

"PROJECT ON ETHNIC RELATIONS"
PRINCETON, USA

**THE ETHNIC
SITUATION
IN BULGARIA**

(RESEARCHES IN 1992)

CLUB'90 PUBLISHERS
SOFIA, 1993

ADAPTATION – REALITY AND IMAGES

DJENI MADJAROV

The narratives of the personal experiences of individuals which coincide with the experiences of large groups of people play a certain role in the building up of generalized images which reflect in a particular way past events. In cases when the parameters of the experience transcend the bounds of common daily occurrences, then the narrative may grow from a run of the mill description of facts and events into an object of collective oral creation. In this scheme, a part of that which has really happened, events and their causal links disappear from the oral construction, or undergo a transformation into a direction beneficial to the teller of the tale. Separate events and sets of real phenomena acquire a new interpretation in the context of the told tale, a new content which has not existed and was not even suspected at the moment of the happening of the actual event. For such reasons, the reproduced image of past experience does not correspond to the real facts, but is a reworked frame of the experience which contains elements of creation and artistry. When an individual narrative fits in tone, context and ways of telling with the general mood of the group, there are considerable opportunities for the folklorizing of the oral form.

The present paper looks at some of the already created – and constantly amended – images connected with the experiences of the Turkish and Bulgarian population in Bulgaria during the forced change of names and the so-called "revival process", as well as during the exodus to Turkey in the summer of 1989 ("the great tourist trip").

Our attention is focused on the mechanism through which collective memory selects, presents and interprets phenomena and events in the narratives of participants and witnesses. We are not going to look for real causal links between events and only where possible will try to show the difference between reality and the images created out of it. The paper has been prepared on the basis of a field study in villages in two distant regions – Razgrad and Kyustendil¹. In the first, the villages are with mixed population – Bulgarian, Turkish and Gypsy, while in the second the population is homogeneously Bulgarian and only during seasonal agricultural work do Bulgarian Muslims appear from the Kurdjali region, the Rhodopes mountains and other areas. After 1985 the region housed a few dozen deported Bulgarian Turks. Because of this composition, people in the Kyustendil area have only a vague notion of the problems which shook the lives of Muslims in Bulgaria.

The study concentrates on the way in which the individual and the group have interpreted the events, their adaptation to the new social situation and, above all, the understanding, interpretation and oral presentation of that past a few years later. This is a study on the images – images of thought and of word – which are connected with the adaptation processes through which pass individuals and groups. All of this took place after the forced change of names and the "revival process" which followed, after the exodus into Turkey in 1989, during the encounter with the new environment in Turkey and after the return – the re-adaptation. It must be pointed out that there is a certain one-sidedness in the study of the adaptation of Bulgarian Turks to conditions in Turkey – we were able to talk only to people

who had returned from that country and we don't know what think those who have remained there; we can only guess that they have managed to adapt to that new situation.

* * *

For a better understanding of the problems of adaptation in the new places of migrating Muslims, it is necessary to consider some circumstances, such as relations within the family and within the villages between the different ethnic communities.

In the 1980s and the 1990s, the different Muslim groups in this country, and particularly in the countryside, we still see the functioning of a patriarchal form of family relations. In the first two age groups, patriarchal family relations are seen as uniquely correct, and are a matter of pride. With a part of the middle and the young generation the leading role of the male in family decision making is diminishing, