She was obliged to participate in a governmental interview within the scope of the application procedures. I joined her to have the first-hand experience regarding how these processes go. I included my personal encounters and familial experiences in my writings when they deemed relevant.

1.3.1 Research Participants

Among the eighteen people I interviewed for my thesis research, twelve were born in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey between 1969-1978 and six were born in Turkey to Bulgaria-born migrant parents. Among twelve first-generation participants, one person was not interested in dual citizenship applications but had comprehensive knowledge about the application processes because of his involvement with *BAL-GÖÇ* (Culture and Solidarity Association of Migrants from the Balkans). I met him in order to gain a perspective about general tendencies regarding applications. Another person was among the people called "tourist-comers" (*turist gelenler*), instead of being in the migrant position within the scope of the migration agreement between Turkey and Bulgaria. "Tourist-comers" is a category used to refer to the people who traveled to Turkey with a tourist visa and applied for a residency permit there. Although this participant became a dual citizen recently, I did not include his life story in my analysis because the experiences of migrants and "tourist-comers" display considerable differences in terms of both migration processes and application procedures.

Hence, the analyses in the following chapters rely on the life narratives of ten migrants, firstly. During our interviews, nine of them were still in the application process, whereas one of them has recently been recognized as a Turkish-Bulgarian dual citizen. These ten people are composed of four men and six women. Seven of them are retired, whereas three of them are still working. They all are married, have children, and living in Bursa.

Additionally, I interviewed six Turkey-born people whose parents migrated from Bulgaria between 1969-1978 and currently have been applying for dual citizenship. These six people are composed of three men and three women, whose birth years vary between 1981 and 1995. One of them is married with children and living in Bursa. Another one is also married and living in Istanbul. Three of them are in Istanbul for their university educations. The final one graduated from a university in Sakarya and moved back to Bursa.

Because of ethical concerns, these participants will be mentioned with their pseudo-names throughout the following chapters. Since interpersonal and familial relations are of utmost importance for my arguments, I did not choose to anonymize these figures totally. However, to avoid any personal detail that might reveal their identities, I did not mention any names belonging to neighborhoods, workplaces, or institutions. Even in the quotations from participants' narratives, I made necessary changes during the translation in a way to hide these names so that their privacy would be protected.

Finally, although I add necessary explanations regarding the participants when I appeal to their accounts in the following chapters, I find it useful to give, at this point, a brief summary of which participant is related to another one in what ways in an organized order. Familial relations of the participants with their pseudo-names go as follows:

Bahri *Bey* and Rabia *Hanım* are a couple who got married in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey in 1978 together with Bahri *Bey*'s parents and siblings. They are currently retired. The elder one of their two daughters, Ece, was born in Turkey in 1981. She is married to a man who is not from Bulgaria. They have a teenage son and continue working. They all live in Bursa.

Müzeyyen *Hanım* and Sami *Bey* are also another couple who experienced migration as adults. They got married in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey in 1978. Their first son was born in Bulgaria. They had two more sons in Turkey. They are currently retired and living with their middle son and his family in a duplex building in Bursa.

Renginar *Hanım* is a 55-year-old woman who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1973 when she was 7. Her husband, Fikri *Bey*, is a 60-year-old man who migrated to Turkey in 1971 when he was 11. They have two sons, both living in Istanbul. The elder one is married and working in a company. The younger one, Ümit, was born in 1995 and continues his education in Istanbul.

Sümbül *Hanım* was born in 1953 in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey in 1978 when she was 15. She is retired now. She is married to a man who is also a Bulgaria-born

migrant. They have a daughter and a son. Their son, Sinan, is also among the participants of this study. He is in his 30s and married. He lives in Istanbul.

Zülfiye *Hanım* was born in 1966 in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey in 1978. She still works. Her husband is also a Bulgaria-born migrant. They have two sons. I interviewed the elder one, Murat, who was born in 1993 and continues his university education in Istanbul.

Metin *Bey* was born in Bulgaria in 1965 and migrated to Turkey in 1978 when he was 13 years old. He is the only participant whose application procedures were completed. He has two sons, but neither of them was available to participate in this study.

Neriman *Hanım* is a 54-year-old woman who migrated to Turkey while she was very little, only 3,5 years old, in 1970. She is retired now and married to a man who is a Bulgaria-born migrant. She has two children. Her son lives neither in Bursa nor in Istanbul. Her daughter lives in Bursa but was not available to attend an interview with me.

There are also two more participants who were born in Turkey to migrant parents, but I could not interview neither their mothers nor their fathers. Neslihan is in her 20s and moved back with her parents after she graduated from university. She currently lives in Bursa. She did not prefer to confirm audio-recording; hence, I could only use our interview as background information. Aynur is also in her 20s and living in Istanbul where she continues her university education. She confirmed audio-recording and we talked for hours. However, her interview has been challenging to read and analyze since she recently lost her mother to cancer. Her relationship with her mother was a very constitutive element in her life story which differentiated her from other interviewees substantially in this sense. Hence, I chose not to provide a reading of her account.

1.3.2 Method

> "Story [. . .] stands for the way we narrate the past, seek and transmit knowledge, and imagine our future. Story is the principle of how we make sense of human experience. [. . .] Stories are made from an emotional process that involves symbolically elaborating experience in a way that brings narrative coherence and understanding to our existence. In this way, every story is the better story, or the best possible story we have

invented to allow ourselves to go on living (Georgis 2013, 1)."

In the fieldwork which I conducted through the participation of 18 people, I have embraced oral history as my method and mainly chased the life stories of these participants. Georgis's above-quoted description of the power of stories perfectly explains why I chose to conduct oral history research. The conception of home and the sense of belonging cannot be grasped through direct questions regarding these matters. Also, they are not confined to the moment of application for dual citizenship. Instead, they are notions finely knitted within the narratives of lifetime events. What people tell as well as what people choose to remain silent about are the principal indicators of how they relate to themselves, their past, their future, and the world around them. Hence, in the interviews, I asked participants to tell me about their lives.

A life story inevitably includes a work of memory. However, remembering does not function by grasping a lifetime period in its coherency and continuity. Rather, memory is constituted of fragmented pieces, images, and moments (Abrams 2010, 8-9). During the interview, the narrator provides "an ordered account created out of disordered material or experience (Abrams 2010, 106). The construction of a life story as a narrative is shaped by the present conditions as well as past experiences (Rosenthal 2006, 1). The narrators address an audience by presenting a persona of themselves depending upon their perception of the audience both as the interviewer and the larger group who will listen/read their narratives. Hence, their performance in the narrative is constructed in an intersubjective manner (Abrams 2010, 131). Within this intersubjectivity, there appears a possibility of going beyond ready-made narratives and capturing some implications regarding the interstices. In other words, even though there exists a narrative of a community as a homogeneous and unified entity, subjective and intersubjective stories might shed light on the contradictions and differences which threaten this homogeneity. Thus, oral history appears to be a very powerful method.

To reach the participants, I used the snowball sampling method in Bursa, a migrant-receiving city especially during the mass movements of people from the Balkans to Turkey throughout the 20th century. Since migrating to and settling in other cities might add additional layers to the very multi-layered migration experience, I confined the scope of my interviews with first-generation migrants with the city of Bursa. First, I asked my personal contacts to introduce me to their applicant acquaintances. Then, I contacted the people who are suggested by these initial participants. In order not to remain within a limited circle, I took help from more than one gatekeeper.

Once I completed my interviews with migrants/applicants themselves, my initial aim was to contact their children since these familial and intergenerational relationships occupy an essential place in my analyses. I conducted interviews with the children of first-generation migrant participants of this study as long as it was possible. When it was not the case in all instances, I also interviewed Turkey-born children whose parents did not participate in this study.

1.3.3 Positionality

Besides my academic interest on the topic of my research, I also have a personal one. Both my parents were born in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey during 1969-1978, and presently, my mother is in the application process for the restoration of her Bulgarian citizenship. Also, in my extended family, there are plenty of people who applied for or took their Bulgarian passports within the last five years. Each time they visited Bulgaria, I witnessed how refreshed they returned with plenty of stories about their longings and encounters.

Approximately a decade ago, I stumbled upon my grandfather's handwritten notes composed of two notebooks. These notes about which I heard for the first time turned out to be a detailed narrative of my family's origin and the history my grandfather had witnessed during his whole life. He had not only told the stories of my grand grandparents but also, as a member of the cadre of the village cooperative, had given an insight into how the institutionalization of socialism was reflected in a Turkish village in Bulgaria. Through his notes, one could easily trace the village-based organization of the socialist regime, the functioning of cooperatives as the primary economic unit, and the daily life of a Muslim minority group. When I look back now, these detailed notes were built upon a motivation to record and transmit the way of life in Bulgaria to the next generations. My motivation to conduct this thesis research has been indisputably related to trace these transmissions as well.

My insider position might lead to some doubts about ensuring critical distance and "objectivity." However, as Lila Abu-Lughod, among others, argues, "[T]he outsider self never simply stands outside" (Abu-Lughod 1991, 53). A researcher, either as an insider or an outsider, "stands in a definite relation" and "in a specific position vis-à-vis the community being studied." Therefore, instead of searching for an objective positionality, I value to be aware of my standpoint. This awareness requires to address the risk of taking some cultural aspects as natural and given, and of becoming blind and oblivious to some relationalities. However, I believe that I

could manage to overcome this challenge in two ways: Firstly, I have paid specific attention to think over and articulate the processes of the construction of each and every category and practice, instead of taking them for granted. Secondly, I have included the narratives which are quite different from the experiences of my parents, my grandparents, or my own as well as the ones which show resemblance.

Since interviewing family members and relatives involves too many personal layers and becomes complicated, I did not make any interviews with them. However, I did not refrain myself from including my encounters to my analyses when it was relevant.

1.4 Theoretical Approaches

Oral history research provides plenty of paths to be followed at the moment of analysis since it includes participants' life stories very comprehensively instead of focusing on a segment or a single dimension. During the writing process, the author, as an authority, steps in and decides how to handle this plurality of data, how to create a coherent entity, which parts to include, and which parts to leave aside. My fieldwork, too, presented several possibilities for the analyses of the life stories that I listened to. An appeal to the literature on nationalism, ethnicity, migration, and identity would surely be an inspiring perspective to approach these narratives. As a result of the experience of the migration from Bulgaria to Turkey, first-generation migrant participants' narratives inevitably included the formation of Turkishness as a national identity in a minority position in Bulgaria, on the one hand, and in a position claiming to be a part of majority yet facing several discourses of exclusion in Turkey, on the other. Also, the narratives of migrants' Turkey-born children would shed light on the transformations concerning the idea and the practice of Turkishness. Although being aware of the potential contribution of such an inter-generational analysis to the literature, I have chosen to approach the narratives by taking the concepts of home and belonging as main pillars of this thesis study because I have found dual citizenship applications very promising for such an account. Since the idea(s) of home and the sense(s) of belonging are not easily separable from the construction of identity, community, and nation, I have appealed to the literature on those concepts as long as they are relevant to my discussion on home and belonging.

1.4.1 Community Formation and Identity

I was on a bus traveling from Sofia to Istanbul. It was my first time, but it was obvious that the bus was mostly populated with regulars of this road. An overwhelming majority of the travelers across the border between Turkey and Bulgaria were either dual citizens of two countries or Turkish citizens having *lişna kartas*, identity cards showing that the holder has a residency permit in Bulgaria. We reached the border gate at midnight. All passengers were asked to get out and take their luggage along. We were expected to carry our bags into the building right there and to be lined up in front of the passport police. After our entrance to Turkey gets approved, we would put our stuff to the x-ray machine. No one did seem to pay attention to the passport control much. Early comers in the queue started to move on to the next step. We heard the voice of the luggage-check police: "I am in fine feather today. I did not throw anything away. But, I warn you. Do not bring this much meat once again." It was not a matter of security. The point was to keep dual citizens' attempts to bend the rules at a moderate amount by searching for meat or alcohol in their bags. There were three Arabic-speaking men among our travel companions, one with a Bulgarian passport and two with American passports as the host of the bus informed me. The passport police spent too much time with one of them until his entrance to Turkey was approved. Possibly more authorized police officers were being called on to the desk. We were waiting in the queue for almost half an hour right under the hot air blowing device. Grumblings among the crowd began. A man standing right in front of me turned to his back and said, "We are waiting so long because of the *strangers*." He was holding a Bulgarian passport and speaking Turkish. Among three dozens of people whose sense of belonging probably goes beyond the national borders and boundaries, a feeling of "us" was formed all of a sudden in the face of the "other" who is defined as a stranger.

During my trip to Bulgaria, I have got involved in the interactions between unacquainted people not as a researcher, but as the daughter to a dual citizenship applicant. In other words, I have been in "the everyday world where the individual acquires a coherent identity or selfhood" (Gardiner 2000, 76). As it is mentioned in the vignette above, this has created a possibility for the man standing in front of me during the passport control line to group himself with me on the same side while categorizing another person as the stranger.

> "Strangers are not simply those who are not known in this dwelling,
> but those who are, in their very proximity, already recognised as not

belonging, as being out of place. Such recognition of those who are out of place allows both the demarcation and enforcement of the boundaries of 'this place', as where 'we' dwell. The enforcement of boundaries requires that some-body – here locatable in the dirty figure of the stranger – has already crossed the line, has already come too close (Ahmed 2000, 21-22)."

Sarah Ahmed's conceptualization of the stranger has two crucial implications. Firstly, the very moment of interpersonal encounter is the space where the processes of estrangement are in function. This encounter differentiates people who belong to a place or who "own" the place from the others who should not be there. Accordingly, "stranger as a figure" appears to "embody that which must be expelled from the purified space of the community, the purified life of the good citizen" (Ahmed 2000, 22). Secondly, the figure of a stranger does not entail an entity that exists far away, on the contrary, is recognized in the immediacy of an encounter. The stranger is situated in a very close position and this closeness becomes the main source of estrangement. Ahmed's conceptualization based on encounters of estrangement is very illuminating for discussing the concept of community with all its fluidity and dynamism. In this thesis, although I focus on the migrants of 1969-1978 and their Turkey-born children, it would be problematic to assume that there is such a group living, eating, praying, and traveling together. However, even in a place like a border gate which is not owned or dwelled by anyone, which intrinsically hosts the movement of plenty of people, there appears a categorization based on "us" and the "strangers". These very encounters and the processes of estrangement, I argue, form identities and communities. Throughout this thesis, when I refer to these concepts, I mainly rely on such a conceptualization.

If community and identity are extremely intangible, always re-producible, fluid, and dynamic concepts, why do we need such analytical categories? Right at this point, the difference between identity as a "category of practice" and as a "category of analysis" becomes highly significant (Brubaker and Cooper 2000). According to Brubaker and Cooper, identity appears to be a category of practice meaning "categories of everyday social experience, developed and deployed by ordinary social actors" (2000, 4). In this sense, identity might be articulated either by politicians or by identity politics activists to invoke solidarity even though the former attempts to create an illusion of sameness whereas the latter tries to reveal concealed differences. Acknowledging the existence of identity as a practical category appearing in the social world creates confusion about how it will be analyzed. Brubaker and Cooper suggest that analyzing identity by taking it as a given and natural notion leads to "reification" and, therefore, a genuine analysis of identity should reveal its mecha-

nisms of functioning instead of reproducing and reinforcing it both as an analytical and a practical category (2000, 5).

According to Brubaker and Cooper, if the analytical concept of identity either reifies the illusion of sameness or refers to something highly fluid and intangible, why do we need such a problematic term as a category of analysis? Instead, they offer to explain at length what we mean by identity (identification, self-understanding, or commonality). Although I find their warning quite significant, identity is still a valid concept because it embraces all three meanings at once since these mechanisms do not function separately. In other words, how we understand ourselves occur in a close relationship with how we are identified by others and how we form communities.

As can be seen in the example at the very beginning of this section, the encounter with someone who is recognized as the "other" or the "stranger" generates a shared identity yet neither solid nor permanent. Instead, the experience of identity as a practical category is very sudden and occurs through the intertwinement of the mechanisms of identification, self-understanding, and groupness. Because it is so sudden and temporary, it is also plural; it is "us" against Arabs in the border gate, against non-Turks in Bulgaria, or against non-migrants in Turkey. In parallel, assuming a pre-determined community based on an identity seems problematic because it is also a fluid and intangible concept which is re-formed and re-generated through different encounters. At this point, I should clarify that the phrase "dual citizenship applicants among the migrants of 1969-1978" does not correspond to a given community. Instead, I argue that the mere processes of application create a condition to see the negotiations regarding the identity and the community by multiplying cross-border interactions and encounters.

1.4.2 Imagining Space

Although the concepts of identity and community are constructed and re-constructed plenty of times in different contexts, this does not mean that this is an individualistic process. Instead, in my opinion, the mechanisms which shape these encounters become highly important. In order to provide an understanding of these mechanisms, I rely on the concept of "interpellation" by Althusser, in my thesis study. Accordingly, humans are turned into "subjects" by being "interpellated", "hailed" or "called" by the dominant ideology which eventually determines how these subjects relate to their relationship with the material reality (Althusser 1994, 130). In this sense, encounters of estrangement appear not to be independent happenings

but shaped by the dominant ideology.

Considering that Althusser makes a discussion about an imaginary representation of the relationship with material reality, I find it important to visit Benedict Anderson (1991), who describes nations as "imagined communities". This is to say that people, in the very moment of an encounter, do not randomly assign some-bodies as stranger figures. Instead, there appears a dominant ideology, which calls people to be subjected to acting in certain ways, and a process of imagination, which groups certain people together by leaving the "others" aside. Additionally, the processes of imagining communities, also entail imagining places where these people are supposed to belong (Gupta and Ferguson 1997).

1.4.3 Imagining Past, Present and Future

Since this thesis is a study based on life stories, it certainly requires specific attention to be paid on temporality. In oral history literature, it is widely acknowledged that the past is not a fixed and stable entity to be recalled in its unity at the moment of narrativization. As I discussed in the "Method" subsection of this Introduction, it is a whole of fragmented parts, which are constructed as a narrative sometimes in a coherent, sometimes in a slippery way. Whereas the influence of present circumstances on these constructions is generally recognized, the involvement of future prospects might sometimes be overlooked. However, how people narrate their past, how they articulate their sense of belonging, and how they form their homely feelings take place in a temporal framework which is constituted by future prospects as well as past experiences and present conditions.

In order to provide a future-based analysis of the narratives and the actions, I rely on the concepts of "anticipation" and "expectation" which are put forward by Bryant and Knight (2019). These two terms differ from each other in the sense that whereas the latter is a prediction based on past observations, the former is an impatient hope which blurs the boundaries between the present and the future. Whereas these two forms of imagining the future are certainly important mechanisms to make a subjectivity-based analysis regarding people's decisions and actions, I aim to go one step further. My fieldwork informed me that there was a future-based consideration in the decision of migration from Bulgaria to Turkey. However, the future at the stake appears to be the past during the moment of narrativization. Therefore, it should be noted that how people imagine their current future as dual citizens shape their narratives of past futures which belong to fortysomething years ago. In several

16

interviews, participants highlighted that they are genuinely glad to be Bulgaria-born migrants who came to Turkey. This emphasis can be evaluated through a perspective that recognizes both current and past futures as that the narrators feel a need to justify their action of migration in the context of ongoing dual citizenship applications. In other words, dual citizenship applications are narrated in a way to not negate the legitimacy of the decision of migration.

1.4.4 Belonging and Home

The idea of home and the sense of belonging are related to both emotional attachments and material surroundings, based on both temporal and spatial elements. How people relate to certain spaces as well as to their past and future become highly significant in the construction of the idea of home and in the formation of the sense of belonging. I examine these aspects, in the following chapters, through a perspective which attaches importance to the mechanisms shaping spatialities and temporalities, as I explained in previous subsections in detail.

Additionally, material surroundings and how people attribute the meaning of home to these things also become necessary to discuss the concept of home. In order to conduct such a discussion, I rely on the perspective provided by material culture studies which enable me to go beyond binary thinking between house and home. This approach prescribes to focus on social relations in order to overcome the "distinction between the material and the ideational" (Hicks 2010, 46). It requires to investigate how physical buildings or houses and the homely meanings attributed to these structures are formed together (Jacobs and Smith 2008). Also, it recommends concentrating not only on what kind of homes people make but also what kind of subjectivities are formed in relation to these homes (Miller 2001).

Although the concept of home, in my opinion, should be discussed in relation to spatial and temporal elements as well as material structures and emotional attachments, it might not be experienced by every individual in the same way. Whereas age, gender, and status differences shape the experience of home for its dwellers, the idea of home also might be perceived by different people in different ways. Since I conducted my fieldwork through the participation of not only Bulgaria-born migrants/applicants but also their Turkey-born children, I finally focus on the intergenerational differences regarding the idea of home and the sense of belonging.

The term of generation, in social sciences, is used in a way to refer to "a principle of

kinship descent", "cohort", "life stage", and "historical period" (Kertzer 1983, 126). In this study, I appeal to this concept only to make an analytical categorization between participants who personally went through the experience of migration and the participants born into migrant families. Whereas I refer to the former as "first-generation migrants", I choose to call the latter as "second-generation migrants". People who were born into migrant families might or might not embrace a migrant identity. There is not a single and homogeneous way to recount this matter. Hence, I should mention that I make this denomination only in order to clarify my argumentation especially while I discuss how people who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey differ from their Turkey-born child in the sense of belonging.

I analyze the difference in terms of the idea of home and the sense of belonging between first- and second-generation migrants by leaning on Heller's (1995) conceptualizations of "temporal home" and "geographic promiscuity". Accordingly, freedom is reached through a move away from the "appointed place", and hence, "the appointed destiny" (Heller 1995, 4). Whereas these movements increase "social contingencies", they also make these people attached to the spirit of time instead of a sedentary space.

1.5 Outline

In order to discuss my research questions in the light of abovementioned theoretical approaches, I organize this thesis under three chapters.

In the first chapter, I take the decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey as my point of departure. The migration wave which I focus on is not an example of deportation or forced migration. However, since I find the binary thinking between forced or voluntary migrations problematic, I discuss this experience as a matter of choice. I analyze how people made such decisions with the influence of what kind of factors and by embracing what kind of imaginations.

In the second chapter, I focus on the housebuilding processes after the migration to Turkey, which appear to be a very central part of the life stories of the first-generation participants. By doing so, I provide an analysis of the relation between the idea of home and the physical structure of the house. Additionally, I pay attention to in what ways the endeavors to build a house as soon as possible are gendered and aged.

In the final chapter, I introduce a comparative perspective to the experiences and narratives of first-generation migrant participants and their children. Here, I discuss intergenerational transmission as an important element of community formation. I concentrate on the ruptures and continuities in terms of values, norms, and ideas. Additionally, I pay attention to the transmission of material assets and take the applications for dual citizenship into special consideration.

2. IMAGINING HOMELAND, FUTURE, AND THE SELF: THE DECISION TO MIGRATE FROM BULGARIA TO TURKEY BETWEEN 1969-1978

In May 2019, I visited Bulgaria with my mother and her cousin. They had embarked on a journey in order to attend the interviews for the restoration of their Bulgarian citizenship. I joined them to see the places which the participants of this study were talking about during our interviews. That was my second trip to Bulgaria, yet I had never seen Kardzhali (*Kırcaali*) or Sofia before. After spending a couple of days in Kardzhali, we arrived at Sofia. We had not arranged a place to stay beforehand and were in lack of internet connection. So, we started to walk around the city center until we found a hostel. This stroll around the city enabled us to see how cosmopolitan Sofia is – a city in which you could walk from a street full of nameplates in Arabic to another one that seems to be mainly populated by Roma people. In the hostel we checked in for the night, I engaged in a conversation with a man under the presumption that he was telling me something in Bulgarian. I was trying to explain in English that I do not speak Bulgarian. However, he was not speaking Bulgarian either and did not understand what I was saying in English. In the end, I somehow figured out that he was a Kurdish refugee from Syria, currently living in Berlin and visiting Sofia.

After we left our bags in the hostel, we toured around, tasted Bulgarian beers, and found a place to eat. Strolling in the city, we found ourselves in Vitosha Boulevard which seemed to be a more gentrified area of the city. As an Istanbulite since 2009, the proximity of areas with very different auras, the uncanny feeling deriving from the constant unpredictability, and yet the sense of belonging thanks to conflicting claims over the city were familiar to me. This familiarity continued until the next day when I accompanied my mother and her cousin during their walk to the building of the Foreign Ministry for their citizenship interview. First, we went to the park right in front of the Ivan Vazov National Theatre to meet the intermediary person who had followed all the paperwork during the application process and would be present in the interview as a translator. The intermediary person

came from Kardzhali together with all the other applicants who had scheduled to be interviewed on that day. In a rush, as a group of approximately ten people, we walked towards the building of Foreign Ministry located behind the theatre together with other government buildings. The walk was like passing through the state of Bulgaria, during which one would feel very tiny in the middle of gigantic structures looking well-groomed, mighty, and not very welcoming to such an extent that despite my urge to take some photos while I was waiting outside during the interviews, I could not dare. Meanwhile, as we waited at the ministry's gate for my mother's turn for the interview, she was anxiously trying to recall which national heroes to mention during the interview and which not to.[1] This did not stem from a difficulty to remember some historical information from primary school years. Rather, since she went to school in Bulgaria between 1973 and 1978, some historical figures, such as Mitko Palauzov[2] , were demoted from the position of a national hero after the collapse of the socialist regime. Likewise, the mausoleum of Georgi Dimitrov[3] in Sofia was destroyed in 1999. Thus, she needed to remember the ones who should be remembered and not mention the ones who should be forgotten. Similarly, the national holidays had gone through several changes in the last 40 years. For example, March 3rd, "the Day of Liberation of Bulgaria from Ottoman Dominion", was not a national holiday back then, as my mother narrates. Instead, she remembers, September 9th, the Day of People's Uprising, that had been celebrated as the day when the Red Army entered Bulgaria and the Communist Party came to power. In addition to the national heroes, when it comes to the national holidays, she was supposed to remember the "right" ones.

After the interviews, we walked towards a central crossroad in the middle of which the statue of *Sveta* Sofia[4] is located. In order to enable people to cross over these large streets intersecting around the statue, underpasses were built. However, during the process of construction, remnants from pre-Ottoman times were discovered.

---

[1] A template of interview questions and the correct answers are prepared by intermediary people who follow the procedures of application. These forms are sent to the applicants in advance so that they can study before their interview. The questions which are expected to be asked include national holidays and other important dates in Bulgaria, Bulgarian national heroes, and the products which Bulgaria is known for.

[2] Mitko Palauzov is a historical figure, known also as the "child partisan", who was born in 1930 to communist parents who actively took part in the communist struggle. While hiding in the mountains together with his parents, he was killed by a bomb attack. Although it has been debated whether this is a true or a fictional story, it has been told that Palauzov, as a child, participated in the struggle with his own pistol. After the transition to the socialist regime in 1944, the "child partisan" became one of the figures who was honored and commemorated by the state.

[3] Georgi Dimitrov is a Bulgarian communist leader and the first prime minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

[4] *Sveta* is the Bulgarian feminine word for the saint. The statue of Lenin in the city of Sofia was destroyed after the fall of the socialist regime. In 2000, the statue of *Sveta* Sofia was constructed in the very same location. The figure represents *hagia sophia*, or holy wisdom, through the elements of the crown, the wreath, and the owl.

Following that discovery, authorities decided to turn the very city center into an archaeological excavation site and an exhibition space. While excavation works were still continuing in several parts, the findings were immediately opened to visitors.

What I found very interesting about our trip to Sofia was the historical gaps which have become very visible in the atmosphere of the city. Accordingly, Bulgaria's historical narrative and nation-building process rely on the denial of certain periods and the embracement of others. Whereas the "ancient roots" of Bulgarian nation have been adopted, the following five centuries (between 1396-1878) under Ottoman rule were compressed into the moment of uprising against it. While the years between 1878-1944 could find a place for themselves in the exhibition of Bulgarian history in the capital city of Sofia, the socialist period was ignored and excluded. Since the city does not reflect a sense of historical continuity, one would feel like that someone has pushed the record button, then paused, then kept recording, and paused again.

This sense of discontinuity becomes significant in that it entails conflicting official discourses which *interpellate*, in Althusser's term, people into different forms of subjectivities during different periods. The term of interpellation can be briefly described as being addressed, called, or hailed by the dominant ideology as a subject (Althusser 1994), and will be explained and discussed in more detail in the third section of this chapter. A two-day trip to Sofia revealed to me that the processes of subject-making contain plenty of inconsistencies and ruptures. These processes with all their contradictions reflect on how people live their lives, plan the future, make decisions, take actions, and narrate these processes. However, in the case which I focus on, changing characteristics of *persona grata* for the Bulgarian state is not the only matter. The subjectivities of the participants of this study have been formed also through the involvement of Turkish official discourses. Although ideology is defined as an imaginary form of relating to the reality in a very encompassing, overarching, and all-inclusive sense in Althusser's approach, which I mainly rely on in this chapter, there appear interstices deriving from these ruptures, inconsistencies, and contradictions in the official discourses. Therefore, in this chapter, I set out to focus on how Bulgaria-born participants of this study narrate their (or their parents') decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey, by specifically paying attention to the factors which influence and shape these decision-making subjects as well as the narrators of these decisions. In other words, the city in which one has been tells them something about their existence there, as Sofia did for me. Considering the decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey, I wonder how Bulgaria motivated the participants (or their parents) to leave and in what ways Turkey called them. Therefore, in this chapter, I set out to focus on the decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey between 1969-1978.

As I mentioned in the section on "Historical Background" in the *Introduction*, it is not possible to talk about an example of "forced" migration in the specific period between 1969-1978. Turks living in Bulgaria were neither formally deported nor forced to leave the country during these years. The governments of Turkey and Bulgaria signed a migration agreement which enabled the Turks of Bulgaria to apply for migration to Turkey on the condition that they had relatives who had earlier migrated to and already were living in Turkey. By avoiding a binary conceptualization between "forced" and "voluntary" migration, I aim to emphasize that migrating to Turkey is a matter of choice during this period. In the field of migration studies, it is possible to address a perspective that relies on a categorical opposition between "forced" and "voluntary" migrations. However, there is a recent trend in the literature suggesting that "the volition" in migration should be discussed within a spectrum instead of nominal categories (Erdal and Oeppen 2018, 981-982). The term "voluntary" migration might be problematic since it overlooks the factors which might influence, shape, and generate this voluntariness. However, evaluating the experiences of people who were forcefully deported from a country together with the ones who could plan their departure seems also problematic. Therefore, I intentionally avoid such a binary approach by describing the experience of migration from Bulgaria to Turkey between 1969-1978 as a matter of choice without attributing any forcefulness or voluntariness to it.

Defining the experience of migration from Bulgaria to Turkey as a matter of choice enables me to focus on the people making such decisions, and on the factors shaping and surrounding their subjectivities. Transnational migration from a socialist country to a capitalist one creates a sharp transition. Returning to Bulgaria to apply for the restoration of citizenship and finding a country whose pillars have been radically changed intensifies this sharpness. In the end, this situation creates a unique and very promising case to investigate the subjects and the making of subjectivities.

This chapter aims to focus on how Bulgaria-born participants of this study narrate their own or their parents' decisions to migrate. First, I will mention a form of telos based on a nation-state centric imagination which the participants appeal to give an account of their decisions to migrate. Then, I will delve further into these narratives and articulate the role of the concept of the future in the decision-making processes. In other words, I will explore the role of expectations and anticipations influencing the migrants' decisions to go to Turkey. Finally, I will provide an analysis of how subjectivities of the participants were shaped through an interplay between different "official" and "hegemonic" discourses, by drawing on the argument suggested by Rebecca Bryant (2008). To elaborate more, I will investigate how the experience of migration as well as being a part of a minority group in Bulgaria opens up a space

to see the interstices in the processes of subject-making.

To clarify in the beginning, this chapter sets out to present an analysis of how past, present, and future are located in the narratives of migration which took place approximately forty years ago. Future-based considerations are important factors in the "orientation" in present (Bryant and Knight 2019). Therefore, migrants' decision to migrate has been shaped by their consideration of forthcoming years in the moment of decision. However, the future in question during the time of deciding to migrate happens to be a part of the past during the narrativization since these decision-makers have been living with the outcomes of their act of migration for decades. In other words, they have already lived the future which they expected or anticipated. Therefore, these narratives include the processes of making sense of the past in the forms of *past present* and *past future*. This weird-looking terminology becomes convenient because the narrators' present circumstances and present considerations of future as well as past experiences that took place after the migration are also influential in the construction of these narratives. In other words, an account of *past present* and *past future* can be comprehended only through an analysis which encompasses *current present*, referring to the conditions during the narrativization, and *current future*, referring to forthcoming periods during the narrativization, as well as *current past* which covers a longer period than consideration of past in the moment of deciding to migrate. Therefore, I propose a dual perspective on the notion of future by not only focusing on how future-oriented reasoning affects the decisions to migrate but also discussing how current present, current future, and current past shape the narratives of the decision to migrate.

2.1 "Reuniting with Something You Yearn for, Something You Love So Much": Narrating Migration as the Telos of Turks in Bulgaria

Müzeyyen *Hanım* is a 66-year-old woman who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1978 when she was 24. She and Sami *Bey* (who is another participant of this research) had gotten married in Bulgaria and gone through the migration process with their eldest son and Sami *Bey*'s parents. They have three sons who are 45, 42, and 35 years old, and working as a doctor, a manager, and a physical education teacher, respectively. Currently, Müzeyyen *Hanım* and Sami *Bey* live in a duplex house together with their middle son and his family. Among 12 first-generation participants of this thesis project, they are two of four people who migrated from

Bulgaria to Turkey during their years of adulthood.

For the interview, I met with Müzeyyen *Hanım* in the home of her youngest son and his family. Her son and his wife were at work and Müzeyyen *Hanım* was there to babysit her granddaughter. When I started the audio recording, she explained that she was born in a town in Kardzhali and "married into" a village closer to the city center. During the first thirty minutes of our interview, she narrated the life stories of her sons one by one. Then, I expressed my willingness to listen to her years in Bulgaria in more detail and asked her about her childhood. Our conversation moved towards how they migrated to Turkey. When I posed a question about the decision to migrate during the interviews, a remarkable amount of answers was about the procedures which needed to be completed to be able to go to Turkey. Many participants started the narrative by mentioning *istida*, which is a word meaning petition, not belonging to colloquial Turkish, referring to the documents filled by relatives in Turkey. Since the migration agreement which was signed in 1968 between Turkey and Bulgaria was a form of family reunification agreement and enabled only people who had relatives in Turkey to migrate to Turkey, these relatives were required to submit an *istida* to state that certain people in Bulgaria are their relatives and should be permitted to migrate. Hence, the narrative of migration is likely to start with a detailed explanation of what *istida* is. However, *istida* does not ensure that its holders will be enabled to migrate to Turkey.

Müzeyyen *Hanım*, first, gave a detailed account of who submitted an *istida* for them and in what ways they were related. Then, I kept questioning what motivated them. She replied as follows[5]:

> "Look, my child, in Bulgaria in 1951... I mean, as far as I know... I hope that it isn't wrong. The roads were opened. I mean that they allowed the migrancy in 1951. But, Bulgaria sent the gypsies to Turkey as migrants. Turkey realized it. They opened the border gate and saw that all the migrants were gypsies. Turks are hardworking. They [with reference to Bulgarian government] didn't want to give the Turks away. Then, Turkey sealed the borders. All the Turks were left there with their passports in their hands. In Bulgaria, all the Turks were in love with Turkey. Because, my child, our grandfathers... For example, my father lost his two uncles in the Dardanelles War during the First World War. I mean, they came to fight on the side of Turkey. Back then, those lands [with reference to Kardzhali] were a part of Turkey. There were no borders. I mean, we were willing to come to Turkey. We were seeing

---

[5]All translations, including transcriptions, are mine unless stated otherwise.

it as our *vatan*[6]."

Since Müzeyyen *Hanım* was born in 1954, she personally witnessed neither the migration wave between 1950-1951 nor the World War I. Hence, she has formed this narrative either on what she was told or on what she read. Expectedly, the historical accuracy of her account is debatable.[7] However, what I am interested in this account is not historical facts. Rather, what catches my attention is that she describes Turkey as "our *vatan*". Accordingly, the perception of Turkey as "our *vatan*" creates a shared willingness among Turks of Bulgaria to migrate to Turkey, not only during 1969-1978 but throughout the century as a way to encompass all the other migration waves.

In order to dwell on the description of Turkey as "our *vatan*", first, I want to focus on the concept of nation with reference to Benedict Anderson, the first person who comes to mind in a discussion on that matter. Anderson (1991, 6) describes the nation as "an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign." He explains why it is imagined, why it is limited, why it is sovereign, and why it is a community as follows:

> "It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. [...]
>
> The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind. [...]
>
> It is imagined as *sovereign* because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of

---

[6] *Vatan* is a Turkish word with Arabic origin, which is described as (I) the lands where a nation lives sovereignly and independently and (II) the place where one was born and raised, according to Language Association's dictionary. It might be roughly translated as homeland, motherland, fatherland, or home country. Motherland and fatherland are gendered terms yet *vatan* solely does not refer to a specific gender when it is not used as *anavatan* (motherland). Homeland and home country, on the other hand, correspond to the second definition of *vatan* by not necessarily including any reference to the lands of a nation. Turkey can be hardly described as the place where first-generation migrant participants of this study were born and raised. Therefore, I choose to use the word in the original form by not translating it.

[7] Several historical research on the migration of 1950-1952 confirms that Turkey seals the Bulgarian border on the grounds that Bulgaria sends only "gypsies" to Turkey and does not let Turks go. A more in-depth analysis, however, demonstrates that Bulgaria imposes an obligation on Turkey to accept the migration of 250 thousand of Turks to Turkey within three months. Turkey, being extremely unprepared for such mass immigration, seals the borders twice, first on October 7, 1950, and the next on November 8, 1951. These practices are justified through an antiziganist discourse putting forward that there were people without any visa, people with forged visas, and "gypsies" among migrants (Tünaydın 2015).
When it comes to the involvement of Turks of Bulgaria in the Dardanelles War, the maps of that time show that Kardzhali was a part of Tsardom of Bulgaria during that period, not of the Ottoman Empire.

the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm. Coming to maturity at a stage of human history when even the most devout adherents of any universal religion were inescapably confronted with the living pluralism of such religions, and the allomorphism between each faith's ontological claims and territorial stretch, nations dream of being free, and, in under God, directly so. The gage and emblem of this freedom is the sovereign state.

Finally, it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as deep, horizontal comradeship (Anderson 1991, 6-7, emphasis in original)."

Anderson (1991, 6) intentionally chooses to use the word "imagining" instead of "inventing", because the latter might end up with attributing a "genuine" characteristic to other forms of communities by emphasizing the "falsity" of nations. He suggests that the process of imagining includes imagining being a community, imagining being sovereign, and imagining being limited. However, Gupta and Ferguson (1997, 39) take a step further and include imagining places where these communities supposedly belong to. Although they do not specifically focus on nation, but investigate the concept of culture, they propose a critique of "the idea that 'a culture' is naturally the property of a spatially localized people" (Gupta and Ferguson 1997, 3). "Conceiving 'peoples' as properly 'rooted' in national soils" manifest itself in many areas from nationalist discourses to academic writings, from daily language to the maps (Malkki 1997, 53-56). At this point, how it becomes possible to attribute a naturalness to the territories of cultures and nations in the cases of transnational migration might be questioned. Whereas there is a chance that the border-crossing activities and migrations of people might shake and blur the borders and boundaries of nation-states, Gupta and Ferguson see and address an irony in times of increased mobility:

"[T]he irony of these times is that as actual places and localities become ever more blurred and indeterminate, *ideas* of culturally and ethnically distinct places become perhaps even more salient. It is here that it becomes most visible how imagined communities (Anderson 1983) come to be attached to imagined places, as displaced peoples cluster around remembered or imagined homelands, places, or communities in a world that seems increasingly to deny such firm territorialized anchors in their actuality (Gupta and Ferguson 1997, 39, emphasis in original)."

In cases of migration, exile, and displacement; a focus on the conceptions of lost

homelands as a form of "social glue" (Allan 2007, 255) would be beneficial in order to understand the community formation practices. "Nostalgia", as a way of narrating the past, might help to "form and remain a community" (Bryant 2008, 404). However, narratives of the pre-migration period on which I focus do not include people "clustering around" through the memory of "lost homelands." Rather, they express a longing for *vatan* which was not encountered yet as it appears in Sümbül *Hanım*'s narrative.

Sümbül *Hanım* is a 57-year-old woman who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1978 when she was 15. She is from the northern part of Bulgaria and her thick accent which she apparently still keeps in spite of living in Turkey for approximately four decades reflects this. Upon her wish, we met for the interview in my mother's house in Bursa. In the beginning, she seemed a little hesitant and shy, not because she had any doubts about me, but since she was feeling a bit nervous about narrating her life, as I guess. She was willing to help me though since I am from the "*muhacir*[8] community" and striving to achieve something educational. As far as I can tell, she pushed herself to open up and answered my questions in the best way she could. Given the emotionally loaded content which she conveyed, her uneasiness lasted during the whole interview.

> "The train journey was exciting. I mean, you are a kid. We came to the border. Everyone was looking out of windows. Everyone was curious about Turkey. Turkey, I mean, the *vat-* [Probably, she was about to say '*vatan*', but she did not complete the word.] One looks at it with longing. How can I tell you this? It was like reuniting with something you yearn for, something you love so much. I mean, we came willingly, voluntarily. After then, we stayed in *Muhacirhane*[9]. It was probably a military barrack. We stayed there. Then, we got on a bus. We were excited. I mean, seeing Istanbul, crossing the Bosphorus Bridge... Our eyes got opened. I thought to myself: 'My father was saying poor for this place. Where is the poverty? Look at this place! How beautiful...' We had never seen anything like that. We had never seen Bosporus Bridge or Istanbul. We went through beautiful places and came to Bursa."

"Reuniting with something you yearn for, something you love so much" is a very powerful expression of an emotional relationship with a place that kept being unseen until the moment of reuniting. At this point, the term "imagining" becomes even

---

[8] *Muhacir* is a Turkish word with an Arabic origin which means migrant. Whereas it actually refers to a general experience of migration, it is mostly used to address migrants from Bulgaria in Turkey.

[9] *Muhacirhane* is a colloquial expression referring to the guesthouse in Edirne where migrants spent few nights while their paperwork was being done.

more fruitful. As it appears in several other interviews, imagining Turkey took place in the forms of listening to the radios of Turkey, constantly following the political developments in Turkey, and planning the daily life with the anticipation that someday it would be possible to go to Turkey. One of the participants mentioned that she did not start primary school with her agemates because the next year they would be migrating and her parents thought that it would be meaningless for her to go to school in Bulgaria just for one year. Another one narrated that he got married in a hurry after his family's request to migrate was approved, because you could migrate with your spouse only if you got married several months before the migration.

My interview with Zülfiye *Hanım* was quite rich in terms of the examples of planning the daily life with the anticipation of migration. Zülfiye *Hanım* was born in 1966 in a town in Kardzhali. With her family and her paternal relatives, she migrated to Turkey in 1978. She mentioned that her family migrated from Kardzhali to Burgas when she was a child because working conditions and opportunities were better there. However, after a couple of years, they returned to Kardzhali since it was easier to follow the migration-related developments in an area that was mainly populated by Turks. "The purpose of all the Turks here [with reference to Bulgaria] is to migrate to Turkey one day", she said. At another point in our interview, she mentioned that they lived together and had good relationships with Pomaks[10]. However, the interethnic marriages between Pomaks and Turks were not approved, as she stressed out, because it might have impeded the migration to Turkey. She also highlighted that her elder sister was graduated from a high school in Bulgaria, but could not enroll in a university there, because the procedures of enrollment were including signing a paper stating that she would not migrate. These examples suggest that the pre-migration period in Bulgaria was like living in limbo, which Zülfiye Hanım described as that "People could not properly hold on to the life in Bulgaria since they lived with the expectation of an upcoming migration."

In addition to the description of Turkey as "our *vatan*", several other participants described it as motherland, our own lands, our own country, and Turkish lands. For instance, Zülfiye *Hanım* narrated what her father told her, while they were on the train which brought them from Bulgaria to Edirne, as follows:

---

[10]Pomaks are Bulgarian speaking Muslims currently living in Bulgaria, Turkey, and Greece. They are generally defined as Bulgarian people converted to Islam during the Ottoman rule. Since the migration agreement between Bulgaria and Turkey during 1969-1978 enabled only the migration of Turks who had relatives in Turkey, interethnic marriages with Pomaks might have been regarded as an impediment for the migration applications.

"I saw how enthusiastic and how excited my father was. He was coming here knowingly and willfully. 'The best thing I could do for you is to take you to Turkish lands, to bring you together with the land of Turks. I, as a father, have the pride of accomplishing it.' Throughout the journey, he inculcated such things into us. For him, it was very important to be under the Turkish flag. He had always imposed [the discourses] of our own race, our own flag, the concept of Turkishness on us. We had always heard such things from him."

Zülfiye *Hanım*'s word choices of "inculcating something into someone" and "imposing something on someone" are quite interesting especially because she did not clarify how she has felt about these inculcations and impositions. The recent passing away of her father is an important reason for this ambiguity, in my opinion. However, I leave her relationship with her father aside for the moment since I will elaborate more on it in the third section of this chapter. For the time being, I focus on how these narratives put forward that Turkey, among Turks of Bulgaria, was seen as the ultimate destination to be reached. Most of the narratives which I listened to rely on the processes of imagining Turkey as the place where Turks should live. At this point, migration to Turkey takes a form of telos which should be fulfilled by Turks living in Bulgaria. Although the homeland where any community is supposed to belong is always an imagined concept since it is neither given nor natural as I discussed above, Turkey has been thoroughly imagined as the homeland by most of the migrants because it was not seen before the migration. Such an imagination is a significant reason for *choosing* to migrate to Turkey as it appears in the narratives of participants. At this point, it becomes necessary to discuss the processes which influence and shape these choices and imaginations in detail, which will be the primary aim of the following sections.

2.2 "Coming Events Cast Their Shadows Before": The Role of Anticipation in The Decision of Migration

Sami *Bey*, the husband of Müzeyyen *Hanım* whom I mentioned above, is a 66-year-old man who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1978 when he was 24,5 years old. After his migration to Turkey, he worked in many different jobs as a laborer, a steel bender, an electrician, a lottery ticket seller... He is retired now and describes his current occupation as "defending the front line" with reference to his intellectual

endeavors like writing poems and engaging in political and literary discussions. I had an interview with him in May 2018 as part of one of my final projects and as a preliminary interview for my upcoming thesis research which was quite tentative at that point. Maybe because of being the first face-to-face moment in the field, this interview constituted the most difficult two hours in my whole fieldwork. At that moment, I had not embraced oral history as my research method yet and I was not totally familiar with the analysis of a life story. Instead, I had a list of questions in my mind to directly address the matters which I was interested in and curious about. He cared nothing for what I was trying to do and what I was questioning. In the end, what we had was not even close to a dialogue. I posed my questions and he told a story which he wanted to tell regardless of its relevance to what I asked, for which I am truly grateful at the moment since his account greatly enriched my study.

After he introduced himself at the beginning of our interview, I asked him how he decided to migrate to Turkey. He emphasized that it did not pertain only to him and his family. Accordingly, it was necessary to evaluate the decision of migration in a broader sense so that I could "fully understand the reasons and the outcomes." Then, he provided a very detailed historical review starting from the moment that Bulgaria became an autonomous entity in 1878. Until the autonomy, Bulgaria had been "under the Ottoman rule for five centuries"[11] and this situation caused the accumulation of anti-Turkish sentiments, he narrated. These accumulated sentiments had repercussions after the independence of Bulgaria especially on minorities. Following the transition to the socialist regime in 1944, he continued, Georgi Dimitrov became the first president and organized a secret session in 1949 which ended up with the decision that all the minority groups in Bulgaria to be assimilated until 1985. Through his mother's maternal uncle, who was a "communist partisan" meanwhile, he told me, he learned about this secret decision. He presented this framework as an explanation for the decision to migrate. In a more personal manner, he continued as follows:

> "You feel an inferiority complex. At that period, they [with reference to Bulgarian authorities] started to prevent Turks from being a manager. There was no Turkish member of the parliament. Although it didn't co-

---

[11]Considering my entire fieldwork, I have reached a conclusion that the phrase of "five centuries under the Ottoman rule" was a very essential part of the historical narrative of Bulgaria, which engraved in people's memories so deeply so that it appeared in many interviews. Sami *Bey* articulated this phrase in Bulgarian as "*nie byahme pet veka pot Osmansko robstvo*" which might be translated as "We had been under the Ottoman slavery for five centuries." However, it was not an idea which he shared. Instead, he harshly criticized by claiming that Bulgarians were not in the position of slaves under the rule of the Ottoman Empire since they have their own schools, churches, and hospitals.

incide with our period, they started to fine you with 150 levs if you speak in Turkish. Beating, violence... And I thought that my children... I was married when I came here [to Turkey]. I thought that my children wouldn't have any chance to get a footing there. Regardless of whether they are smart or stupid, they wouldn't have any chance to make their way. You know what they say: Coming events cast their shadows before.[12] Since it was a closed political system, if you dare to claim your rights, they would instantly kill you. According to the information that I reached, 70 thousand of people were killed in Bulgaria. You should have heard about Belene Island.[13] 46 thousand of people were killed only in Belene Island. We saw that they humiliate us, they destroy our culture. Once I realized it, I thought that it was impossible there. We would be assimilated if we stayed. Hence, we took our children and came here."

It is possible to read Sami *Bey*'s account on the decision to migrate by focusing on several points, one of which inevitably is how he provided a very wide temporal frame which started from five centuries before Bulgaria's independence and went beyond the moment of migration by including Bulgarian government's assimilation policies against Turkish minority between 1984-1989. Sökefeld (2006, 269-270), with reference to Erving Goffman (1974), defines "frames" as "specific ideas that fashion a shared understanding [...] by rendering events and conditions meaningful and enable a common framework of interpretation and representation." Additionally, they are discussed as "guides" to the "conditions of appearance or of understanding" by "shaping interpretations of reality" (Kleist and Jansen 2016, 374). In this sense, the frame is a very convenient conceptualization to analyze "all the ideas from which an imagination of community is composed" (Sökefeld 2006, 270). At this point, it is possible to read Sami *Bey*'s historical review, as a response to a question related to his decision to migrate, as a frame surrounding this decision and enabling me to "fully understand the reasons and the outcomes" of migration. Hence, it does not matter for my analysis whether Georgi Dimitrov organized such a secret meeting which ended up with a decision of assimilation of all minorities until 1985. Regardless of its factual or fictional characteristics, this narrative is a frame that

---

[12]In Turkish, there is an idiom of "*Perşembenin gelişi çarşambadan bellidir*" which can be literally translated as that the coming of Thursday becomes obvious on Wednesday. This expression means that what happens on Wednesday should be regarded as an indicator of what will happen on Thursday. Throughout this chapter, I will refer to this expression through another idiom, namely that "Coming events cast their shadows before."

[13]Belene Island, or also known as Persin Island, is located in the Danube River as part of Bulgarian lands. After the transition to the socialist regime in 1944, Bulgarian Communist Party constructed a labor camp on the island in 1949, which later started to be mentioned as Belene Labor Camp or Belene Concentration Camp. Between 1949-1959, the political opponents of the regime were deported to this area. Although the camp was closed in 1959, it was activated one more time during the assimilation campaign, namely "Revival Process", conducted against Turks in Bulgaria between 1985-1989. Turks opposing the forced change of names were sent to the camp (Baeva and Troebst 2007, 77).

contains plenty of implications regarding the "imagination of community"[14] which includes the forms of imagining Turkey as *vatan.*

Within the frame provided by Sami *Bey*, there are several points that should be underlined. First and foremost, it is necessary to have a close look at the discriminatory policies of the Bulgarian government against minority groups. After the transition to the socialist regime in 1944, Bulgaria embraced an "ideology of ethno-nationalist unity based on proletariat brotherhood" in the discursive level (Parla 2006, 545). At a practical level, this corresponded to the policies of "spreading education, ensuring healthcare, and encouraging cultural activities and publications in Turkish" in the 1950s, which aimed to "override ethnic isolationism" by creating a "socialist consciousness" (Parla 2006, 545). The initial education-related legal regulations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria recognized that "national minorities have a right to be educated in their vernacular and to develop their national cultures, while the study of Bulgarian is mandatory" (Eminov 1983, 136). However, the Bulgarian Constitution of 1971 replaced this article with a more limited one which put forth that "citizens who are not of Bulgarian origin have a right to learn their national language" with no reference to the right to be educated in their native languages (Eminov 1983, 136). This situation addresses a change in the legal approach to the Turkish language in 1971. Also, it is possible to mention a wide range of different experiences starting from the 1960s.

Considering that the first-generation migrant participants of this research are from different areas of Bulgaria and went to school in different periods, it is not very possible to trace changes in practical conditions regarding the Turkish language through their narratives. Also, given that memory has a slippery nature, it does not seem very possible to reach a conclusion about what kind of practical changes took place in exactly which year and in which part of Bulgaria. However, I find it important to mention that several policies regarding the Turkish minority were, directly or indirectly, addressed as the elements of the frames of decisions to migrate by most of the participants, including Sami *Bey*. Accordingly, education in Turkish was transformed into Turkish courses. Subsequently, as some participants mentioned, Turkish courses became possible only when several teachers of Turkish origin took the initiative to teach it secretly during the painting class or else. Turkish mag-

---

[14]I intentionally choose to keep using the concept of "community" which is invoked in Sökefeld's (2006) description of "frame". However, I do not discuss Sami *Bey*'s account as an example which is valid and applicable in all other experiences and narratives of deciding to migrate within 1969-1978. This would be problematic because, first, it would imply a given and tangible group of people whose understanding of the world (including migration) is shaped in the same way. Second, it would be making a very overarching generalization which I specifically try to avoid by embracing a subjectivity-based analysis. However, it is useful to make reference to the "imagination of community" in the sense that these decisions to migrate and these frames to make sense of migration are, although subjective, not individualistic.

azines and newspapers were banned. Wearing *shalvar*[15] in public was prohibited. Pomaks' names started to be switched into Bulgarian ones. Accordingly, although Bulgaria's assimilation policies against Turks had reached its peak point only after 1985, the discourse of "proletariat brotherhood" was paralleled to discriminatory policies long before. At this point, I argue that these practices of the government of Bulgaria were very influential in the formation of the decision to migrate. Although this decision was mostly narrated as a form of telos relying on the necessity that Turks should be in Turkey, this imagination has been accompanied by very practical processes which the participants experienced in their everyday life and which have been closely related with who should be where.

Secondly, Sami *Bey*'s narrative implies that the decision to migrate was related to not only present circumstances but also expectations and anticipations regarding the future. Appadurai (2004) argues that there has been a division between the disciplines of anthropology and economics in terms of their temporal focus. Whereas culture, as the primary focus of anthropology, has been mostly associated with the past; the future, which might be articulated in terms of "plans, hopes, goals, targets", was pushed towards the field of economics (Appadurai 2004, 60). Although the past has occupied a very pivotal place in anthropological studies for many years, the future started to be invited as a main subject only recently. Increasing interest in the concept of hope with the embracement of an affect-based analysis (Kleist and Jansen 2016) and the rising unpredictability due to the global financial and environmental crises (Bryant and Knight 2019) brought the matter of future to the table. Accordingly, by not neglecting the importance of past as a category of analysis, "historicity" was defined as "the manner in which persons operating under the conditions of social ideologies make sense of the past, while anticipating the future" (Hirsch and Stewart 2005, cited in Kleist and Jansen 2016, 380). In other words, the future became a cultural category in addition to the past.

Sami *Bey*, in his narrative about his decision to migrate to Turkey, emphasized that being a Turk in Bulgaria would pose an impediment for his children in their endeavors to achieve their goals. What he observed in terms of discrimination against Turks in Bulgaria rendered such a prediction meaningful for him. He articulated this relationship between what was observed in the past and what is expected to happen in the future as that "coming events cast their shadows before." It goes without saying that the imagination of the future shapes the present actions and decisions. However, the concept of the future might get involved in people's orientation in the present through different ways, which Bryant and Knight (2019) categorize as antic-

---

[15]*Shalvar* is a form of clothing, which seems like trousers, but tighter in the ankle and looser in the upper part. Wearing *shalvar* is generally associated with being traditional or rural.

ipation, expectation, speculation, potentiality, hope, and destiny. I find anticipation and expectation very relevant to Sami *Bey*'s narrative which I have been analyzing. Their difference might be described as follows:

> "While expectation and anticipation are closely related, we draw a heuristic distinction between them here in order to think about the different thicknesses of the present, and therefore relationships to the past, that are contained in each. These differing thicknesses, we suggest, give us insights into distinct teleologies of action. One may, for instance, expect rain and take an umbrella when going out 'just in case.' The expectation of rain is, in this instance, still on the horizon and is tempered by, for example, weather reports that have failed in the past. [. . .] [E]xpectation may be viewed as a conservative teleology, one that gives thickness to the present through its reliance on the past. To anticipate rain, however, is to feel and smell it in the air, to close one's windows and cover lawn furniture while imagining the future in the present. Anticipation slims the present, often breaking entirely with the past as it draws present and future into the same activity timespace (Bryant and Knight 2019, 22)."

> "Anticipation [. . .] is more than simply expecting something to happen; it is the act of looking forward that also pulls me in the direction of the future and prepares the groundwork for that future to occur. Unlike expectation, anticipation specifically contains the sense of thrusting or pressing forward, where the past is called upon in this movement toward the future (Bryant and Knight 2019, 28)."

Accordingly, the distinction between expectation and anticipation addresses two main points. Firstly, they differ in terms of the distance between the past, present, and future. In the case of expectation, the present acquires a more solid characteristic by including an evaluation of the past experiences and future possibilities. When it comes to anticipation, on the other hand, the future melts into the present. Secondly, but not irrelevantly, expectation refers to foreseeing that something might happen in the future. Anticipation, however, includes waiting for something to happen. Expectation and anticipation become a part of orientation in the present in different ways. If the names of Pomaks are being changed into Bulgarian ones, a Turk living in Bulgaria might *expect* her/his name to be changed too in the future. In such a case, he/she might *anticipate* his/her application for migration to be approved. Sami *Bey*'s long historical review appears to be an example of expectation because it includes a calculation based on the past. Examples, which I mentioned in the first section, of getting married in a hurry before the migration, of postponing the enrollment to the primary school, of living in the areas mainly populated by

Turks in order to follow the migration-related developments appear to be the forms of anticipation in which the future starts to be lived in the present.

Finally, I intend to focus on one more dimension of Sami *Bey*'s narrative. His narrativization does not only include a very long temporal period which goes back to approximately five centuries before his decision of migration but also encompasses several incidents that took place in Bulgaria after his migration to Turkey in 1978. The "coming events" which "cast their shadows before" manifest themselves as the deportation of Turks who opposed the assimilation policies starting from 1985 to the Belene Island, the forceful change of Turkish names into Bulgarian ones, fining people who speak Turkish in public, and mass deportations to Turkey in this narrative. At this point, I find it significant to keep in mind that although the decision to migrate to Turkey includes its own forms of imagination, anticipation, and expectation; the narratives of that decision-making processes inescapably bear the traces of following events. Therefore, the question to be asked is not which factors motivated migrants to decide to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey, but how and in what ways the decision of migration is narrated by the participants who have lived in Turkey for more than 40 years and who are frequently visiting Bulgaria within the scope of citizenship applications. Therefore, in the final section of this chapter, I aim to focus on the making of subjectivities within an interplay of different discourses in different lands and different periods.

2.3 "I am 52 Years Old and I Didn't Forget Vasil Levski's Death Anniversary: February 9": The Making of Subjectivities through the Involvement of Contradictory Influences

In the final section, I intend to maintain my discussion on "frames", which I mentioned in the previous section as a term coined by Goffman (1974) and developed by Sökefeld, and subjects who are shaped in relation to these frames. Although I have focused on the forms of imaginations as well as policies and practices constituted by nationalism, the definition of frame does not necessarily make a reference to the entity of state or to power relations as very active factors in the constitution of subjectivities. Therefore, at this point, I appeal to the concept of ideology which is described by Louis Althusser (1994, 123) as "the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence". Plenty of approaches would be implemented in order to comprehend and explain how people relate to themselves and to their

environments. For instance, Gramsci's conceptualization of hegemony as "material and meaningful framework for living through, talking about, and acting upon social orders characterized by domination" (Roseberry 1994, cited in Smith 2004, 222) or Bourdieu's conceptualization of doxa as "the naturalization of ideas" as if they have always been and always will be an intrinsic part of daily activities and relationships (Bourdieu and Eagleton 1994, 268) would be helpful to analyze the making of subjects in the case of migration. However, I find Althusser's approach more helpful and illuminating since his conceptualizations of "Ideological State Apparatuses" and "interpellation" are very convenient for my discussion.

Althusser (1994, 113), as a devoted Marxist, approaches to the concept of ideology with an aim to explain the ways through which "the reproduction of the relations of production" is ensured in the capitalist mode of production. He, as I mentioned above, does not approach to the concept of ideology as an imaginary way of comprehending the reality, but as "the imaginary relationship of individuals to the relations of production" (Althusser 1994, 125). This imaginary representation of the relationship to the material reality becomes possible through the processes of interpellation. In this sense, subjectivity refers to being subjected to the ruling ideology. In other words, an individual can be considered as a subject as long as he/she is interpellated or hailed within the relationalities constructed ideologically (Althusser 1994, 130). Whereas ideology in general exists to the extent that "subjects", in Althusser's term, answer to this hailing, subjects also exist only when they answer to this interpellation. This reciprocal process of constituting each other creates a situation that there is no possible subjectivity outside the ideology and there is no ideology without its subjects.

These processes of interpellation become possible through Ideological State Apparatuses. The permanence of the relations of production is guaranteed not only through repression and violence (which appears in the forms of police and army), but also through Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) which operate in line with the ruling ideology and include a very wide range of institutions from religious to educational, from familial to political (Althusser 1994, 110).

> "If the ISAs 'function' massively and predominantly by ideology, what unifies their diversity is precisely this functioning, in so far as the ideology by which they function is always in fact unified, despite its diversity and its *contradictions*, beneath the ruling ideology, which is the ideology of 'the ruling class' (Althusser 1994, 112, emphasis added)."

Althusser addresses both a unity and a diversity in his conceptualization of ISAs. However, he leaves, albeit small, a room for contradictions on which I aim to focus. Before I go on with this discussion, one final point I want to address is how Althusser approaches the institutions of education as the dominant Ideological State Apparatus. By dominant, Althusser addresses the effectiveness of this apparatus in interpellating individuals as the subjects of the ruling ideology. Schools serve not only to the production of "diversely skilled labor power", but also to "the reproduction of submission to the rules of established order" (Althusser 1994, 103-104). It becomes very influential in the sense that it functions through the obligatory imposition of this system on infant age children (Althusser 1994, 118). Additionally, since it is counted as "a neutral environment" (Althusser 1994, 119), it consolidates the natural, given, and eternal characteristics of ideology in general.

Since I explore the decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey in this chapter, investigating the pre-migration period in Bulgaria through Althusser's theses on the capitalist mode of production might seem problematic especially because Bulgaria appears to be a socialist country at that time. However, although Althusser specifically argues how people have an imaginary relationship with the relations of the capitalist mode of production, the specific elements in his theory, namely interpellation and ISAs, speak well to the case of making of subjects in Bulgaria. The Bulgarian government, despite attempts to create and consolidate a socialist mode of production, strives to form its own subjects with a socialist consciousness mostly through spreading education as I mentioned in the previous section.

The participants who had started to go to school in Bulgaria mostly spoke of these experiences very positively in our interviews. Mandatory pre-school education was appreciated. The technological facilities of the schools were praised. Simultaneous attention to literacy, physical education, and vocational capabilities was cherished. One of the participants articulated these positive feelings about being educated in Bulgaria as follows:

> "The most important contribution of the migrancy to my life is the discipline we obtained in Bulgaria. I shall say it clearly. The discipline that the Bulgarian government taught to us has always been a guide for me in my whole life."

Whereas many participants narrated Turkish migrants from Bulgaria as a community composed of hardworking and honest people, the existence of a direct relation between these characteristics and being educated in Bulgaria has been a widely

shared idea. Therefore, I argue that education might be evaluated as an Ideological State Apparatus which interpellates individuals into certain forms of subjectivities even though we do not talk about a capitalist mode of production in Bulgaria at that time. The way how subjects should relate to the concept of work in a socialist mode of production is constituted through educational approaches and institutions. This idea appears to be so ingrained so that people, after decades and plenty of different encounters, still have been talking about their certain characteristics with reference to those school years.

However, what is strived to be constituted at schools is not only a socialist consciousness but also a concept of Bulgarian nationhood, especially through history courses starting from primary school. Zülfiye *Hanım* narrated her experience of history courses in Bulgaria as follows:

> "We had a very well-disciplined history teacher. I remember that she was knitting her brows and speaking with hatred while she was talking about Turks. And then, she was turning to us and saying that 'I am not talking about you, but about Ottomans.' Especially while she was telling about their [with reference to Bulgarians] struggle for liberation, she was reflecting her hatred towards Turks on us. In our school, each class had a name given after one of the heroes. The hero of our class was Vasil Levski[16], for example. He had been hanged by Turks on February 9. I don't remember the year. But I exactly know that February 9 is the date when he was hanged. After his *loss*, a lament was written for Vasil Levski. We were reading it on his memorial day, it was taught to us. I remember how I cried my heart out. [. . .] Now, I am 52 years old and I didn't forget Vasil Levski's death anniversary: February 9. For, there were plenty of ceremonies for each hero. The anniversaries of Bulgaria's liberation from Ottoman hegemony were commemorated enthusiastically, there were special ceremonies. And you find yourself sharing their hatred with a child's mind as if there were no Turks among the crowd."

This narrative suggests that educational ISA accomplished its purpose of function to an extent that she still remembers February 9. Zülfiye *Hanım*, in this example, is interpellated into getting emotional about the death of Vasil Levski in addition to learning about it. She did form an emotional relationship to the incidence and "cried her heart out" while she sang the lament written for Vasil Levski. She still chooses her words delicately and prefers to say "the loss of Vasil Levski" instead of

---

[16]Vasil Levski is one of the Bulgarian national heroes, who lived between 1837 and 1873. He played a leading role in the Bulgarian struggle against Ottoman rule. After he was captured in December 1872, he was sentenced to death by hanging in Sofia.

Vasil Levski's death. However, the frame of the moment of narrativization was also involved and she spoke critically of her experience. Additionally, after she mentioned that she still carries the traces of her experience of starting the education in Bulgaria, she suddenly jumped how her father told her who Mustafa Kemal Atatürk[17] was:

> "My father was born in 1933. He knows the times when Atatürk died. He clearly remembers from his childhood years how the dominance of Ottomans gradually ceased. There was something distinguishing my family from everyone else. I got to know about Atatürk at a very young age in my pre-school period. In Bulgaria in the past, postcards were very famous. My father – I don't know how he procured from his acquaintances here [with reference to Turkey] – had the postcards of Atatürk. Maybe, in order to teach my elder brother and sister... My father taught us Atatürk by saying that 'Look, this is Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, our biggest forefather.'"

At this point, I believe that Vasil Levski and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk were presented in a way to highlight the influences of the making of subjectivities in the middle of different and sometimes conflicting historical discourses. At this point, I find it important to visit Bryant's distinction of official and hegemonic. Accordingly, official historical narratives do not necessarily embrace a hegemonic characteristic since hegemonic could be described as something "so habituated, so deeply inscribed in everyday routine, that they may no longer be seen as forms of control" (Comaroff and Comaroff 1991, cited in Bryant 2008, 402). Hence, Bryant criticizes the idea that "unofficial" or "repressed" historical accounts categorically carry a "counter-hegemonic and therefore liberatory" feature and emphasizes that "official" discourses may fail to gain a hegemonic characteristic as well as that "unofficial" narratives may not be examples of counter-hegemonic struggles (Bryant 2008, 402). When it comes to life narratives, Bryant summarizes her approach as follows:

> "[I]n narrating their own lives, individuals' narratives are not only often a mixture of the 'official' and the 'unofficial', but they also often contain elements of hegemonic narratives that are interwoven in complex ways with their own. I play off the 'official' against the hegemonic, arguing that the easy confusion between 'official' and hegemonic, or 'unofficial' and counter-hegemonic, leads to a less-than-sophisticated understanding of what people's stories do, both for themselves and others, when they

---

[17]Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is a Turkish historical figure who lived between 1881 and 1938 and who is recognized as the founder of the Republic of Turkey. He also became the first president of the country starting from 1923 until his death in 1938.

tell them (Bryant 2008, 403)."

Whereas Althusser mentions contradictions as a part of a unified ideology, as I pointed out above, Bryant's approach gives a wider room for differences and diversities by conducting a discussion on the ways that different (official, unofficial, and hegemonic) discourses shape personal narratives and subjectivities. In Zülfiye *Hanım*'s narrative, it becomes possible to see the traces of these different discourses becoming hegemonic in the making of subjectivity. Whereas her narrative on the days of commemoration of Vasil Levski's death keeps embodying internal contradictions in the sense of how she feels about it, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk becomes intertwined with the process of subject-making in a close relation to her relationship with her father. As I mentioned in the previous section, while she was narrating how her father talked about Turkishness, she articulated very loaded words such as "inculcation" and "imposition", which do not have very positive connotations and refer to an external indoctrination. However, she did not explicate her own position. In another part of the interview, she described herself as "the daughter of her father". As far as I can tell, she knitted her narratives on Turkishness, Turkey, and migration to Turkey in close relation to her father's point of view. Subsequently, she articulated in our second interview that her father is the second person who she has seen as a model after Atatürk. In other words, what her father taught to her, namely the doctrines of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, became even more important in comparison to her father. Since she had lost her father a few years before we had the interviews, I believe, she left her own position ambiguous regarding the "inculcations" and "impositions" implemented by her father. Her respect towards these authority figures, namely her father and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, in my opinion, made her justify these indoctrinations to a certain extent.

In the end, in my opinion, Vasil Levski has symbolically represented the influence of experiences, practices, and ideologies in Bulgaria on Müzeyyen *Hanım* in a deeply contradictory way. This contradiction, to some extent, has derived from the "unofficial" involvement of Turkish historical discourses to the picture. Since this involvement took place through her father, as she narrated, the narrative itself and Zülfiye *Hanım*'s word choices appear to be revealing these contradictions.

In the end, it is necessary to discuss people's decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey by paying attention to the processes of making of subjectivities as well as the contradictions, gaps, interstices, and inconsistencies which appear during the interpellations as I mentioned in the introduction of this chapter. The ways that decisions to migrate were made and narrated are quite rich to catch these interstices which manifest themselves in the practices of imagining lands, imagining potential

future events, and imagining the relation of self to the world. In other words, the imaginations regarding space, time, and subjectivity become three important pillars of this analysis.

Although these narratives have been shaped through a very long temporal period, my glance at these practices becomes possible only at the moment of narrativization. Hence, encounters and experiences of approximately four decades, including the ones which the participants went through in Turkey after the migration and the ones which have taken place during the applications for Bulgarian citizenship, have gotten involved in the memories and the stories of the past. Such a perspective, I should emphasize, has been guiding not only this chapter, but the whole thesis in general.

3.   HOMEMAKING AND HOUSEBUILDING IN TURKEY

> "Two *muhacirs* run into each other in the marketplace after they migrated to Turkey. The first one says, 'It has been two years since we came to Turkey, and we built a five-storey house.' The other one gets surprised, 'How come?' he asks, 'We came two years ago, too, and have been eating only bread and salt. We could build only a three-storey house.' The first one laughs and replies, 'You need to cut out salt.'"

As it is usually the case with the ethnicity-based comedy, the above-quoted joke has a homogenizing effect in terms of community. It reproduces certain stereotypes of being obsessed with housebuilding and being stingy, regarding the Turks who had migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey throughout the 20th century. It creates a unidimensional perspective by making a superficial generalization. However, when it is told with a thick *muhacir* accent in Turkish, it attracts an audience. Referring to a somehow shared migration experience, it conveys a certain sense of humor and might create a smile. Although I do not embrace an approach which discusses the concept of community as a homogeneous entity and I aim to develop a more nuanced and multi-layered understanding of the reality, I argue that the stereotypes, including the ones existing in this joke, reveal several clues about the formation of subjectivities and social relations. Especially considering the act of migrating from Bulgaria to Turkey was very loaded with expectations, as I have discussed in the previous chapter, the narratives of housebuilding in the first years in Turkey become particularly significant in terms of how people relate to themselves and to the world around them.

The humor based on the intense desire to build a house as soon as possible and on the willingness to make sacrifices like giving up not only luxurious, but also essential things such as salt offers the possibility of catching various implications. First and foremost, it demonstrates that there is an umbrella narrative about the initial period following the migration from Bulgaria to Turkey, which highlights the importance of having a house/home in these new lands (also occasionally referred

to as the motherland) right away. Secondly, it addresses the financial difficulties the migrants encountered. However, this unfavorable situation does not create an obstacle; it is only a challenge. Finally, it describes the community as composed of determined and hardworking people who take up this challenge and overcome it. In the end, this joke and its implications provide a framework and reference point for the accounts I discuss in this chapter.

As it is mentioned in the *Introduction*, this thesis study relies on interviews with people who went through the migration from Bulgaria to Turkey in different ages ranging from toddlerhood to young adulthood. The elements shaping migration experiences vary depending on the migrants' positions within the family in terms of age and gender. What recurrently appears and constructs an insisting pattern, on the other hand, is the centrality of the housebuilding process within their life course.

In this chapter, I set out to discuss the implications of the narratives about housebuilding in Turkey in relation to the conception(s) of home. Because housebuilding processes appear to be critical milestones in the constitution of subjectivities, special attention on the matter seems to be called for and necessary. Therefore, to have a deeper understanding of the relationship between homemaking and housebuilding as well as between the concept of home and migrant subjectivities, I ask the following questions: What do the narratives of devotedly striving to build a house mean? How do certain structural and material elements of a house relate to the community-based comparisons? Where does a house stand in relation to the idea of home and the sense of belonging in a migration context? What kind of temporal and spatial features surround the processes of homemaking/housebuilding? What does a house/home imply about the perception and the presentation of the self? In this chapter, I intend to address these questions. In the first section, I aim to focus on the conceptualizations of home in binary thinking with the house. I briefly mention the understandings that differentiate these concepts with a motivation to grasp the elements of home that exceed the physical structures of house. In the second section, I propose a critique of this strict distinction between materiality, on the other hand, and meanings and emotions generating around it, on the other, by visiting material culture studies. By embracing an approach that discusses meaning-making processes in line with material surroundings, I aim to discuss why the concepts of home and house need to be evaluated together. In the third section, my intention is to focus on how housebuilding processes in the first years in Turkey influence the formation of subjectivities and the life course of my participants by bringing age and gender-based differences into question throughout these processes. Whereas being part of a family that ceaselessly strives to build a house after the migration

is narrated as a shared experience of people who migrated during that period, I investigate whether each and every person goes through this process in a similar manner. Finally, in the fifth section, I take a look at the literature which discusses the concept of homemaking as a *process* under the term of "homing" (Ahmed et al. 2003; Boccagni 2017) in the contexts of migration. These perspectives enable me to make a temporal analysis by taking into account the imaginary aspects as well as actual forms of the concept of home.

3.1 Home as an Idea versus House as a Physical Structure

Heller (1995, 1-2) addresses a shared tendency among human beings to "privilege one, or certain, places against all the other" and describes "home" as "one of the few constants of human condition." Home assumes a very pivotal role in comprehending how humans relate to each other, the world, and their selves. In response to this central position of the concept of home – in its ideal or actual form, in its presence or absence – in human life, there exists a rich, yet sometimes disconnected literature across various disciplines ranging from geography to psychology, from architecture to anthropology and sociology. Endeavors to provide an interdisciplinary approach (Després 1991; Somerville 1997), studies to present a comprehensive review of the literature (Boccagni 2017; Mallett 2004), and the efforts to discuss the concept of home in relation to migration studies (Ahmed et al. 2003; Al-Ali and Koser 2002; Boccagni 2017; Frost and Selwyn 2018) form a strong basis for this rapidly-growing area of study.

The positions of the concepts of house and home in respect to each other constitute one of the main points of discussion within the literature on home. Various studies highlight the difference between the two terms and suggest that home cannot be confined to the structural features of physical dwellings alone. The necessity to emphasize that these are not synonymous terms derives from their interchangeable use in media and the sector of real estate as it appears in "home ownership" (Dovey 1985; Mallett 2004). Although the concept of house appears to correspond to the physical building and the concept of home usually means more than that, invoking the latter as in "home ownership" for the sake of sales corresponds to a promise of acquiring not only a mere building, but rather what the idea of home proposes as a package.

Lawrence (1987) describes house as the "physical unit that defines and delimits space for the members of a household," which implies shelter and protection as well as a distinguisher "between public and private domains." Although the terms of home and house should not be conflated because house corresponds to only one dimension of the home, he approaches the physical structure as a prerequisite to conceptualize home. In contrast, Douglas (1991) acknowledges that the idea of home might be possible in the absence of "bricks and mortar." Unfixed spaces such as "a wagon, a caravan, a boat, or a tent" might incite this idea. However, she adds that "[home] is always a localizable idea," which needs to be "located in a space" because the idea of home itself "starts by bringing some space under control." Saunders and Williams (1988) also suggest that the concept of home embraces a spatiality. Accordingly, the home might be described as "a place invested with special social meaning and significance where particular kinds of social relations and activities are composed, accomplished and contextualized." What is noteworthy here is that home is discussed with reference to a place, but also as a surrounding context for certain social relations and activities.

Simultaneous attention to spatiality and sociality implied by home is a widely acknowledged stance. Home might be described "as a special kind of relationship with a place" (Boccagni 2017, 4), or, in more detail, it might be discussed as "an emotionally based and meaningful relationship between dwellers and their dwelling places" in particular and "between people and their environment" in general (Dovey 1985, 34). Any building constructed with the purpose of dwelling does not constitute a home, but certain places are marked as homes through emotional meanings attached to them by their dwellers. However, in a contradictory account, the house requires to be defined with all its material features such as "brick and timber, mortar and trowels, carpentry and masonry, foundations and topping off" (Rykwert 1991, 54). Home, on the other hand, might be possible in the absence of a building and can be enabled through "a little tinder, even some waste paper, a few matches, or a cigarette lighter" (Rykwert 1991, 54).

The way Rykwert broadens the conceptualization of home serves well to encompass different homely experiences that are not necessarily bound up with a specific building. Especially when the transnational mobility and migration are at stake, such an extensive definition might help to understand the different ways of homemaking in the absence of an enduring relationship to a physical place like a house. However, what I find problematic in his approach is the very sharp distinction between the material realities and the symbolic meanings. Before I move on with participants' narratives regarding their experiences of homemaking and housebuilding, I will visit material turn in social sciences since it provides an inspiration to analyze

the co-constitution between the physical structures and the meanings surrounding them.

3.2 A Material-Cultural Perspective on House-Home Binary

Material culture is an area of study that originated in, but not confined to, the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology. It finds contributors in the disciplines varying from geography to history, from cultural studies to sociology. This wide range of academic interests on material culture makes it rather an "undisciplined" and "anarchic" field of study (Tilley et al. 2006). The very first "Editorial" (1996) of *Journal of Material Culture* also acknowledges and cherishes the interdisciplinary character of the studies focusing on material culture and describes its forthcoming journey as an attempt to gather various works belonging to different fields.

Although it is not very likely to provide a structured review of the literature because of this dispersed characteristic of the material culture studies, it is possible to address the main understanding, which forms the basis for the development of various works within this area. Accordingly, "[t]his field of study centers on the idea that materiality is an integral dimension of culture, and that there are dimensions of social existence that cannot be fully understood without it" (Tilley et al. 2006, 1). In other words, diverse studies on material culture from various disciplines mainly focus on "how persons make things and things make person" (Tilley et al. 2006, 2). The emphasis on this two-sided interaction between objects and subjects, things and people, material and culture leads me to include material turn in my thesis study since I aim to discuss the relation between houses and their builders and/or dwellers. Since dwelling in space is addressed as a common characteristic of human materiality (*Editorial* 1996), it becomes meaningful to focus on the reciprocal relationship between material culture and social actions through a discussion on house-home binary.

Dan Hicks (2010) reviews the developments in the fields of archaeology and anthropology starting from the moment that "material culture" was coined as a term in the first half of the 20th century. Accordingly, in anthropology, with an increasing interest in fieldwork-based ethnographies at the beginning of the 1900s, material culture was defined as the study of artifacts and then abandoned because the main focus of attention became the social structure (Hicks 2010, 43). In the 1960s, with

the rise of a structuralist approach and the emergence of the semiotic turn in social sciences, objects became a matter of interest, especially in Lévi-Strauss's work, which discusses material things as a part of the general structure. Structural Marxist anthropologists of the 1970s maintained this attention on objects by arguing that "distinctions between the material and the ideational could be overcome through a focus on social relations" (Hicks 2010, 46). This was one of the initial attempts to discuss what is material and what is social/cultural together. Meanwhile, a branch in British archaeology started to focus on the contemporary world and theorize about the relation between people and things. The cross-disciplinary influence of structuralism and semiotics have blurred the boundaries between archaeology and anthropology of the day. In the 1990s, material culture study was named as an area of study within which both anthropologists and archaeologists started to publish journals and book editions. Instead of meta-theories intending to explain the general relation between material and social world, case-based approaches have been mostly embraced. In this period, the material matter at hand varied in a wide range from clothing to foods, interior design objects to supermarkets, cars to artworks. The main focus shifted from production to mass consumption. The studies conducted in this era, named as "Material-Cultural Turn" by Hicks, have criticized the tendencies to discuss socio-cultural and material in separation, and invite us "to transcend subject-object dualities" by focusing on "relational" processes (Hicks 2010, 69).

Material culture studies, with an emphasis on the relationality between material and socio-cultural, are directly relevant to the discussions on the concepts of house and home, which are mentioned in the previous section. Although various authors acknowledge the spatiality of home, the binary approach to house and home pushes the very material components of a dwelling unit such as bricks, windows, doors and so on into the realm of house and away from the formation of home as an idea. This tendency to make an analytical distinction between two terms creates an illusion that materiality exists as a separate phenomenon that does not interact with the meanings and emotions attributed to the concept of home. My intention, in contrast, is to go beyond this division between house and home as separate concepts and to focus on "the coconstitutive relationship between the formal features of actual dwellings and the social life that inhabits them" (Jacobs and Smith 2008, 515). Such an approach requires paying specific attention to "what the home does with us" as well as "what we do with homes" (Miller 2001). In other words, the material components of a house can acquire a constitutive role in the formation of identities and the senses of belonging. As I will discuss in more detail below, making a home out of Bursa might be possible mainly through the construction of these buildings.

The existence of a looser differentiation regarding the concepts of house and home in daily Turkish language assists me well in my argument that the analytical distinction between these terms might obscure the interaction between materiality and sociality. In Turkish language, *konut* or *mesken* are the equivalents of the concept of house, while the concept of home is referred as *ev* or *yuva*. However, *konut* and *mesken* are actually technical terms which are rarely articulated in colloquial language, but frequently used in legal texts and real estate projects. *Yuva* appears to be a more emotionally loaded way of referring to home. *Ev*, on the other hand, is a word that is interchangeably used to describe the dwelling units as well as homely feelings. The experience and the discourse insist on eliminating the idea that these concepts belong to separate realms.

However, my objection to differentiating the realms of house and home does not mean that the concept of home can appear in a person's life only through the existence of a house owned and dwelled. Petridou (2001, 87) addresses the risk of identifying "the home with the bounded, physically defined space that we normally call 'house'" that such an approach might overlook "the dynamic way in which everyday practice makes the home meaningful to those who inhabit it." In order to bring an approach embracing this dynamism, she suggests not to reduce material culture solely to the physical structure of a house. Instead, she focuses on food packages sent from Greece to Greek students studying in the United Kingdom. By taking this warning seriously and keeping in mind that sedentary relation with a building is not a universal experience, I do not propose equating homeliness with house ownership. Rather, I argue that house -when it exists or is absent, when it is owned or rented, when it is currently dwelled or far away- occupies a place in people's meaning-making processes. Although there are plenty of cases that people do not have a house of their own, the concept of house still stands there and affects their relationships to themselves and to the world. Not only home, but also house becomes a significant cornerstone when such a meaning is attributed to it. In the particular case on which I focus throughout this study, housebuilding has a crucial place in the participants' symbolic worlds regarding whether it is present or absent, whether it is owned or rented, and what kind of physical characteristics it has.

3.3 Multiple Meanings and Experiences of a House/Home

At this point, what it means to have a house/home becomes an urgent matter requiring further discussion. As it is argued in the previous sections, it is significant to form a connection between physical structures and symbolic worlds. Thus, it becomes necessary to elaborate more on what home means and what house provides for its dwellers.

In the literature on home, there are various components of homely feelings which set forth by several authors. Boccagni (2017) emphasizes security, familiarity, and control as primary attributes of home experience. What these terms correspond to might be respectively mentioned as (I) "a sense of personal protection and integrity", (II) "intimacy and comfort" as well as "orientation in space, stability, routine, continuity or even permanence", and (III) "autonomy in using a certain place" in addition to being "out of the public gaze and judgment" (Boccagni 2017, 7). While Boccagni compactly categorizes the meanings of home under three titles, Després (1991) provides a more extended list with overlapping elements: security, control, permanence and continuity, center, refuge from outside world, and personal status. Somerville (1997) brings a sociological approach to the matter and discusses the concept of home with a focus on privacy, identity, and familiarity. Reducing the experience or the idea of home to any of these elements would be superficial and one-dimensional. In different interviews, I encountered with different aspects of the relationship between people and their dwelling places. From this point on, I intend to focus on the multi-dimensionality of home by analyzing these narratives.

<div align="center">***</div>

I met Neriman *Hanım*, a 54-year-old woman, on a cloudy day in a café near her home. She was planning to travel on the following day to visit her son who lives in another city with his wife and son. She was busy with pre-travel preparations and a little bit short on time. She made clear at our first encounter that this rush was the reason that she could not invite me to her home, yet she did not neglect to point out where she lives even from a distance. She lives with her husband and daughter in a recently-developed and currently-favorable area of Bursa. When we had our teas and started the interview, I explained to her that I have been interested in her life story. As I could observe, as a cheerful and chatty person, she immediately started to narrate whatever came to her mind at that moment. Since she had migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1970 when she was 3,5 years old, she mentioned that she does not remember everything clearly. However, the first thing she could think

of was how she frequently visited Bulgaria to spend the summer with her relatives there after the migration and how difficult life in Bursa was because of the efforts to build a house. When I asked her to tell more on this housebuilding endeavor, she first described the structure of the living spaces in Bulgaria:

> "Back in my parents' day, there was no one living in rental houses in Bulgaria. Everyone had a house, a house with a garden. Half of the basement was buried in the ground, and the other half was standing above it. The upstairs belonged to the children. They called it *mağaza* back there, not basement, but *mağaza*. There were two rooms, a living room, and a kitchen in the *mağaza* floor. The adults were living there. The brides and the children were living upstairs. They hadn't seen such a thing as rent there. Since they found it difficult to give away half the money they earned by paying rent, everyone started to build their own houses."

After she gave introductory information about how people were used to doing certain things before the migration, she mentioned that the way they constructed their houses in Turkey was similar to the previous homes in Bulgaria in an architectural manner.

The next day, I met Fikri *Bey*, a 60-year-old man who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1971 when he was 11. Fikri *Bey* has two sons living in Istanbul. The older one is in his 30s, married and working in a company there. The younger one is a university student in Istanbul. Before I met Fikri *Bey* for an interview, I first came together with his wife, Renginar *Hanım* in Istanbul, to listen to her life story. Renginar *Hanım* spends most of her time in Istanbul in her younger son's house and occasionally goes to Bursa. However, it is not a fragmented family situation. She rather divides her time to complete housework in more than one house. I visited Fikri *Bey* just after the weekend Renginar *Hanım* spent in Bursa. The house was looking freshly cleaned and Fikri *Bey* offered me some cake which was also baked by Renginar *Hanım*. In our interview, Fikri *Bey* pointed out the way of living in Bulgaria as a reason for being so motivated to immediately build a house in Turkey:

> "In Bulgaria, nobody was living in rental houses. Can you imagine that? Rent was an offending thing back there. [People would say], 'Look they are living in a rental house.' Think of it as a shameful thing. Among *muhacirs*, our people, if you could not build your house in two years, you are toast! See all the gossiping after that."

What I find noteworthy in the accounts of Neriman *Hanım* and Fikri *Bey* is the emphasis on how people were used to living in Bulgaria and in what ways they strived to maintain these habits. On the one hand, there appears a motivation to create continuity and permanence between life in Bulgaria and life in Turkey. Accordingly, the house became a medium to overcome any feeling of rupture. Additionally, in terms of living standards, both participants expressed their parents' desire to be free from the obligation of paying rent as it was the case in Bulgaria. On the other hand, it was not an individually experienced process. House has served as a mark of social status and has occupied an essential place in community-based comparisons. In addition to having a shelter without being obliged to pay monthly rents, a desire to be recognized by fellow migrants as capable of managing it was a strong motivation to complete housebuilding as soon as possible.

After Neriman Hanım briefly summarized how the houses were in Bulgaria, she went on with what she remembers about her parents' process of building a house:

> "We started to build a house when I was in primary school. We were living in a rental house. There was an empty land, a field right below it. There was a house in the middle. People were cultivating the land. When the *muhacirs* started to come, people parceled out the field. My parents had bought a land there. My [paternal] uncle and his wife had come from Bulgaria to visit Turkey. They said 'Let's start! Let's lay the foundations of the house.' They were digging out the foundation, not with excavators, but by hand excavating. You draw a rope. That is the project of the house. You mark three rooms, a living room, and a kitchen with ropes. You dig out the foundation and lay up the brick. Then, they used to pour the concrete. I remember how they started. I mean, we started with my uncle. We dug the basement. Then, the foundation was poured. Back then, there was an *artijen* in our back street. They were calling the flow of water without any tap as *artijen*. The spring water from the ground I mean. . . I remember that when I was a child I was going there and filling the barrels with water while my parents were at work so that construction workers could use it. Also, I remember that I carried a lot of bricks while we were building the house. They were bringing bricks but unloading them altogether to one point. We were carrying and putting them to the middle of the rooms so that workers could lay them up easily. Now, construction is easy. Back then, the lime was not sold in bags. It was like either powder or stone. They put it into water. It boils up. Back then, while *muhacirs* were building their houses, lime splattered many people. Even there were people who fell into the lime and got burned. You [with a reference to my generation] don't know these things.

Heidegger (1993) describes dwelling as a mode of existence and a shared condition for human-beings. Since dwelling becomes possible through building, there appears a means-end relationship between two activities. Whereas dwelling appears as an end-in-itself process, building becomes a means to achieve it. "We do not dwell because we have built, but we build and have built because we dwell, that is, because we are dwellers," he writes (Heidegger 1993, 350). Through building, we make "places and things that structure and house our activities. These places and things establish relations among each other, between themselves and dwellers, and between dwellers and the surrounding environment" (Young 2005, 177). In the end, building turns into creating a spatial context for forthcoming social activities and relationships which will take place within this environment. At this point, it becomes possible to read Neriman *Hanım*'s narrative as something more than how difficult it was to build a house in her early years in Turkey with scarce resources and undeveloped technologies. She went through this process when she was a child. Her teenage years and young adulthood were surrounded by an environment constructed through this process of building. Gradually, the water and the bricks carried by Neriman *Hanım* were built into the spatial context of her teenage years. What was constructed here was not only a shelter for them to live but also a neighborhood and a way of living since many other migrants simultaneously went through similar processes in the same location, as she narrated.

At this point, the endeavor to build a dwelling space requires further attention by investigating what these building activities are composed of. Young (2005) criticizes Heidegger's approach from a feminist perspective. Accordingly, Heidegger defines two aspects of the concept of building, namely preserving and constructing, but pays very little attention to the former and values the latter.

> "Through building, man establishes a world and his place in the world, according to Heidegger, establishes himself as somebody, with an identity and history. [. . .] Even today, when women have moved into so many typically male activities, building houses and other structures remains largely a male activity in most parts of the world. [. . .] Women as a group are still largely excluded from the activities that erect structures to gather and reveal a meaningful world (Young 2005, 118)."

Young's review of Heidegger through a gender lens is quite valuable. In various life stories, different aspects of home might become more prominent. Home might be associated with feeling either settled or secure, either sheltered or autonomous, either comfortable or centered. However, there might be a difference between the

idea of home and the actual experience of home. Each and every member of a household might not experience the very same home in a similar manner since it is an area that is not free from norms and inequalities operating all across society. On the contrary, home might be the place where these inequalities are shaped and reproduced. Therefore, it would be convenient to define homes also as "gendered spaces, inhabited by people of various social classes, different generations and political orientations with diverse experiences of previous and current homes and the movements between them" (Al-Ali and Koser 2002, 6). That is to say, the feeling of autonomy in and control over this space, the sense of safety and security, the division of labor might not be similarly experienced by different people who relate to the same home. Just as this broader understanding of home, the process of housebuilding is directly linked with such differences especially in terms of age and gender. However, if you let me return to Young's critique of Heidegger, defining construction as a male activity might as well be reductionist. If the activity of constructing refers to putting a brick onto another one, Neriman *Hanım*, as a primary school kid, became a part of it. My objection is not that housebuilding entails a gendered process just as home experience. It certainly does, as I will discuss below. However, the operation of the gender roles does not necessarily correspond to the identification of construction with men and of preservation with women. Instead, I argue that the activity of constructing requires to be analyzed in more detail by including the process of creating financial resources to make any building erected. At this point, women were very actively involved with housebuilding processes by working in order to make money for construction materials. Nevertheless, this was not narrated as an emancipatory experience, rather defined as a sacrifice for the sake of others. Additionally, the value attributed to the work of construction should be questioned by considering that it is a very ill-paid and labor-intensive job in which workers mostly do not build houses for themselves, but for other people.

In order to delve into how age and gender affect housebuilding processes, I will give some space to my interview with Sümbül *Hanım*, whom I also mentioned in the first chapter. In order to remind briefly, Sümbül *Hanım* lived through the experience of migration in 1978 when she was 15 years old, with her parents and her brother, 4 years younger than her. She narrated that she was a high school student in Bulgaria at the moment of migration and dropped out of school. Her initial times in Turkey appeared in her life story as follows :

> "We said, 'Let's get to work right away. Let's move forward. Let's have a home.' I totally forgot about school. I was a marvelous student back there. Yet, I forgot about my school. Just having a home... My father

told me that they could send me to school if I wanted to. I said, 'No, let my brother study, I won't.' It was okay as long as we could build our home. We could make it happen. We had brought some stuff from there. We sold them and moved into our home. We didn't have doors at the time. We only had an external door to avoid cold. There were no doors within the house. We placed the sofas which we had brought from Bulgaria."

Sümbül *Hanım* continued to narrate that she found a job much earlier than her parents thanks to her relatives -probably earlier migrants from Bulgaria- living in Bursa. Her relatives took her to textile factories. Since the textile was a developing sector with an increasing need for the labor force in Bursa at that day, working in this sector was a widespread practice among migrants back then. She, first, worked in a small enterprise without any wage for 15-20 days. Then, she gradually switched to bigger and bigger companies. She articulated this process as "Our status got improved." However, this was not a smooth experience to narrate, let alone live. Her eyes were filled with tears while she was telling how she felt about it:

"Until we overcame those difficult conditions... I don't know. I mean, people of our generation kind of sacrificed themselves. The ones who came here when they were 14-15 years old or the ones who came here by dropping out of high school... I mean, I can say that they sacrificed themselves because they all had to work regardless of whether they were very good students or not. Because there was no income. Okay, we came but we had difficulties here. We couldn't have it at once. But we didn't have a thing to return back, we didn't rebel against it. We said okay, we strived, we worked hard."

As I discussed in the previous sections, housebuilding has occupied a very central role in the life stories of the participants. However, it affects each and every person in different ways. Nevertheless, it is possible to point out some social mechanisms shaping these differences. When it boils down to generating income for the household, the decisions about who will keep studying and who will start working acquired an age- and gender-based character. For example, in Sümbül *Hanım*'s narrative, while her 4-year younger brother continued his education, she immediately started working and she narrated this as her own decision. A similar narrative in my interview with Fikri *Bey* also came to the fore. As the younger sibling, he continued his education, but her older sister dropped out of high school. He recounted his sister's decision as follows:

> "My parents wished their children to study. But, since my sister is five years older than I am, she could not adjust and left her education unfinished. She said, 'Dad, I won't keep on studying.' We enrolled her in good high schools. But she couldn't make it. When she got bad marks, she got demoralized, of course. My father has a sister who is at the same age as my sister. When she started working in a spinning factory, my sister said, 'I want to work, too.' Even though we told her to study, she didn't."

This is a remarkable account in the sense that Fikri *Bey* attributed the responsibility of dropping out of school to her sister but also provided an excuse by mentioning difficulties in the adjustment process. However, her sister does not appear to be part of "we" who carried out the act of enrollment, whereas Fikri *Bey*, the youngest member of the household notwithstanding, does according to this narrative. Later in the interview, he evaluated this process as follows:

> "The migration cuts out one generation. I mean, the older children in the family... Let's say older brothers and sisters... The migration cuts out one part of the family. Those people got so busy with housebuilding that they could neither go to a cinema nor to a theatre. They disappeared off the face of earth without seeing anything."

Although age is a very important factor in determining who will contribute to the household and in what ways, the gendered dimension of the process should not be overlooked. When I look at the experience of my own extended family, I see a similar decision-making process regarding who will study and who will work. My mother is the youngest among three siblings and has a 10-year older sister and 13-year older brother. Whereas my maternal uncle continued his education after the migration to Turkey until he received his MA degree, my maternal aunt went through the migration process after she finished high school in Bulgaria and directly started working in Turkey. This is a delicate topic within the family that one cannot easily talk or question about. Therefore, I do not prefer to go deeper into this experience, instead confine myself to merely mentioning it in order to point out that age is not the only criterion in these decisions. This does not lead to an overarching generalization that migrants send their younger sons to school and older daughters to work. The experiences of both Sümbül *Hanım* and Fikri *Bey* preserve their uniqueness. However, people who had migrated in the same period, who had known each other from Bulgaria, who were related to each other, who kept their relations intact in Turkey created several patterns about the appropriate way of doing and narrating

certain things. Just like the manifestation of commitment to housebuilding as an umbrella narrative for my participants, the ways this process was gendered and aged share several characteristics. Accordingly, creating the financial resources needed for the housebuilding processes was organized in a way that the education, especially for elder girls within the family, might have pushed into the background. Instead, they were motivated to start working and to earn money to afford housebuilding expenses. When it comes to the younger participants who migrated to Turkey when they were in primary school age, they were motivated to continue their high school education in short-term schools such as nursery colleges or technical and vocational high schools. Since these institutions do not require to continue education for a long period and provide guaranteed jobs after the graduation, children who were directed to those places could become a part of business life in the short term.

Revisiting Young's critique of Heidegger's categorization of building into constructing and preserving might be helpful to bring a broader understanding of what constructing is. According to the above-mentioned narratives, it seems insufficient to limit it with the brick- and mortar-related works. Creating a place to dwell also includes the act of earning money to buy bricks and other construction materials. Thus, Young's argument that constructing, as a male activity, is valued compared to preserving seems insufficient. According to my fieldwork, women were involved in the activity of construction especially by creating financial resources for the building expenses. However, this does not mean that women could participate in this valuable activity in a liberatory way. Instead, it was not seen as a preferable thing to do, which is an important reason for women's widespread involvement. Thus, its value lies only in the discourse of sacrifice. The narrative of Sümbül *Hanım* about her own experience of immediately starting to work and the comments of Fikri *Bey* about how the experience of migration influenced the elder siblings appear to be examples of how the act of sacrificing is simultaneously valued and seen as an unfavorable thing.

3.4 Home as a Concept Constantly in Making

In the final section of this chapter, I intend to focus on the temporal aspects of the experiences, ideas, and narratives of home. As it is mentioned above, the concept of home contains a dynamic character. Even though I have attempted to emphasize the link between material structures and social relations, house does not appear as

a sedentary, static, and fixed unit, but as an entity always in the making. Migration addresses a prominent point of "biographical transition" in one's life and "a major shift [. . .] in socio-spatial sense" by entailing "leaving home behind" (Boccagni 2017, 15). However, it is not experienced as a linear transitional process of being uprooted, settling down in a new land, and re-finding the stability. Even after the housebuilding process is completed, the journey continues. Both physical dwelling units and the meanings attributed to them continuously change. Therefore, it becomes crucial to present an understanding which grasps this shifting characteristic. In other words, homes need to be conceptualized as "not static, but dynamic processes, involving the acts of imagining, creating, unmaking, changing, losing and 'moving' homes" (Al-Ali and Koser 2002, 6).

Another aspect of this dynamic process is the discrepancy between what home is imagined to be and how home is experienced, in other words, the difference between "ideal homes" and "actual homes". Acknowledging that meanings attached to the relationships with specific places might not overlap with the ways these relationships are experienced leads us to discuss the concept of home as a *process* instead of a given and fixed entity. In addition to the gap between home as an ideal entity and home as the actual experience, the experience of migration compels us to think about home as a notion negotiated constantly.

Boccagni (2017, 23) offers the concept of "homing" with cognitive and normative, emotional, and practical elements in order to offer a dynamic analysis. Accordingly, homing appears to be a "tentative process of gap-bridging" between "ideal and real sides of home" by using the resources available during this endeavor (Boccagni 2017, 23-24). Similarly, Ahmed et al. (2003, 9) appeals to the concept of "homing" and explains it as follows:

> "Making home is about the (re)creation of what Eva Hoffman would call 'soils of significance' (1989: 278), in which the affective qualities of home, and the work of memory in their making cannot be divorced from the more concrete materialities of rooms, objects, rituals, borders and forms of transport that are bound up in so many processes of uprooting and regrounding. Homing, then, depends on the reclaiming and reprocessing of habits, objects, names and histories that have been uprooted – in migration, displacement or colonization."

Materiality takes place in these two conceptualizations of homing in two different forms. In the former account by Boccagni, material circumstances appear as the resources available to the people in the endeavor of homing. In the latter, materi-

alities might refer either to the symbols of an imagined home with reference to the future or they might be fragments of the past. What people brought from Bulgaria when they were migrating to Turkey constitutes an excellent example of this dual characteristic of materialities. During the period between 1969-1978, people could leave Bulgaria only after they sold or transferred their properties to someone. Most of them bought several portable objects with the money they made from selling their houses. These objects, varying from motorcycles to pianos and from dinnerware to televisions, were sold in Turkey so that they could afford to cover the initial expenses after migration. When they embarked on this journey, they carried things that had meanings for them, things that could be used in their new homes, and things that could be sold. Whereas the tradable belongings provided a financial resource for the gap bridging as Boccagni (2017) mentions, the ones they planned to use created affectively loaded relationships through the work of memory, as Ahmed et al. (2003) suggest. Bulgarian sofa beds and cupboards built a continuity between these not very close lands, especially during the Cold War years when the distance was experienced more intensely since traveling could take place a lot less frequently.

The majority of the participants of this study narrated that their living conditions improved after the housebuilding was completed. However, the thing about an imagined home is that it is never the real one. Hence, although the intensity of the efforts to make some money to invest in housebuilding seems to diminish, the process has continued.

Renginar *Hanım*, whom I previously mentioned as Fikri *Bey*'s wife, migrated to Turkey with her parents and younger sister in 1973 when she was 7. They brought two beds, one stove, one wardrobe, and a cream-colored cupboard with them. They moved into their own house in 1977 even before the windows were placed. She narrated this process as follows:

> "All the effort was for building the house and being able to pay for the construction materials. Everyone was like that. You will build the house, you will be freed from paying rent, you won't pay rent. Why? They were always thinking about the next generation. For example, my mother-in-law built a two storey-house because she will wed his son. Migrants had an attribution that if you have a son, you have to build an additional storey for him. You wed your son next to you."

Then, I asked her whether their living conditions changed after the construction was completed. She replied as follows:

"Not at all. We built the third floor, the fourth floor... It didn't change. Now my mother says that I built the storeys for nothing. We say, 'You also ruined our lives. If you did buy a flat in Mudanya[1] instead of building last two storeys, we could go and stay there.' She says, 'We were foolish.' But it is the psychology deriving from the migration. Can you get rid of it? Not possible! [...] Generally, the migrants have the ambition to build a house. No one can deny this. For example, you are composed of two households. Why do you build four storeys? I am asking you, do you need to build four storeys? No. If you have two children, then build two storeys. No, even if they have two children, they definitely build four floors."

Although Renginar *Hanım* seems to be complaining about her parents' attitude, house ownership occupied an important place in her adult years too. Currently, she and Fikri *Bey* do not live in any storeys built by either her parents or by parents-in-law. Like many other migrant groups, *muhacirs* initially dwelled in the least favorable parts of the city. In the following decades, there has been an inner-city flow towards more developed areas in some cases. Since the gap-bridging endeavors never end, homing continues even after the all storeys are completed. Temporarily, this points to not only continuity and dynamism but also a future-oriented approach that considers the next generations. Next generations become an important factor shaping not only the processes of homing but also the decision to migrate to Turkey, as I discussed in the first chapter.

Finally, regarding the gap between imagined and experienced aspects of homes and homing processes, I intend to discuss the concept of home in a broader sense by including the development of the sense of belonging in Turkey. As I scrutinized in the first chapter, the decisions to migrate to Turkey went along with an imagination about how life was supposed to be after the migration. However, especially initial encounters in Turkey, as it was narrated, did not necessarily overlap with these expectations. Sami *Bey*, for example, describes his disappointment as follows:

"I said, 'I want to go back.' It might seem simple to you while I was telling. Look, they [with reference to inhabitants] don't accept us as Turks here. They say, 'You, Bulgarians!' Secondly, they don't accept us as humans here. 'We are communists,' they say. [...] I asked where we did come. I said, 'Send me back, if it is possible.' But, they didn't. Well, most of us wanted to go back after we came here. You can't find a single *muhacir* who came to Turkey and was not cheated. When we were in Bulgaria, we thought that Muslim means the ideal human. We had such

---

[1]Mudanya is a seaside district in Bursa.

a thought in our minds. We were living in a dream world. We came here, and there is no Muslim. [...] We go to a workplace, they make a wry face and don't employ us. I bought a land. It turned out to be the property of someone else. I hired a lawyer. He/she turned out to be a fraud. There is no form of cheating left which we didn't experience."

Kaya (1997, 171), in his dissertation on the Turkish youth in Berlin, mentions the "mystification of Istanbul and Turkey in the imagery of the Turkish minority." Accordingly, Turks in Berlin create an image of ideal Turkey in response to the mechanisms of exclusion and subordination which they were exposed to. The idea(l) of Turkey and "the use of familiar signs and symbol" in their daily lives help them in their "quest for homing" (Kaya 1997, 172). Similarly, Sami *Bey*'s pre-migration assumption that Muslims are the ideal people might be regarded as a coping mechanism with the discrimination in Bulgaria. Accordingly, Turkey was created as a homeland for Turks, where they should have eventually migrate to, as I discussed in detail in the previous chapter. These processes of imagining Turkey became part of homing in Bulgaria. However, the unpleasant encounters, such as being labeled as Bulgarians or communists and being cheated, after the migration caused disruption and fragmentation in this imagination which Sami *Bey* narrated as "the tragedy" of migrancy:

> "When I visited Bulgaria, a woman summarized the situation so well so that she devastated me. I thought about it the whole day. She said that you are Turks here and you are Bulgarians in Turkey. This is true. They still see us as Bulgarians here. And when we go to Bulgaria, we become Turks. We are second-class citizens both here and there. This is what happened to us, nothing else."

The dynamic quality of homing processes becomes directly related to Sami *Bey*'s inability to feel belonging to neither Turkey nor Bulgaria. This fragmentedness —described as "home away from home", "here and there", "double consciousness" or "awareness of multilocality" by Kaya (1997)— also appears in his willingness to live in Switzerland after his application for Bulgarian citizenship is approved. However, although Sami *Bey* was quite expressive, in my opinion, about unpleasant encounters he had experienced after the migration to Turkey, this was not the case in all other interviews. Most of the participants were not as articulate as Sami *Bey* when it comes to narrating their experiences and encounters in Turkey after the migration. Mostly, to listen to whether they experienced any encounters that make them feel like a "stranger", I had to ask such questions specifically. What was narrated included

experiencing difficulties in reading and writing in Turkish at school, being laughed at because of the accent, being found strange by the "*manavs*"[2] due to men "letting" women to work. However, the unwillingness to verbalize these experiences and being quite vocal about housebuilding processes have quite important implications, in my opinion. As I emphasized earlier, the first-generation migrant participants of this study have been living with the results of the decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey for more than 40 years. Therefore, they probably have not been very willing to unsettle the rationale of this decision. Instead, they might wish to speak in a manner to consolidate their homeliness in Turkey, by leaving aside the encounters which make them feel not belonging.

At this point, the processes of housebuilding, although include plenty of difficulties, represent the accomplishments and describe the narrators as capable of overcoming these challenges. What could be achieved stands as a solid and tangible building which is supposed to shelter not only the builders but also the next generations whose relation to this community-based narrative will be discussed in the third chapter. The discrimination which the migrants were exposed to, on the other hand, has shaken the feeling of homeliness. As a result, the concept of homing, with its inherent dynamism, still continues to be a process in the making even during and through the narrativization. In other words, the narrators still continue to make themselves homely wherever they are by telling their homes in a certain manner.

---

[2] *Manav* or *yerli* are the words which can be translated as the inhabitant. The ways these words are used mostly include a motivation to address a difference between migrant community and the inhabitant community by emphasizing the positive attributes of the former.

4.   INVESTIGATING IDENTITY AND BELONGING THROUGH A FOCUS ON INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION

In May 2019, my mother had a plan to go to Sofia in order to be interviewed for her application concerning the restoration of Bulgarian citizenship. I joined her and we decided to broaden the scope of our travel by adding the visit of Kardzhali (*Kırcaali*) to our plan. My very first visit to Kardzhali created an atmosphere of excitement, especially for my grandparents. My maternal grandmother specifically advised me to look at the Rhodope Mountains and drink water, once for her and once for myself, from the tap located right next to the municipal building in their village, Lenishte (*Alfatlı*). When we arrived at the village, I realized that her request directly corresponds to a form of experience belonging to her life in Bulgaria. The village of Lenishte was composed of scattered houses in a highland area. The house my grandparents had lived in was very close to the village center and the municipal building. The tap, although renovated, was still standing there. I drank once for myself and once for my grandmother in addition to bottling some water to bring to Bursa. Then, we walked towards my grandparents' home, which is currently owned by someone else and was not seeming very well-groomed during our visit. However, it had an almost magical and picturesque view, since you see nothing but the Rhodope Mountains from the window. These hills to be seen from the window and the tap located right next to the municipal building were the coordinates of my grandmother during her life in Bulgaria.

My grandmother's advice to drink water and to see Rhodopes has two motives, in my opinion. Firstly, she probably feels a longing for that period of her life. Water and the hills are the symbols representing the life in Lenishte. Hence, she wishes me to have this experience on her behalf. Secondly, and more importantly, she might be looking for compensation for the rupture created by the experience of migration. As I have analyzed in the first two chapters, migration caused an interruption in migrants' life courses. They had to disengage from their plans, expectations, and dreams regarding their future. Instead, they found themselves in a rapid tempo of working in order to build a house as soon as possible. However, this was not

the only discontinuity. Additionally, the possibility to transmit the way of life in Bulgaria to the next generations became limited with stories and photos, since it has usually not been possible to take children or grandchildren to the previous home. The experiences and memories of that period were situated far away both in a spatial and temporal sense. My visit to Lenishte, in a sense, bridged this gap for my grandmother. Although I cannot travel back in time and witness the exact experience she went through, I could drink the water of Lenishte and see the Rhodopes.

Dual citizenship applications, by requiring regular visits to Bulgaria, shorten the temporal and spatial distances between migrants' life in Bulgaria and their Turkey-born children or grandchildren. Accordingly, migrants can apply for a long-term or permanent residency permit in Bulgaria. In order to make their permit to continue, they are obliged to visit Bulgaria at least semi-annually. After they follow through these visits for three years, they can submit an application for their previous Bulgarian citizenship to be restored. They attend a citizenship interview in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. If their application is approved after the interview, they become Bulgarian citizens in addition to European Union citizens since Bulgaria is an EU country since 2007. Although my visit to Kardzhali took place mostly in relation to my thesis research, many participants of this study narrated that they had organized such trips to Bulgaria as a family during their processes of the application. Hence, I argue that the applications create room for discussing intergenerational transmission by focusing on what first-generation migrants desire their children to learn and embrace about their past as well as to what extent their Turkey-born children become a part of these processes.

In this chapter, I set out to focus on how the idea of home and the sense of belonging have been constructed in relation to intergenerational transmission and parent-child relationships. Whereas Bulgaria-born migrants have memories in and emotional attachments to both Bulgaria and Turkey, their Turkey-born children either have an image of Bulgaria, which has been formed through stories told by their parents or have seen Bulgaria only during the occasional visits increasing with the application processes. I mainly intend to investigate whether there is a continuity or rupture between Bulgaria-born migrants and their children in terms of the sense of belonging. However, in my opinion, it useless to ask people where their home is or where they do belong to. Especially in the context of migration, there are various mechanisms and processes which make people feel either homely or as an outsider in different places. Because of the existence of more nuanced and multilayered conceptions of home and belonging in reality, these mechanisms and their articulations should be investigated, I argue, instead of searching for clear-cut responses to home-related

questions. In my opinion, parent-child relationships are convenient for conducting such an exploration, which is what I set out to do in this chapter. In order to pursue inclusive and exclusive mechanisms, the subjectivities formed in relation to these processes, and intergenerational continuities as well as ruptures regarding the idea of home and the sense of belonging, I will focus on three themes: (I) migrant parents' investments on the future and wellbeing of their children, (II) dual citizenship applications and regular visits to Bulgaria, and (III) community and identity formation processes based on otherizing discourses. Throughout the following sections, I will analyze these phenomena through a comparative perspective between first- and second-generations.

4.1 The Concept of Generation

Generation is a complicated term to work with since it carries a vast number of meanings, and it leads to a categorization that might end up with an unintended yet extensive generalization. In the 1900s, Karl Mannheim defined the concept of generation as people who share a "common location in social and historical process" limiting them "to a specific range of potential experience, predisposing them to a certain characteristic mode of thought and experience, and a characteristic type of historically relevant action" (Mannheim 1968, cited in Skrbiš, Baldassar, and Poynting 2007, 262). However, "cohort" has not been the only meaning referred by this concept. Anthropological studies concentrating on family structures and aging, identity formation, transnational mobility and migration, and the conceptions of belonging, in later years, made use of the term with reference to genealogical relations. This duality in meaning was explained by Lamb as follows:

> "[G]eneration refers to a group of people who are living through a time period together and participate in some kind of shared identity, practices, and beliefs. Generation is also used by anthropologists in its more genealogical, kinship-related sense, to refer to the relationship between parents and their children, and so on, and/or to forms of prestige and identity tied to one's position in such a system of kinship descent (Lamb 2015, 853)."

In order to avoid confusion, I find it essential to clarify what I mean by generation

and intergenerational transmission. As I have mentioned in *Introduction*, I have conducted oral history interviews with 18 people, 12 of whom were born in Bulgaria and migrated to Turkey, and 6 of whom are Turkey-born children of Bulgaria-born migrants. 12 Bulgaria-born migrants, who showed great courtesy to participate in my study might seem as a "cohort" since they went through similar experiences of migration during the same period, namely between 1969-1978. Additionally, they have narrated their processes of migration to and housebuilding in Turkey through somehow shared elements in their life stories, as I discussed in the first two chapters in detail. However, whereas four of the participants lived through these migration processes as young adults, the other eight participants migrated to Turkey either as children or as teenagers. When the differences deriving from gender, the position within family, the location of departure, and the existence or non-existence of relatives in Turkey are added to the age differences, there appears a manifoldness in terms of experiences. For instance, people who migrated to Turkey at younger ages narrated that they could continue their education, whereas their elder siblings were led to work and generate income for the housebuilding endeavors. Or, if migrants had relatives who had migrated to Turkey earlier, they encountered less difficult conditions, especially in the first years following their migration, because this condition created a safety network, as they narrated. However, if they were in a lack of such a safety network, the initial years were a lot more challenging. Considering these different experiences, evaluating them as a cohort might be problematic since their stories reveal diverging characteristics of their experiences as much as shared elements.

When it comes to Turkey-born children, it is even more difficult to evaluate six participants of this study as a cohort. Their age range displays great variety since the participants include a person born in 1981 as well as another born in 1995. Additionally, they have different life courses and are at different moments in their lifespan in comparison to each other. One of them is married, with children and living in Bursa. Another one is also married but has no children and lives in Istanbul. Three of them are currently in Istanbul for their university education. And the final one was graduated from a university in Sakarya and moved back to Bursa, where she works in a factory and lives with her parents. These differences inevitably reflect on the life stories of these participants.

Although there exists a great variety of encounters, experiences and expectations among both Bulgaria-born migrants and their Turkey-born children, I will appeal to an analytical categorization between first-generation migrants and second-generation migrants throughout this chapter. I will elaborate more on to what extent the latter embraces a migrant identity in the following sections. For the time being, I should

point out that my intention is not to melt these very diverse experiences in the same pot. Thus, I intentionally avoid using the concept of generation in the sense of cohort. In addition to the differences among participants, I do not propose these narratives and my analysis on them as a representative entity for thousands of people who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey during the same period and their Turkey-born children whose number is uncertain. Instead, I aim to pursue a subjectivity-based approach that I have adopted throughout this study. Therefore, I use the concept of generation in the genealogical sense to focus on the relationships between parents and their children. The only criteria of my categorization based on generations, at this point, is the experience of migration. Whereas first-generation migrants are composed of people who personally experienced the migration from Bulgaria to Turkey, second-generation migrants are children born in Turkey to Bulgaria-born migrant parents. Such a categorization is useful only for conducting a discussion on intergenerational transmission of material assets in addition to values, norms, and the idea of community.

4.2 Existing as a Family-Being Instead of an Individual-Being

The first two chapters of this thesis have focused on the decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey and the processes of housebuilding in Turkey. As I have analyzed in detail, both practices were closely linked to a consideration of the future, not only in terms of forthcoming years but also in the sense of possible and potential futures to be provided for the children. Regarding the decision to migrate, especially for the migrating adults who were in the position of decision-makers, "coming to Turkey" was a result of the discriminatory policies against the Turkish minority in Bulgaria, which blurred the future for the Turks living there. Together with these practices, the idea that people of certain groups should live in certain lands was consolidated. Additionally, the future was extended in a way to encompass the adulthood years of children.

However, these endeavors for providing a better life for the children were accompanied by several difficulties in current living conditions, which were narrated as that "a generation kind of sacrificed themselves." The discourse of sacrifice suggests that some members of migrating families gave up their plans and desires for their own futures for the sake of family's wellbeing in general and the next generations in particular. In this sense, the act of sacrificing refers to either dropping out of school and

starting to work immediately after the migration or having education in the schools to be completed in a short period and providing more guaranteed occupations, such as nursing schools or technical and vocational high schools. Additionally, the initial period after the migration was narrated in a way that life was thoroughly organized in the axis of work, and hence, personal interests, dreams, hobbies, or plans were totally postponed. In several interviews, participants emphasized that they could not enjoy their childhood because of the migration.

At this point, my interview with Metin *Bey* was illustrative of this relationship between migration and childhood. Metin *Bey* is a 55-year-old man who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1978 when he was 13. He is the eldest of three siblings. Even before the dual citizenship applications, he has been regularly traveling to Bulgaria since he has enrolled in a Ph.D. program in a university there. He narrated the change in his life taking place as a result of migration as follows:

> "Imagine that you were very comfortable and free in the village [in Bulgaria]. You could play, you could wander around, you could have fun. You could have plenty of leisure time. But when you came here [to Turkey] as a child, you had no time to play anymore because you had to work and assist your family. At the same time, you had your school to go to. Thereby, it was difficult for us. It was a difficult period because all the family members had to work. A field should have been bought and a house should have been built as soon as possible. We saw that Turkey is not a place where everything will be easy at the moment you came. We had the idea that you can live a comfortable life in Turkey only if you work and make an effort. Thereby, we started to work at full force. [. . .] As children, we started to go to school. I waited for one semester to start school, but I didn't idle about. I started to work as a waiter in a tea house. Then, I quitted it because it was too tiring. And I started to work in a textile workshop. During our school period, we both worked and studied."

Similarly, Zülfiye *Hanım* also stressed out that the experience of migration was an ending point for her childhood period.

> "While I am telling you these things, I am thinking that I came here by leaving my childhood in Bulgaria. When we migrated here, we started to be regarded as grown-ups. Of course, our parents showed love and compassion, but they were absorbed in so many different things. . . Our childhood was over. I mean, my childhood was over at least. My childhood ended in Bulgaria."

The rupture which took place in the life course of migrants as a result of migration and the interruption of dreams and plans by the necessity of generating income became apparent mostly in the theme of education. Since dropping out of school or being only able to get educated in short-term periods are the most obvious consequences of migration on people's lifespan, it is possible to see that some participants reflected their deferred dreams on their children. In other words, they articulated in their narratives that they have valued their children's education a lot and paid specific attention to that. For instance, Renginar *Hanım* emphasized in various points of her narrative that she was unable to enjoy her childhood because of the necessity of taking responsibility at a very early age. Also, she narrated her two children's educational processes as follows:

> "I mean, we didn't make any mistakes regarding our children's lives in the sense of education. We guided them very correctly, very nicely. Maybe I couldn't have a good education but we, as parents, made sure our children to be educated well. Imagine that you send your thirteen-year-old child to a boarding school to Istanbul. It wasn't an easy decision. It was a very difficult thing to do. For my other son, studying medicine at Uludağ [University] was a possibility. We had just bought a car at that time. His father offered him to take the car key and go to Uludağ. But he wanted to go to Istanbul. He made his own choice. We could put pressure on him. We could say that we won't send you [to Istanbul]. We could do these things as parents, but we didn't. We paved the way for him. I think that we played a great role in our children's education, we did the right thing, we didn't make any mistakes. And in our extended family, we are seen as a family whose children have been educated very well. But we struggled a lot; we made a great effort. I mean, we spent most of our time on our children. We lived our whole life according to their education."

In this narrative, it is possible to see a direct relation between Renginar *Hanım*'s inability to have education in a way which she might have wished to and her willingness to enable her children to shape their educational lives in the best possible manner. In other words, it seems that she looks for compensation and the completion of her interrupted dreams in her children's lives. This situation was not unique to the narrative of Renginar *Hanım*. As the discourse of being unable to enjoy childhood appeared in more than one narrative as I have exemplified above, the reflection of deferred dreams on children's lives has been a very descriptive aspect of my fieldwork. This has created a situation that I choose to call living life as a *family-being* instead of an individual-being. Karl Marx (2009), in his work called *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, describes humankind as a species-being . Although

he provides a multidimensional and an enriched discussion on this description, his following lines inspired me to read these narratives through the above-mentioned approach:

> "Death seems to be a harsh victory of the species over the definite individual and to contradict their unity. But the determinate individual is only a determinate species being, and as such mortal (Marx 2009, 106)."

I read this statement as that the existence of an ending date for human life makes humans live as species. Because of the mortality, unity can be searched and achieved only in the continuity of generations, not in the lifespan of a single individual. In a similar manner, in the narratives which I focus on, first-generation migrants whose life had been interrupted by the experience of migration could look for unity and continuity only through the inclusion of children's lives into the equation. In other words, the evaluation of life and the measurement of success do not appear to be an individually calculated phenomenon. Instead, the achievements which could be reached have been measured as a family-being.

At this point, one counterargument would be that an attempt to provide a better life for children is not unique to migrant families. It goes without saying that parents who did not experience migration, too, might strive to present the best possible future for their children. However, my argument is not that there is a certain parenting style that is peculiar to *muhacir* people and which entails paying great attention to the wellbeing of children. Instead, I argue that children are situated to a very significant point to tell what kind of people *muhacirs* are. The narrative of the past, the greatness of difficulties, and the diligence of the narrators in the face of these challenges are woven into children's current positions and achievements. In other words, although any parent might be happy about and proud of their children's success, in the case which I focus on, the parents form their subjectivity and their life stories around these achievements. Their children's success becomes, in a way, the migrants' own success because they could provide these conditions to their descents even in the most challenging circumstances. Or, they could make it possible, through their never-ending efforts, maybe not for themselves, but for their children to reach a favorable position in their lives. This narrative appears to be constitutive of who they are and how they narrate their lives. This is why I prefer to call this condition as living as a *family-being*. Also, this is why intergenerational transmission carries great importance to comprehend and understand these narratives.

Nevertheless, I must also mention that these narratives might differ from each other, primarily due to of the influence of gender roles. For instance, in Renginar *Hanım*'s narrative, children occupy a very central position because she lived her life in a children-oriented way. When she said that "We lived our whole life according to their education," this way of living also encompasses her current conditions. As I noted before, she has two children living in Istanbul, one being married and one being a university student. She spends most of her time in Istanbul, in the home of her younger son, Ümit, so that she can manage the housework there while his son studies. She narrated in detail how she has prepared food and beverages while Ümit has gotten prepared for his final exams. She mentioned how she has washed the laundry and ironed the clothes in more than one house, one being her own home in Bursa and the other being her son's home in Istanbul. "Living life according to the education of children" becomes a very comprehensive and thorough organization in this sense. However, her husband, Fikri *Bey*, who also participated in this study, formed his life story mostly on his own experiences and standpoints. This does not mean that children's education was not significant for him. Quite the contrary, he spoke proudly of what his children could achieve by not underestimating his role and contribution to these processes. However, how he could financially support his family and how he could buy a house for Ümit in Istanbul in a favorable location became prominent in his narrative, instead of the works of laundry or cooking. Therefore, I argue that living as a family-being entails a gendered division of labor. Participants' ways of experiencing their family and their relationship with their children have been shaped according to these gender roles. Their narratives also have reflected these differences.

Until this moment, I have clarified that the narratives of challenging and difficult experiences have a constitutive feature regarding participants' self-perception. They narrated who they are with reference to their hard work to overcome those challenges. By doing so, they appealed to their children's achievements to provide an evaluation of their endeavors. However, it is also important to investigate whether migrants' children embrace this framework in order to analyze how these self-perceptions are turned into the identity of the *muhacir* community. My interview with Sinan, who is the son of Sümbül *Hanım*, was very rich to pursue such questions. I met with Sinan at his home in Istanbul, where he lives with his wife. He is in his 30s currently. During our interview, he had recently quitted his job for personal and political reasons. However, he spoke gladly about the educational and professional trajectory of his life. Sinan narrated how he relates to the *muhacir* identity as follows:

"It seems to be a nice identity for me. Namely, the thing you call *muhacir* is a migrant, you see? They move from one place, come here and build a new life. In the heat of the time, you don't realize the fact that you are a *muhacir* or whatsoever. You don't even know that it's an identity. It downs on you later when you look at things in a different way through another perspective that this is indeed an identity. If you ask why, well for me, our people are the winners, do you get it? They started from scratch, built a new life here, and raised their children... See, for instance, you do an MA at Sabancı University. A university that so many people adore almost as a divine place... I, too, attended a prestigious university in Istanbul. Then I have worked at a place again envied by so many people for ten years and have resigned on my own. When you look at things in this way, we are totally their children, right? So, in a way, we are the children of the ones who were despised, who weren't even given a job [after their migration to Turkey]. We came here and our families raised us. We, fortunately, succeeded in holding on to life. In this sense, I think they are very successful and have won in this life. This is an important thing to me."

In his narrative, Sinan also mentioned that he grew up in a neighborhood in Bursa where most people are migrants from Bulgaria. His parents have been good friends with several *muhacir* couples living around. Their children were around the same age as Sinan and became his best friends during his childhood and teenage years until he moved to Istanbul for his university education. In this sense, the *muhacir* identity was not an abstract concept for him. He went through the experience of living within a community whose members, for him, have been people he could personally know, speak with, play around and observe. In other words, he has based his idea of community on his real-life experiences and observations. However, the concept of community still carries an imagined character, with reference to my discussion on the understanding of Benedict Anderson (1991) regarding nations in the first chapter, especially because he included my position of being born to *muhacir* parents and having education in Sabancı University to his explanation of what kind of people *muhacirs* are. This imagination entailed several assumptions regarding my experiences, which have been unknown to him. To put it differently, he proceeded inductive reasoning based upon his experiences, but encompassing other *muhacir* people as a community. Then, he supported his point of view by revisiting his personal encounters and narrating his relationship with his mother, Sümbül *Hanım* as follows:

"One of the reasons why *muhacirs* dote upon their children this much is this fact, in my opinion. All of them left their childhood and youth

behind and came here. For instance, my parents came here while they were in secondary or high school age. Let me tell you about my mom's story. She used to be the most successful student at the school there. [. . .] And those below her at that time in terms of performance are now in special positions in Bulgaria. They are all higher in rank, above the social average, let's say... Well, my mom came here and started to work in a textile factory. She got retired as a worker and she is at home now. What I want to say is that she had left her own life to come here and that's the reason why they made a fuss over our lives. In a way, they have wished that we did all the things they couldn't. So, if you ask me what I remember of my childhood at primary school, it's our conflict, our fight with her. My mother used to tell me all the time that I should study. According to her, it was impossible to succeed without education. There was always a kind of pressure. She almost became my nightmare. However, now I can understand why she did that. When I look back to those years, I can see everything from another perspective. Now I can at least understand why she acted in that way. I don't say that she did it right, but I can understand her now."

As I stated above, I regard the narratives of the efforts made for children's well-being as a constitutive element of the participants' self-perception in the context of migration. However, when this perspective was multiplied in many interviews and when the children's narratives go with a similar understanding, the articulation of these efforts goes beyond the situation of being a mere self-perception. There appears an umbrella narrative that is descriptive of the *muhacir* identity. y. In this process, children become both the signifiers of the extent to which a *muhacir* family could become successful and the receivers of this community-based narrative. In other words, the idea of a community becomes an intergenerationally formed and transmitted notion. How children describe themselves and the community they feel belonging to directly relates to how their parents think about such matters. In the narratives of Sümbül *Hanım* and Sinan, it is possible to see a continuity in the sense of communal feelings. Sinan was informed about his mother's experiences and has recognized his mother's standpoint. Maybe he has not been acknowledging these practices to be right in every sense and has experienced conflicts with her mother adue to these differences. However, his narrative seems to me as an example of continuity in intergenerational transmission, instead of a rupture. Even though he was critical about his mother's "pressure" to make him study, he narrated the long-term result of these experiences, namely his university education and professional life, very gladly. In the end, he has been involved with the formation of an umbrella narrative describing the community.

4.3 Exploring Intergenerational Transmission Through a Focus on the Dual Citizenship

First-generation migrants' efforts to provide better living conditions and opportunities for their children are not limited to their investments in education. Although they narrated a good education and a successful professional life as the most valuable assets which they could give their children, dual citizenship applications too fit nicely into these endeavors. In general, when I asked the narrators, in our interviews, what motivated them to follow dual citizenship procedures, most of them replied, "We do it mainly for our children." The more detailed explanations covered a motivation to enable children to travel across Europe freely or to provide an opportunity for children to live abroad if they wish so. However, I find it problematic to evaluate first-generation migrants as mere transmitters and providers, whereas defining second-generation as silent receivers. The dialogues and relationships between parents and children include conflicts and contradictions, as well as continuities, in my opinion. The dual citizenship applications are not an exception to that. In this section, I intend to explore the intergenerational transmission by situating the second-generation migrants in an active position instead of the objects of a unidirectional transmission from parents towards their children. In other words, I set out to focus on the reciprocal elements that reveal conflicts as well as continuities in the relationships between migrant parents and their children.

Dual citizenship applications become convenient to investigate the reciprocity in the relationship between parents and their children in two ways. First, being a citizen of an EU member country is seen as an asset that can be literally transmitted from parents to their children. In other words, Turkey-born children, even though they have Bulgaria-born parents, cannot apply for Bulgarian citizenship, unless their parents have already acquired Bulgarian passports. Hence, in order to enable children to become EU citizens, parents should go through this process first. Secondly, the procedures of applications require regular visits to the lands where the applicants were born. Such processes cannot be evaluated by merely focusing on their pragmtical benefits. The emotional content stimulated by these visits should also be investigated. Hence, in this section, I will analyze the continuities and ruptures in the relationships between migrants and their children by focusing on these two aspects of dual citizenship.

Bahri *Bey*, who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1978 when he was a recently-married young adult, narrated his motivation to be Bulgarian-Turkish dual citizen

as follows:

> "I should state clearly that I am becoming a Bulgarian citizen only for my children and grandchildren. I don't do it for myself. Only in order to enable my children to have a Europe-related... Because my grandchildren are growing up. I have a grandchild who is in seventh grade currently. Maybe he will go to study abroad in the future. At least he will visit a European country. In these circumstances, he won't have any visa or passport issues. Once we become a citizen, their procedures will be easier. If it was up to me, I wouldn't become a citizen. What should I do with it from now on? To be clear, I wouldn't want it. But I do it for my daughters and my grandchildren. Do you understand it? We set our minds on this for the next generations."

The question of "What should I do with it from now on?" sets forth that Bahri *Bey* does not have any individual motivation to pursue these processes, because he is very-well settled in Bursa and he does not plan to change this situation. Additionally, the application process is a long-term and a kind of expensive endeavor which spreads over an approximately five-year period and which requires to spend 1500-2000 Euro per person except the expenditures deriving from regular travels to Bulgaria. Therefore, it becomes an investment in which the applicant puts money and effort into the future of children and grandchildren. In this sense, these processes can be evaluated as another practice, similar to the efforts made for children's education, resulting from the perception of life as a family-being instead of an individual-being.

Whereas Bahri *Bey* narrated his children's and grandchildren's wellbeing as his only motivation to become a Bulgarian-Turkish dual citizen, his wife, Rabia *Hanım* approached to the matter from a very different point of view:

> "I objected. I said, 'I can't insult Turkey.' I love Turkey. I said, 'I certainly can't insult Turkey. I don't want to be a dual citizen.' Only and solely Turkish citizenship! But I realized that things are not going well... And the children said, 'If you don't give a start to these procedures, we can't be dual citizens either.' Then, I said, in order to make use of this opportunity, 'We are starting.' I had blocked the process. Otherwise, we had already become citizens a long time ago. [...] This is how we decided. Bahri initiated the procedures for the children. What did I do? As an individual, I asked why I am not becoming a citizen. I said, 'I want to be a European citizen too.' Recently, I started too. [...] I have my mother there. My sister also lives there."

There are several remarkable implications in Rabia *Hanım*'s account. Firstly, she migrated to Turkey together with her husband's family by leaving her siblings and parents in Bulgaria. Living as an extended family right after the migration in addition to having elderlies as childcarers at home since most adults were working are widespread practices. However, in the case of Bahri *Bey* and Rabia *Hanım*, although they migrated to Turkey with Bahri *Bey*'s family, they decided to live in a separate house in a very short while. Additionally, they had one of their neighbors as a paid babysitter instead of grandparents who would take care of children voluntarily. Even in these conditions, which might have enhanced Rabia *Hanım*'s bond with Bulgaria because she has her relatives there, she regarded dual citizenship applications as an insult to Turkey. Additionally, she addressed "things" which "are not going well" as the reason for her delayed approval of this endeavor. Unfortunately, Rabia *Hanım* did not open up what she meant by "things" which "are not going well." However, my interview with her daughter, Ece, became illuminating for this question. Ece is a 39-year-old woman, currently married and has a teenage son. She narrated how she and her sister talked their parents into the applications as follows:

> "In the very beginning, Turkey's conditions were not so bad. Then, the coming of Syrians... In the neighborhood where we used to live, there are people from every section of society. There are people from the East, Blacksea, *muhacirs*, inhabitants... But the migration of Syrians and the course of Turkey together with our pressure... What will happen in the future? My child is growing up. Shouldn't he study at good schools? Deterioration of the educational system... We constantly tried to brainwash them [with reference to her parents]. Then, she [my mother] was convinced in a single night. I mean, she couldn't reject us. My sister put a lot of pressure too. We said, 'Mom, don't you care about us? Think of our children. Think of our future. Maybe, we go abroad in the future and make ourselves comfortable.' We could finally persuade them like this."

In addition to "the coming of Syrians" and "the deterioration of the educational system," Ece was also critical about the economic conditions, violations of freedom of speech and several governmental discourses especially on the coup attempt on July 15, 2016, in different moments of our interview. In this way, the things which are not going well acquired a more concrete character. However, she does not have any settled plan to live abroad. Instead, she and her husband want to live in a coastal town in Izmir after they are retired. In such a framework, the applications also become an attempt to create a Plan B for the family because "things are not going well" in Turkey. Nevertheless, these quotations illustrate that the asset of

dual citizenship is not necessarily provided by the migrant parents to their children without any contradiction or negotiation. Instead, the migrants might not be very willing to undertake these procedures because it is too much work, because it is expensive, because it is unnecessary at that point of their life, or because it appears to be an insult to Turkey, where they migrated to very voluntarily as they narrated. They are currently conducting these application procedures, nevertheless. This instance displays that dual citizenship might be something for which children were insistent and demanding. Hence, I argue that living as a family-being does not necessarily refer to certain assets being transmitted from parents to their children. Instead, these relationships are constructed reciprocally. Dual citizenship might be an opportunity demanded by the children. Only then, in some cases, parents might initiate the processes.

However, this can be only one dimension of an account focusing on dual citizenship applications. Not including how applicants feel about their visits to Bulgaria and how children are involved in these processes would cause serious shortcomings. The transmission of past events by people who either experienced or witnessed those happenings to the younger generations is an important component for the construction of an idea of community. How younger generations relate to a community-based identity and how they orient themselves in the present in relation to the past can be analyzed through a glance at the collective memory (Achugar 2016). Parent-child relationships are a significant factor in the shaping of the perception of self for second-generation. However, how children situate themselves in the world and in society is not limited to their interactions with their parents. The multiplicity of interactions with plenty of actors might determine to what extent children embrace the narratives regarding the past in Bulgaria.

The applications for dual citizenship have multiplied the number of travels to Bulgaria. These travels have revealed some emotional content, brought past into the present, and increased the frequency of Bulgaria-related stories told by migrants to their children. Additionally, they have made the narrators negotiate and question their sense of belonging. For instance, Zülfiye *Hanım*'s narrative about how she felt during these travels goes as follows:

> "My first visit was great excitement. So were the next ones. It means so much to me to go there, walk through the streets and squares, and breathe in the air. Sometimes I feel like I live here [in Turkey] temporarily and will one day continue my life there [in Bulgaria]. This is, of course, a matter of preference. I can do such a thing if I want to, but all of my roots are here now. There are not many people left there. Social circle

is important to me. My family is here. I cannot get too far from them. Still, for touristic purposes or a temporary period to stay, we now have a chance to go. This opportunity is given to us. So, I will go. Each time I go there, I enjoy myself so much."

This part in my interview with Zülfiye *Hanım* was almost like a monologue during which I, as an interviewer, almost ceased to exist while she was responding to her own thoughts about where she should live. The feeling that she lives in Turkey temporarily and will continue her life in Bulgaria perfectly indicates that although she spent more than forty years in Turkey where she formed plenty of material and emotional bonds, she finds herself in a comparison of two places when she visited Bulgaria. During her travels, her past in Bulgaria has called her, but she has reminded herself that her "roots" are in Turkey now. She also stressed out that her elder son, Murat, who visited Bulgaria with his family when he was 8, is very curious about and fond of the way of living there. However, Murat expressed his lack of curiosity as follows:

"There is a bridge in Bulgaria, the importance of which is too much for my parents. [. . .] It is a bridge on the Arda [River], the Devil's Bridge. During its construction, too many workers died because of intense rains and the rise of Arda. 20 people or 30 people. . . Then, songs and ballads were singed for those events. Now, there is a well-shaped bridge there. And it is, for my parents. . . For example, there is a picture of the Devil's Bridge in the living room at our home. I can't exactly understand why. I guess it has been too important for my parents. The Devil's Bridge has always been a part of our lives. I have never wondered about it and I didn't ask the details. I mean, I am not genuinely curious about it. They tell and I always hear those things. Both my father and mother love to tell their childhood memories and how Bulgaria was. But, because these are not very interesting to me, I don't listen very carefully. I just say, 'Yes' and go on. . . "

Whereas the water and the hills of Rhodopes are the coordinates of life in Bulgaria for my grandmother, as I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the Devil's Bridge might be regarded as the symbol representing the life in Bulgaria for Zülfiye *Hanım.* When she left where she was born, she carried her home on her back by putting a picture of the bridge on the wall in her home. However, her son, Murat has not been sharing her enthusiasm at this point. In a sense, there appears a rupture and a discontinuity in intergenerational transmission, which might be exemplified in more detail through Murat's opinions about visiting Bulgaria:

"Once my father, my mother and I went to Bulgaria when I was 8. But, I don't remember it clearly. Yet, I really want to go there. If there occurs an opportunity, I will. But, not to the part that... My parents' homes don't seem attractive to me. [...] But my mother says, "Let's go to Bulgaria and see those places." Alright, let's go. But for you, that house has value. For me, it doesn't. I mean, it's just a building. I can't express this to my parents. They certainly and constantly want to visit those places. And this is not very interesting to me. [...] There are very beautiful places on the seaside near the Black Sea [in Bulgaria]. I want to go to those places. Let's go and see those lands. What will we do on the mountain? There is a mountain in Bursa too. We can go and see it. I mean, I understand them. They spent their childhood there. This is very important for them. My mother is still... Although she constantly goes to Bulgaria, she gets emotional when she saw something related. She starts to tell, 'Look, such a thing happened in that place and another thing happened in this place...' But this is not very alluring for me. I mean, I don't have any memory there. I just look [at the pictures]. The house is a normal house. Just the nature is very beautiful there. I mean, one really wants to live there. Its nature is wonderful. But, that's it! Just nature. [...] But it is not alluring. I don't know. At least for me... Because I feel like... For example, let's say we went to Bulgaria. When we get there, I would want to see historical places such as museums... I like these things. But we will go to the mountains and look at the houses. OK, maybe this is also history, but my mother's history. I mean, when there is the history of a country, I don't want to see the history of my mother. At least, it is not interesting for me."

Murat, in our interview, was very articulate about his disinterest in his family's past in Bulgaria. He clarified that he does not have any emotional connection with those lands and does not feel any homely engagement with Bulgaria. His mother's home there seems to him as a mere physical building. He does not have the personal history and emotional attachment he considers necessary to make that house a home for himself. Therefore, he regards Bulgaria only as a possible departure point of a touristic journey. In this sense, different generations share the excitement regarding the practical benefits of dual citizenship applications. However, the symbolic meanings of travels to Bulgaria and the emotionality surrounding the application processes do not necessarily appear in Turkey-born children's narratives. Instead, they perceive Bulgarian citizenship as a mere instrument to become an EU citizen. Hence, they do not go along with the joy and excitement which their parents experience.

4.4 Community Formation Processes Through the Transmission of Otherization Mechanisms within Intergenerational Relationships

One of the most significant aspects of intergenerational transmission is the formation of a sense of "us". People might embrace a sense of belonging to various communities or identify themselves with many different groups throughout their lives. However, a description of who we are inevitably starts within the family, although it might be maintained or negated in the later phases of a lifespan. In this sense, community and identity do not appear as given or natural phenomena that people born into. Instead, they are formed through the acceptance of certain norms and values, embracement of a historical narrative, construction of a sense of "we," and transmission of those to the children. Most importantly, the formation of a community appears to be a dynamic process that relies not only on how people describe themselves and their fellow members but also how they differentiate their attributes from the others. In other words, the community is constructed through discursive processes that make a differentiation between "us" and "them." These discursive differentiations take place "in the everyday world" which is described as space "where we confront the concrete 'other' in the most immediate and direct sense, and where the individual acquires a coherent identity and selfhood" by Henri Lefebvre (quoted in Gardiner 2000, 76). In this section, I will delve into the mechanisms of differentiation, which describe *muhacirs* as a community through a focus on intergenerational relationships. These mechanisms do not rely on a stable and concrete "other," but are prone to be re-produced and re-formed with reference to different "others" in the moment of everyday encounters. In other words, there exist limitless ways of describing "who we are" within a comparison to Syrians who have migrated to Turkey since 2011, to inhabitants living in Turkey, to earlier Bulgaria-born migrants who went through different experiences, so on and so forth. Therefore, I will analyze the factors and the power relations surrounding these encounters that are very dynamic in nature.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

In my interview with Bahri *Bey*, I asked him about his housing conditions after he migrated to Turkey. After he told his long history of moving from one house to the other, he mentioned that, before he moved into his current house, he was living in a multistoreyed building with his married daughter in a neighborhood where most of the population had initially been composed of *muhacirs*. However, he decided to sell that house and buy two separate flats, one for himself and one for his daughter's family, in another part of Bursa. He narrated this process as follows:

"Now, if I tell you why I sold this house, I only did it for my children because the district became too mixed. So many Syrians have come. I saw that my grandchildren got more and more intertwined with them. So, I came here only for my grandchild, not for myself. That place has changed so drastically. I mean, my dear, when you go out, it is nearly all Arabia [...] What should I do among them? What if my children become like them eventually? We have an idiom for it: The grape becomes rotten by looking at the next grain.[1] This is the way of things. So, you have to make sacrifices to protect your children. Moving to another place is, of course, not that alluring. However, when the time comes, you should act swiftly and change it. I am really comfortable here now. Look, there is no sound, no noise, absolutely nothing."

I think Bahri *Bey*'s account embraces two crucial implications. First, the wellbeing of children and grandchildren was regarded as an important factor in the processes of decision-making and acting regarding housing conditions. However, secondly and more importantly, this wellbeing was threatened by Syrians' existence in the neighborhood, as he narrated. It appears to be an example of how Syrians who have been migrating to Turkey starting from 2011 as a result of the civil war in Syria have constituted "the other" in the processes of community formation of *muhacirs*. This entity of "other", namely Syrians, has represented a form of "danger" and motivated Bahri *Bey* to sell his house and move to another location. The question here is not whether Syrians are threatening people who make the neighborhood a more dangerous place. Instead, this is a matter of describing the neighborhood as "the purified space of community" and denominating the Syrians as "strangers" who threaten this purity (Ahmed 2000, 22). In other words, what makes Syrians "dangerous" is that they are located in proximity and they dared to come this close by violating the community's borders. However, as Sara Ahmed (1999, 21) argues, the community does not appear as a predefined entity, but becomes formed and consolidated in the very moment of this encounter through the "demarcation" of dwellers, on the one hand, and strangers, on the other.

During my fieldwork and in my personal or familial relationships with Bulgaria-born migrants, I have encountered plenty of contexts that Syrians' existence in Turkey was described as an unwanted condition without presenting any causality as if this is the idea that should be shared without questioning. Likewise, Bahri *Bey* put this situation forward as a reason for his decision to move his house. He did not provide any further explanation. However, his daughter, Ece, was a lot more articulate about her position towards this phenomenon:

---

[1] "*Üzüm üzüme baka baka kararır*" is a Turkish idiom used to express that the people who spend a lot of time together start to resemble each other in terms of temperament and character.

"Now that these Syrians keep coming, there is unavoidably a lot of discussions going on. Especially to us, 'You came [from somewhere else], too,' they say, 'We have accepted you.' It's true; we came indeed. Whose daughter did we attack, who did we rape? Did we ever break into your house and rob you? Did we break into your store and take your goods? What did we do? Nothing! We did absolutely nothing. We only worked. And what did you do instead? You accused us of working hard. What did your wives say? 'Look, *muhacirs* have come all and even their wives are working. Because of them, we have been obliged to work, too.' All these have been said; it's not a lie. *Muhacirs* are indeed hardworking. They work both at home and work. They work everywhere. They like to build a home. Our *muhacirs* like to have a guarantee. That's for sure. You know the saying, in a way they like to have their *kefen*[2] money ready. Then they feel at ease. They don't need anything else. Who, among the *muhacirs*, did go from door to door and beg for money? Their wives didn't appreciate any work. Ours went to cleaning, went to wholesale market halls. They did *kırişi*[3]. Those on the other hand? They don't have any proper education. They don't know how to speak eloquently. They don't know how to behave in public. What should we do? Do they expect to become managers in the factories? They sit in front of the housedoors with gums in their mouth all the time. Isn't it so? Your parents should have toiled and moiled too, when they came, I assume."

Ece, here, addressed a concept of "we" in the face of two different entities, which might be described as "them." First, she spoke to inhabitants in Turkey as her audience and she responded to certain possible statements that identify *muhacirs* with Syrians based on the experience of migration. She described in what ways *muhacirs* are different from Syrians while displaying not-so-latent anger and hatred. She associated rape, robbery, housebreaking, and thievery with Syrians in Turkey. By doing so, she pushed Syrians to complete silence and did not even recognize them as her addressees. She formed her sentences in a way to speak to the inhabitants in Turkey. In other words, she presented a hierarchy between two different "others" in the face of "us", namely the inhabitants and the Syrians. Syrians were situated at the bottom of this categorization. Her anger, hence, was stimulated by the inhabitants' statements, which might compare or identify *muhacirs* to these people who do not even know "how to speak or how to behave in public" in her point of view. Secondly, she differentiated her community-based identity from the inhabitants of Turkey by focusing on women's practices of working. However, at some point, which "other"

---

[2] *Kefen* is a white fabric used to wrap deceased people before their burial.

[3] *Kırişi* is an expression which literally means working outside. It is used to refer to working in vegetable fields or fruit gardens on a daily basis. This practice is narrated as that *muhacirs* started to go to kırişi on the weekend or their day-offs after they find a regular job in order to save more money for the housebuilding expenses.

was differentiated from "us" in which sense got blurred. The multiplicity of ways of forming a community in the face of different "others" emphasizes the dynamic character of the processes of community formation. Hence, the community becomes a fluid and intangible entity that is discursively produced in contrast to the "other." Eventually, these discourses become the carriers of identity, which help transmit it from parents to children intergenerationally. When Ece said, "Yes, we came [from somewehere else] indeed," she embraced this intergenerationally transmitted identity, although she was born in Turkey and did not come from anywhere else.

Finally, I think there is one more point requiring to be addressed in these accounts. What I highlighted until this point explains neither such a bold action of Sami *Bey* of moving a house nor such anger or hatred expressed by Ece. Notwithstanding that discrimination and otherization against Syrians are widespread practices all across society, I think that there is one missing element to comprehend these reactions thoroughly. At this point, I believe that one of my personal encounters will help fill this gap. Approximately two years ago, I was in a taxi, in Bursa, the driver of which was ceaselessly talking about how the arrival of Syrians terribly affected the country, what kind of "coward" people they are, how they could leave their homeland behind and came here, by simultaneously looking for approval by me. At some point, I felt obliged to comment and said that "I don't understand why we expect these people to stay in Syria and fight who knows to what end. My parents had an experience of migrancy too. As far as I listened to, it isn't an easy thing to go through. No one would probably wish to live this." He asked me where I am from. I replied, "I was born and raised in Bursa, but my parents are from Bulgaria." He asked me how many siblings I have. I answered, "One." He smiled and only said, "You see." Apparently, a higher authority compared my family's procreation tendencies with another migrant group and decided that I am in the cluster of acceptable migrants while Syrians are not. This is why, in my opinion, Ece has shown such anger and lost her clarity about who she was talking about and who she was addressing. Although she articulated plenty of discriminatory sentences, which can easily be evaluated as hate speech, about Syrians, her main problem was not actually directly with them. Instead, she has had a more severe problem with the inhabitants who make such comparisons and decide who is acceptable and who is not. The comparison itself seems like an insult to her since she does not recognize Syrian migrants as her equal. Thus, she suddenly stopped talking about what kind of people Syrians are and turned to the inhabitants "whose wives become obliged to work" since *muhacir* women went to cleaning and *kırışi* or worked in wholesale marketing halls. The inhabitants who see themselves able to make such comparisons, disturbed her because it addressed a hierarchy among people by stating who belongs to these lands and who is out

of space. In the end, Ece reacted to this exclusion from a claim over belonging to Turkey. However, by doing so, she has reproduced these mechanisms of exclusion by marking another community, namely Syrians, as stranger figures who do not belong to Turkey. The parallelism in the accounts of Bahri *Bey* and Ece illustrated very well that the formation of communities based on the discourses of otherization is an intergenerationally transmitted phenomenon.

The incidence that Bulgaria-born migrants feel as an outsider has not been unique to the comparisons between migrant groups. An important component of this feeling as an outsider is the continuous feeling of insecurity. It generates an idea that migrants' condition of being accepted might be questioned and re-evaluated, especially during turbulent times. Hence, they might feel a necessity to develop certain strategies to overcome these questionings and possible exclusions. These strategies go beyond the individualistic coping mechanisms and might turn into community-based reflexes which can also be traced through a cross-reading of the narratives of unrelated first-generation and second-generation participants. The narratives of Sümbül *Hanım* and Murat are great examples of similar reflexes to different questions in entirely different contexts. Sümbül *Hanım* is one of the first-generation migrant participants of this study, who migrated from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1978. This was when armed and unarmed conflicts between leftists and rightist groups were increasing day by day. She narrated her experience regarding this period as follows:

> "As I said, there were conflicts between rightists and leftists. One gets anxious and concerned since we didn't see such a thing. If they ask you... You don't know whether the person who asks is a rightist or a leftist. If you say that you are a rightist, he might do something to you. If you say leftist, he might do something else. So, we used to say that we are Atatürkist[4]."

Murat, on the other hand, is the son of Zülfiye *Hanım* and does not have any connection with Sümbül *Hanım*. He was born in 1992 and lives in Istanbul, where he also continues his university education. I asked him whether he remembers anything specific about his parents' warnings and pieces of advice. His narrative goes as follows:

---

[4]Although Kemalist is a more common term to refer to people who embrace and follow the principles and doctrines of the Turkish leader, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, especially in English texts, there is a little difference between Kemalist and Atatürkist in the Turkish language. The former addresses a political stance and engagement, whereas the latter is seen as an understanding which should be embraced by every living Turkish citizen especially throughout 20th century. Hence, being an Atatürkist is supposed to one to avoid any possible conflict. Therefore, I preferred to stick to the Turkish expression and chose to make a straightforward translation.

"My mother used to tell me that 'Look, my son, if someone asks you in the future. . . ' There were consecutive elections one after another at that time. I mean, 'If someone asks you which party you voted for or which party you support, you don't have to answer.' She adviced me to just say things like 'I love Atatürk. I love Atatürk's principles.' I grew up like this."

The first narrative displays that there was a pragmatic appeal to the name of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk with a hope that it will provide a safety net during politically turbulent times. Considering that Bulgaria-born Turks migrated to Turkey from a socialist country between 1969-1978, they might have easily been associated with the left-wing. Some participants narrated that they were labeled as communists or Bulgarians right after their migration. Especially if they were over 18 years old and worked in governmental occupations in Bulgaria, they underwent detailed investigations after their arrival to Turkey. In such an environment, being an Atatürkist was probably seen as a secure position supposed to keep one away from trouble and make one belong. When it comes to Murat's narrative, his mother's advice shows that appealing to Atatürk as a safe word was not unique to Sümbül *Hanım*, but a widely implemented strategy. Murat related such advice with the conditions of the period when general elections, local elections, and presidential elections followed each other. However, in my opinion, this warning also includes a concern regarding freedom of speech. Maybe Murat's mother, Zülfiye *Hanım*, was anxious that if her son expresses his political position, he might get harmed. Hence, she returned to her past reflexes for getting free of political questions and advised her son to follow a similar path.

To analyze the discourses of discrimination and otherization against Syrians as well as the strategic appeals to the name of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, I find Barış Ünlü's conceptualization of Turkishness as a contract beneficial (Ünlü 2018). He does not discuss Turkishness as an ethnicity, citizenship, national identity, or ideological belonging. Instead, he evaluates the phenomenon as a contract that regulates the ways of seeing, thinking, speaking, behaving, and feeling. This contract grants several privileges to those situated within its scope and who participate in the reproduction of these ways of seeing, thinking, speaking, behaving, and feeling (Ünlü 2018, 208-235). The migration of the Turks of Bulgaria to Turkey makes their position in regard to the contract of Turkishness ambiguous. Although they are of Turkish ethnicity, they encountered several instances that they were not recognized as Turks but labeled as Bulgarians, particularly by the inhabitants. Hence, I argue that participants' discriminatory statements against Syrians and public appeals to the name of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk bear an attempt to claim to be within the contract of

Turkishness. These narratives display how migrants and their children construct a sense of belonging in Turkey by assimilating into the dominant discourses.

Finally, I will concentrate on the marital issues, which is an important zone for community formation since the possible future partners of next generations determine the borders of a community. All first-generation migrant participants of this study are married to Bulgaria-born migrants without exception. However, it is not the case for second-generation participants. Among the six people who I interviewed, only two participants are currently married, namely Sinan and Ece. Neither of their spouses has any relation with Bulgaria. Two other participants, additionally, have steady partners in their lives, who were not born to Bulgaria-born migrant parents either. These situations have created different forms of encounters in different families. For instance, Rabia *Hanım*, Ece's mother, has two daughters. Whereas Ece is married to a non-migrant person from Kastamonu, Rabia *Hanım*'s other daughter is married to a man of *muhacir* community. Rabia *Hanım* narrated this situation as follows:

> "I never make any distinction between them. One is an old migrant, the other is a local, but I don't prefer him to the other. This one [with reference to his local son-in-law] is also a good guy. Both of my sons-in-law are nice people. Still, the local one has a special place for me. People know us as mother and son. [...] They have been married for fifteen years. We all live together. God bless him; I don't change him for anybody. So, the most important thing for me is that he is a good person. It doesn't matter where he is from... I also see negative things among migrants. So, the most important point is that they are good human beings. God bless him. He never raised his voice in front of us. Of course, we also treated him accordingly. Everything is mutual, still some people don't know what reciprocity is. Thank God, we are good to each other. He doesn't say mother (*anne*) but mommy (*anneciğim*) to me. He is, in fact, the son of our family. So is it..."

However, in my opinion, there is an important point here that should not be overlooked. Ece's husband lost his parents at a very early age, even before he reached adulthood. Therefore, in this example, marriage does not appear as the merging of families, but involvement of one man into the family. Additionally, even in these circumstances, Ece's father, Bahri *Bey* came up against this marriage at first, as Ece narrated as follows:

"Shall I tell you something? My father didn't want me to marry my husband. You will ask why. Previously, there was a *muhacir* mentality. You know, they say, he should be a *muhacir*... But now, he is very content. I asked my father, 'What will happen? Everyone marries into *muhacir* and then what?' At that period, my father investigated thoroughly to learn what kind of people they are [with reference to people from Kastamonu]. He asked his acquaintances. They [with reference to her parents] called [their acquaintances] and said, 'Ece is seeing a guy, but he is from Kastamonu. We don't know anyone from that place. What kind of people are they? Are they good or bad?' And they [the acquaintances] responded, 'They are certainly republican and nationalist people. We didn't hear anything bad about them. They are very good.' And yes. His family is also very good. I mean, at first, there was prejudice. Do their women wear a headscarf? Can we sit and talk together? But they are exactly like us. Our family structure is the same. I mean, we can even drink alcohol together."

According to this narrative, although Bahri *Bey* and Ece share certain communal sentiments based on the otherization of inhabitants and Syrians, they also have differences in their opinions, which determine their choices regarding their lives. Such a discontinuity also addresses reciprocity through which the first generation's point of view is revisited and might be changed. Another instance for the reciprocal and idea-changing relationship between the parent and the child is Fikri *Bey*'s narrative which goes as follows:

"One of my sons got married, for example. Let me put it clearly: Our bride is from Black Sea region. She was born and raised in Ankara. She studied in Istanbul. But, I don't know... I would wish her to be a migrant. My younger son also has a friend. She is from Antalya. They said very clearly, "We won't care about whether they are migrants or not. We choose life partners." I mean, this is their own decision. But for me, this was a certain condition. For instance, if Renginar wouldn't be my wife, someone else would, but she would certainly be a migrant. I mean, the mentality of our families gets along. It isn't a problem for my children. Why? We have intermingled with the culture here for 40 years, 45 or 46 years. So, it won't be a problem for our co-in-laws. But, for my parents, it would be. Look, my elder sister got married to a migrant of 1951. He is also a migrant. But, conflicts occurred, although they are migrants. I don't count the people who came in 1951 as migrants. They had not seen anything in Bulgaria. According to what my father told me, they [with reference to Bulgarian authorities] made a move to develop education in Bulgaria after 1952, 1953, 1954. I mean, an incredible acceleration until 1978... And these people didn't see it, didn't experience the culture of communism, weren't whipped up by it.

They came here and turned into *manavs*[5]. I mean, they aren't different, in any sense, from inhabitants. Are they migrants from Bulgaria? Come on!"

Considering that romantic partnerships and marriages are an essential mark to trace the components of the community formation practices, the narratives of Ece and Fikri *Bey* address a rupture between the perspectives of first-generation migrants and their Turkey-born children. Bahri *Bey* and Fikri *Bey* have more solid categorizations regarding insiders and outsiders of a community. These categorizations, although dynamic and inclined to be reshaped in different encounters, play a significant role in decision-making processes. For the next generations, on the other hand, inmarriage seems to be outdated. Maybe because second-generation participants have socialization practices that go beyond the limits of *muhacir* community or perhaps since they do not pay any attention to such criteria, their narratives included practices of friendships or partnerships with people who are not from *muhacir* community too.

4.5 Belonging in Terms of Space and Time

What does make us feel that we are at home in a certain place or a specific time? According to Agnes Heller (1995, 5), homeliness entails an "emotional disposition," which includes familiarity in terms of what we see, what we hear, and what we smell. The feeling of being at home also requires being familiar with the language, not only as being able to speak and understand the language which has been spoken but also as being comfortable with silences and being able to comprehend the meanings which have not been told through speech (Heller 1995, 6). Accordingly, the sense of belonging and the feeling of homeliness might be analyzed through a space-centered perspective by focusing on the places that carry these emotional dispositions. However, Heller also argues that it is possible to see "a move away from a spatial notion of home and towards a temporal one" starting from the 19th century (Chowers 2002, 234). In other words, the idea that "geography is destiny" was abandoned for the sake of an understanding that one's life might be shaped through the manifold possibilities all around the world. Heller describes this matter which she calls "social contingency" as follows:

---

[5] *Manav* is an expression used by *muhacirs* to refer to the inhabitants of Turkey mostly in a pejorative sense.

88

"Modern men begin to experience their social contingency as the question mark that now replaces the fixed spatiality (country, city, rank) of their *appointed destiny*. The future is opened up as undetermined space, which is, at first, an uncanny space, the dark niche that may contain the riches of the Orient, yet also contain unforeseeable doom. If one accepts one's *appointed place* on earth, the fixed framework of all the person's choices, whether easy or difficult, are set. Moderns perceive this limitation as unfreedom. The appointed place is unfree–the self-appointed place is free. Freedom, in this sense, means one embraces contingency as the opening up of infinite possibilities (Heller 1995, 4, emphasis added)."

Although I find Heller's approach to the relationship between space and the destiny very illuminating, the matter of appointment has operated quite differently in the conceptions of first-generation migrant participants of this study. Considering the migration from Bulgaria to Turkey, as I have discussed in detail in the first chapter, the mass movement of people was narrated in a way that they move towards the appointed place, instead of leaving the *appointed place* behind in a pursuit of freedom. This appointment was framed within a nationalist discourse suggesting that Turks should live in Turkey. However, "unforeseeable doom" was still a possibility since the appointed place, namely Turkey, was unknown for many people prior to the migration. In this sense, Turkey represented the dream country where Bulgaria-born migrants could actualize themselves since they would no longer be a minority group in the country in which they will live. However, they experienced different forms of otherization, which occupied very little room in their narratives. As I mentioned in the second chapter, this resulted from the continuing practice of homing even in the moment of narrativization. When participants noted that they are happy to be migrants raised in Bulgaria, but eventually came to Turkey, they kept making Turkey their home by avoiding the contents making them feel unhomely in these lands.

Given this framework regarding the decision and the narrativization of migration, first-generation migrants started to visit Bulgaria where they were born. Although they told me that they are happy about living in Turkey, in my opinion, regular visits to Bulgaria initiated a negotiation regarding the feeling of homeliness. In other words, it created a situation of constantly being "there and back again," in the words of Bilbo Baggins (Tolkien 2012), which enhanced a feeling of fragmentedness. At this point, since I believe that it is a manifestation of the negotiation over home, I find it necessary to revisit Zülfiye *Hanım*'s monologue over where she does belong to, which was exemplified and discussed above. In order to briefly remind, Zülfiye *Hanım*, while narrating her first travel to Bulgaria, mentioned that she felt as if she temporarily lives in Turkey and will one day continue her life in Bulgaria. However,

she highlighted that her roots are in Turkey now, including her family and her social circle. She would not want to get too far from them, she said. This negotiation addresses the dynamism and fluidity in the sense of belonging. However, what is questioned is not future possibilities which can be opened up through a move away from the *appointed destiny*, but already existing emotional attachments to the life in Turkey and the past in Bulgaria. In other words, spatial elements appear to be the anchor of the feeling of homeliness.

However, when it comes to the narratives of Turkey-born children, it becomes possible to see a shift in the forms of belonging especially through a discussion on where they plan to dwell in in the future. This shift mostly derives from uncertainty and ambiguity in those ideas that are not even close to constituting a concrete plan. Four among six Turkey-born participants of this study noted that they wish to live abroad after graduating from university. When I asked them to tell more about these desires, Ümit, younger son of Renginar *Hanım* and Fikri *Bey* responded as follows, for instance:

> "Actually, it is a little bit undetermined for me right now. I think of it as somewhere except Istanbul. I think of it as abroad or as somewhere in Turkey except Istanbul. [. . .] I don't feel comfortable here anymore. From the moment that you leave home in the morning until the moment that you get home again in the evening, you feel the crowd wherever you go during the whole day. So, I don't lean towards the idea of living in Istanbul. But, I should not speak very certainly. For example, Bursa seems attractive to me. Or if it becomes possible, living abroad would be a lot better."

In similarity with Ümit's response, Murat also noted that he could live "anywhere but Istanbul" after graduation. Yet, he made it clear that he prefers to go abroad if he can manage, as Ümit also did. They related their unwillingness to live in Istanbul also with the bomb attacks, which took place very frequently in different cities in Turkey between July 2015 and December 2016. Indeed, the rapid transformation which Istanbul and Turkey went through politically, economically, and environmentally weakened people's attachments to these geographies. However, these transformations have not been experienced only by Turkey-born children, but also by their parents. Although first- and second-generation participants witness and live through the same conditions in the country, their responses to these incidences have been quite different. When I asked Bulgaria-born participants whether they plan to live in Bulgaria in particular or in Europe in general, they mostly stated that they know how hard it is to start from scratch and do not want to do it one

more time. What matters to them is what they have built in Turkey for themselves. These efforts and investments, both in material and emotional senses, make Turkey home for them. When it comes to their children, on the other hand, home is not where your past lies but instead where the future can flourish. Experiencing Turkey as a less secure and more unpredictable place is directly related to the limitation of future possibilities. As a result, second-generation participants feel unsure about whether they can actualize themselves in these lands.

Whereas self-actualization seems possible only through a movement away from this appointed destiny for four participants, the accounts of the other two people were a little bit different. First and foremost, they are married and, hence, have more settled lives within which they do not seem to be in-between-places. Therefore, they seemed less willing to leave Turkey and make a fresh start somewhere else. However, this does not mean that self-actualization is not a matter for them. For instance, Sinan stressed out in our interview that he does not want to live abroad because he earns his living by writing in Turkish. In other words, he can actualize his dreams and plans in Turkey because this is the country where he can write. Additionally, he is not indifferent about dual citizenship applications but wants to have it in order to be able to travel without paying any money for visa applications. Either to live abroad or for a touristic trip, going to Europe more easily thanks to dual citizenship appears to be a horizon-widening experience that augments possibilities.

Considering the increasing influence of future possibilities in the construction of the idea of home especially in second-generation participants, space loses its importance in homemaking processes. It is replaced by another attachment, which is articulated as belonging to the "global present" by Heller (1995). Accordingly, people, who embody less and less spatial attachments, form a temporal sense of belonging, which corresponds to a feeling at home at any place in the world through the globally shared spirit of the time and the culture (Chowers 2002). Eventually, this situation creates "geographical promiscuity" (Heller 1995), which finds its counterpart in my fieldwork in the phrase of "anywhere but Istanbul." This promiscuity, in my opinion, appears to be the most significant rupture between first- and second-generations. People who had personally experienced the migration expressed that they do not wish to "start from scratch one more time" to make another place their home. They invested their lives in an endeavor to make a home out of Bursa. Remaking it at another place appears to be too much work. For their children, on the other hand, the desired condition seems to be that "Home is behind, the world ahead. . . "[6] as articulated in

---

[6]Although it is not directly related to my study or my arguments, I frequently recalled J.R.R. Tolkien's classic books of *The Hobbit, or There and Back Again* and *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy. The way adventure is described in those literary works resembles a lot to the second generation's understanding of the future. Similar to Hobbits' embarking on an unpredictable journey, the second-generation participants

Pippin's song (*Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* 2003).

---

do not know what will happen when they go, do not have any exact idea about where to go, but cannot do without going.

5. CONCLUSION

In this thesis study, I have intended to investigate the idea of home and the sense of belonging within the framework of dual citizenship application processes of Turkish migrants of 1969-1978 from Bulgaria as well as the second generation, namely migrants' Turkey-born children. My initial argument has been from the very beginning that the applications for dual citizenship are noteworthy processes, mainly because they create a room to negotiate the past and the future as well as the present circumstances through the requirement of regular travels to Bulgaria. These negotiations are directly intertwined with where people feel at home and how they make efforts to pass certain things to their children. These things to be transmitted to the next generations include certain assets, firstly. A good education, a favorable professional life, decent living conditions, an ability to travel freely across European Union countries, and an opportunity to live abroad if they wish so are desired for the futures of children, according to life stories which I listened to and have analyzed. Hence, people have made investments financially and emotionally on these desires. In the end, while they were narrating their life stories, these efforts and investments occupied a great place and became quite descriptive of who they are.

Migrants have also strived to transmit certain norms and values to their children. Being hardworking, smart about the budget, honest, capable of coping with challenges, in love with Turkey, and proud of being born and raised in Bulgaria appeared to be crucial important elements to tell what kind of people they are. They have desired their children to be raised in that way. Finally, they have wished to transmit certain discourses and standpoints regarding the feeling of community to their children. On the one hand, they have wanted their children to be aware of that they are different from the "others" such as earlier migrants from Bulgaria, inhabitants in Turkey or Syrians who migrated to Turkey starting from 2011. These differences have been embraced because they make them feel as a distinct community in a positive way. On the other hand, they have wished their children to fit into society, feel that they belong, and not come to the fore. In other words, they have wanted their children not to be estranged and excluded by the "others." These two opposite desires have created a contradiction meaning that their children will be aware of how

distinct they are but not seen as divergent. These efforts, desires, wants, or wishes only sometimes have found their correspondence in children's lives. The processes of transmission involved both ruptures and continuities. In the end, this thesis became a study of what is intended for the children and what eventually happened, through a comparative perspective by relying on the narratives of both generations. These intentions are closely related to the concepts of home and belonging because these two ideas embrace constructive power in both how people live and narrate their lives. They cannot be chased through simple responses to questions of where home is, where people feel that they belong or where people plan to live. Instead, they are deeply intertwined with lifetime events and have a more complicated nature than I initially expected.

To understand these complicated phenomena, namely home and belonging, in the first chapter, I focused on the decision to migrate from Bulgaria to Turkey, which is an active statement regarding where home should be. Since Turks were not literally forced to leave during the period I focused on, their decision to leave the place they live behind and to found a home from the scratch seemed interesting to me. During the interviews, these decisions were narrated through an appeal to the nationalist discourses stating that Turkey is the *vatan* where every Turk in Bulgaria irremediably hopes to go. However, a closer look displayed that these discourses have been formed through both Bulgarian and Turkish official narratives, which became highly influential in the shaping of subjectivities. Although the assimilation campaign against Turks in Bulgaria started only after 1984, the participants narrated that they experienced several discriminations long before the 1980s and prior to their migration between 1969-1978. Additionally, although they were subjected to Bulgaria's historical narrative at school, Turkish historical discourses were also included in the formation of their subjectivity through unofficial ways. The contradictions between these two narratives created a form of fragmentedness which became visible in their narratives. In such a context, the participants narrated that they migrated to Turkey for a better life and future. However, they all have applied for dual citizenship recently to become citizens of the country that they left knowingly and willfully, as they narrated. At this point, I realized a tendency to highlight that they do not have any regrets about their decision of migration. In other words, the legitimacy of that action cannot be canceled by their current endeavor to be a dual citizen, because both processes, namely migrating to Turkey and becoming a citizen of Bulgaria, share a motive to provide a better life for the children.

In the second chapter, I concentrated on the processes of housebuilding in Turkey after the migration, which appear to be a milestone in the lives of migrants as well as being directly related to making a home out of Turkey. Participants narrated that

they (or their parents) decided to settle in Bursa either because they have relatives who have already been living there or because Bursa is an industrial city where they can more easily find a job. I encountered an umbrella narrative that migrants, first, moved into rental houses and started to work immediately in order to create financial resources to build their own houses as soon as possible. Notwithstanding that the mechanisms based on age or gender were operating in the negotiations of who will keep studying and who will start working among family members, life was kind of paused due to the efforts of housebuilding. The younger children were sent to schools, but they also worked in part-time jobs simultaneously. The elder daughters, on the other hand, were mainly led towards income-generating endeavors. The plans or dreams that one could have for her own future were totally suspended. This situation created a rupture in one's lifespan, which people tried to compensate through the reflection of these deferred plans or dreams on children. Education became the primary means for that. Migrants, whose educational life had been interrupted by the context of migration, narrated how they have strived to make their children well-educated. The suspension of life and reflection of dreams on children are the primary reasons I find housebuilding processes an important theme. Secondly, the long narratives of housebuilding help the narrators describe themselves as a community that encountered many difficulties but successfully took up these challenges. Finally, whereas participants narrated the processes of housebuilding in so many words, they only briefly mentioned the practices of otherization which they encountered in Turkey, mostly after I specifically asked about it. In my opinion, this tendency addresses a motivation to conceal the factors that make Turkey less homely for the narrator through the detailed stories of houses that help them feel that they belong. Throughout Throughout the second chapter, I discussed these three points by relying on material culture literature, which creates room to think beyond the binary categorization between house and home.

The first two chapters are intended to provide a background for the formation of migrant subjectivities. In other words, the themes of the decision of migration and housebuilding are prominent elements regarding how participants perceive themselves and narrate their lives. These narratives, therefore, reveal what they experience and imagine in terms of the concepts of home and belonging as well as what they intend to transmit to their children. By relying on this framework, in the third chapter, I introduced an intergenerational approach. I presented a comparison between the narratives of first-generation migrant participants and their children in order to set forth the continuities and the ruptures in the intergenerational transmission. The umbrella narrative, which was presented as the constitutive element of the *muhacir* community goes as follows: The migrants experienced plenty of dif-

ficulties but were not overwhelmed by those. Instead, they made a great effort to break the chain and provided a better starting point for their children. In this sense, they became successful in life and turned out to be winners. Firstly, I investigated what kind of financial and emotional investments are made for the children's lives in the scope of this understanding. Education and housing appeared to be prominent themes. Secondly, I put some thought on to what extent the children are aware of this narrative and embrace it. Also, I analyzed the mechanism of differentiating "us" from the "others" to consolidate this description of *muhacirs* in the first- and second-generation participants.

In my interviews with second-generation participants, there appeared a variety in terms of how people relate to Bulgaria and their families' past in those lands. Whereas it is more likely to see a community-based way of living especially in the neighborhoods and the marriages of first-generation migrants, second-generation participants' lives are a lot more dispersed. Hence, it is not very possible to catch common or shared elements in their narratives. However, in my opinion, there is a shift between migrants and their children in terms of how they relate to space where they live and to the future which they plan or hope to live. The former, I can confidently say, has the first-hand experience of starting from scratch and does not prefer to do it one more time. Hence, they form a more settled and space-based relation with wherever they are. The latter, on the other hand, sees the future and the world as the home of infinite possibilities. Therefore, they are more prone to go wherever they can actualize themselves through the help of these opportunities. In other words, they became "geographically promiscuous" as Heller (1995) puts it. Their idea of home is formed through a sense of belonging to the spirit of time and the global present.

Overall, this thesis introduces the future as a very significant notion in the analysis of migration, dual citizenship, and intergenerational transmission. The literature on home, migration, and intergenerational transmission usually focuses on the past to understand how memories and experiences make a place homely and how the past is discursively transmitted to the next generations. Additionally, oral history literature suggests discussing the narratives of the past in relation to present circumstances. This is to say that how people recall their memories and construct a narrative out of them are closely related to what they have been living presently. By not neglecting the significance of past and present in my fieldwork and analyses, I included the consideration of future as an important theme to thoroughly comprehend the narratives which I listened to. In other words, this thesis study makes its humble contribution to the literature on home, migration, and intergenerational transmission by taking the future as an important component of the formation of

subjectivities, homes, identities, communities, and intergenerational relationships.

This research has been personally illuminating for me besides academic inspirations. Although I was born into *muhacir* parents, I did not form a social circle composed of *muhacirs* for myself. This was not an intentional preference, but life happened in that way. Previously, I assumed that certain characteristics, relationalities, values, concerns, and warnings were peculiar to my extended family and my personal history. Mostly, no one has felt the need to question either the background experiences or the motives, including myself. Throughout this research, I learned a lot about my own history and the community basis of my personal narrative, even though it has never been the primary concern.

In the end, I should mention that the fieldwork of this thesis study took place in the first half of 2019. However, my writing period corresponded with the Coronavirus Pandemic, which has influenced the whole world starting from the beginning of 2020. Although its long-term effects are still uncertain, it is possible to predict that it profoundly changed how the participants of this study relate to their homes in particular and relate to the world in general. First, the border gates between Turkey and Bulgaria were sealed and the international travels were suspended. The applicants who are supposed to visit Bulgaria semi-annually postponed their travels. How the processes of application will be affected by this situation is still undetermined. The national borders between these two countries had been kind of insignificant and blurry for the applicants thanks to *lişna kartas*, which are the identity cards stating that its holder has a residency permit in Bulgaria. However, the situation deriving from the pandemic consolidated these boundaries once again. Secondly, the geographic promiscuity which I have attributed to the second-generation migrant participants as a characteristic of their sense of belonging became questionable since millions of people could not leave their houses during this process, let alone their countries aside. Finally, home appeared to be a place of security that literally protects one from a lethal disease. However, especially after the declaration of a curfew in Turkey during the weekends as well as national and official holidays between April 11 and June 1, it also turned out to be a place of confinement probably. These three phenomena inevitably changed and transformed how the participants would experience and narrate their relation to their homes and the world. Hence, I believe, future research would be interesting and illuminating to comprehend these transformations and their inevitable effects on applicants' life choices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Lynn. 2010. *Oral History Theory*. London: Routledge.

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1991. "Writing Against Culture." In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working In the Present*, ed. Richard G. Fox. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press pp. 137–154.

Ahmed, Sara. 1999. "Home and Away: Narratives of Migration and Estrangement." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 2(3): 329–347.

Ahmed, Sara. 2000. *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. London: Routledge.

Ahmed, Sara, Claudia Castañeda, Anne-Marie Fortier, and Mimi Sheller, eds. 2003. *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*. New York and Oxford: Berg.

Al-Ali, Nadje, and Khalid Koser, eds. 2002. *New Approaches to Migration?: Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London and New York: Routledge.

Allan, Diana K. 2007. "The Politics of Witness: Remembering and Forgetting 1948 In Shatila Camp." In *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*, ed. Lila Abu-Lughod, and Ahmad H. Sa'di. New York: Columbia University Press pp. 253–281.

Althusser, Louis. 1994. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)." In *Mapping Ideology*, ed. Slavoj Zizek. London and New York: Verso pp. 100–140.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2004. "The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition." In *Culture and Public Action*, ed. Vijayendra Rao, and Michael Walton. California: Stanford University Press pp. 59–84.

Baeva, Iskra Vasileva, and Stefan Troebst. 2007. *Vademecum - Contemporary History, Bulgaria: A Guide to Archives, Research Institutions, Libraries, Associations, Museums and Sites of Memory*. Berlin: Stiftung zur Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur.

Boccagni, Paolo. 2017. *Migration and the Search for Home: Mapping Domestic Space In Migrants' Everyday Lives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Terry Eagleton. 1994. "Doxa and Common Life: An Interview." In *Mapping Ideology*, ed. Slavoj Zizek. London and New York: Verso pp. 265–277.

Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. 2000. "Beyond 'Identity'." *Theory and Society* 29(1): 1–47.

Bryant, Rebecca. 2008. "Writing the Catastrophe: Nostalgia and Its Histories in Cyprus." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 26(10): 399–422.

Bryant, Rebecca, and Daniel M. Knight. 2019. *The Anthropology of the Future.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bulgarian Citizenship Act. 1998.

Chowers, Eyal. 2002. "Gushing Time: Modernity and the Multiplicity of Temporal Homes." *Time & Society* 11(2/3): 233–249.

Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff. 1991. *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa.* Vol. 1 Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Crampton, Richard J. 2007. *Bulgaria.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Després, Carole. 1991. "The Meaning of Home: Literature Review and Directions for Future Research and Theoretical Development." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 8(2): 96–115.

Douglas, Mary. 1991. "The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space." *Social Research* 58(1): 287–307.

Dovey, Kimberly. 1985. "Home and Homelessness." In *Home Environments*, ed. Irwin Altman, and Carol M. Werner. New York: Springer Science+Business Media pp. 33–64.

Editorial. 1996. *Journal of Material Culture* 1(1): 5–14.

Elchinova, Magdalena. 2012. "Borders and Categorization: The Case of the 1989 Bulgarian Re-settlers to Turkey." In *Migration, Memory, Heritage: Socio-Cultural Approaches to the Bulgarian-Turkish Border*, ed. Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva, and Meglena Zlatkova. Sofia: Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Studies with Ethnographic Museum pp. 12–28.

Eminov, Ali. 1983. "The Education of Turkish Speakers In Bulgaria." *Ethnic Groups* 5(3): 129–149.

Eminov, Ali. 2002. "The Turks of Bulgaria: 1945-1983." *The Turks* 6: 584–591.

Erdal, Marta Bivand, and Ceri Oeppen. 2018. "Forced to Leave? The Discursive and Analytical Significance of Describing Migration as Forced and Voluntary." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6): 981–998.

Frost, Nicola, and Tom Selwyn, eds. 2018. *Travelling Towards Home: Mobilities and Homemaking.* Vol. 3 New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Gardiner, Michael. 2000. *Critiques of Everyday Life: An Introduction.* London: Routledge.

Georgis, Dina. 2013. *The Better Story: Queer Affects from the Middle East.* New York: SUNY Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* New York: Harper Colophan.

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1997. "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." In *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, ed. Akhil Gupta, and James Ferguson. Durham and London: Duke University Press pp. 33–51.

Heidegger, Martin. 1993. *Basic Writings from Being and Time (1927) to The Task of Thinking (1964).* San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Heller, Agnes. 1995. "Where Are We at Home?" *Thesis Eleven* 41(1): 1–18.

Hicks, Dan. 2010. "The Material-Cultural Turn: Event and Effect." In *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, ed. Dan Hicks, and Mary Carolyn Beaudry. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp. 25–98.

Hirsch, Eric, and Charles Stewart. 2005. "Introduction: Ethnographies of Historicity." *History and Anthropology* 16(3).

Jacobs, Jane M., and Susan J. Smith. 2008. "Living Room: Rematerialising Home." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 40(3): 515–519.

Kadirbeyoğlu, Zeynep. 2007. "National Transnationalism: Dual Citizenship in Turkey." In *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*, ed. Thomas Faist. Ashgate Publishing pp. 127–146.

Kaya, Ayhan. 1997. Constructing Diasporas: Turkish Hip-Hop Youth In Berlin PhD thesis University of Warwick.

Kertzer, David I. 1983. "Generation as a Sociological Problem." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9(1): 125–149.

Kleist, Nauja, and Stef Jansen. 2016. "Introduction: Hope over Time—Crisis, Immobility and Future-Making." *History and Anthropology* 27(4): 373–392.

Kostanick, Huey Louis. 1955. "Turkish Resettlement of Refugees from Bulgaria, 1950-1953." *Middle East Journal* 9(1): 41–52.

Lamb, Sarah. 2015. "Generation in Anthropology." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social I& Behavioral Sciences*, ed. James D. Wright. Oxford: Elsevier pp. 853–856.

Lawrence, Roderick J. 1987. "What Makes a House a Home?" *Environment and Behavior* 19(3): 154–168.

Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King. 2003.

Malkki, Liisa. 1997. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees." In *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, ed. Akhil Gupta, and James Ferguson. Durham and London: Duke University Press pp. 52–74.

Mallett, Shelley. 2004. "Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature." *The Sociological Review* 52(1): 62–89.

Mannheim, Karl. 1968. *The Problem of Generations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marx, Karl. 2009. *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and the Communist Manifesto*. New York: Prometheus Books.

Miller, Daniel. 2001. "Behind Closed Doors." In *Home Possessions: Material Culture Behind Closed Doors*, ed. Daniel Miller. Oxford and New York: Berg pp. 1–19.

Özgür-Baklacioglu, Nurcan. 2006. "Dual Citizenship, Extraterritorial Elections and National Policies: Turkish Dual Citizens in the Bulgarian-Turkish Political Sphere." In *Beyond Sovereignty: From Status Law to Transnational Citizenship*, ed. Osamu Ieda. Sapparo: Hokkaido University Slavic Research Center pp. 319–358.

Parla, Ayşe. 2003. "Marking Time along the Bulgarian-Turkish Border." *Ethnography* 4(4): 561–575.

Parla, Ayşe. 2006. "Longing, Belonging and Locations of Homeland among Turkish Immigrants from Bulgaria." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 6(4): 543–557.

Parla, Ayşe, and Maria Stoilkova. 2013. "Bulgaria, Migration Late 19th Century to Present." *The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration* .

Petridou, Elia. 2001. "The Taste of Home." In *Home Possessions: Material Culture Behind Closed Doors*, ed. Daniel Miller. Oxford and New York: Berg pp. 87–104.

Roseberry, William. 1994. "Hegemony and the Language of Contention." In *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*, ed. Gilbert M. Joseph, and Daniel Nugent. Durham, NC: Duke University Press pp. 355–366.

Rosenthal, Gabriele. 2006. "The Narrated Life Story: On the Interrelation Between Experience, Memory and Narration." In *Narrative, Memory 'I&' Knowledge: Representations, Aesthetics, Contexts*, ed. Kate Milnes, Christine Horrocks, Nancy Kelly, Brian Roberts, and David Robinson. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield pp. 1–16.

Rykwert, Joseph. 1991. "House and Home." *Social Research* 58(1): 51–62.

Saunders, Peter, and Peter Williams. 1988. "The Constitution of the Home: Towards a Research Agenda." *Housing Studies* 3(2): 81–93.

Simsir, Bilal. 1986. *Bulgaristan Türkleri*. Istanbul: Bilgi Yayınları.

Skrbiš, Zlatko, Loretta Baldassar, and Scott Poynting. 2007. "Introduction–Negotiating Belonging: Migration and Generations." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 28(3): 261–269.

Smilov, Daniel, and Elena Jileva. 2010. *Country Report: Bulgaria*. GLOBALCIT, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.

Smith, Gavin. 2004. "Hegemony." In *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*, ed. David Nugent, and Joan Vincent. Blackwell Publishing pp. 216–230.

Sökefeld, Martin. 2006. "Mobilizing in Transnational Space: A Social Movement Approach to the Formation of Diaspora." *Global Networks* 6(3): 265–284.

Somerville, Peter. 1997. "The Social Construction of Home." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 14(3): 226–245.

Thiranagama, Sharika. 2007. "A New Morning?: Reoccupying Home in the Aftermath of Violence in Sri Lanka." *Focaal-European Journal of Anthropology* 49: 31–44.

Tilley, Christopher, Webb Keane, Susanne Küchler, Mike Rowlands, and Patricia Spyer, eds. 2006. *Handbook of Material Culture*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.

Tolkien, John R. R. 2012. *The Hobbit, or There and Back Again*. London: Harper Colllins.

Tünaydın, Pelin. 2015. "Irkçılık ile Antikomünizm Arasında 1950-1951 Bulgaristan Göçü ve Romanlar." *Toplumsal Tarih* 260: 84–92.

Ünlü, Barış. 2018. *Türklük sözleşmesi: Oluşumu, İşleyişi ve Krizi*. İstanbul: Dipnot Yayınları.

Young, Iris Marion. 2005. "House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme." In *Motherhood and Space*, ed. Sarah Hardy, and Caroline Wiedmer. New York: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 115–147.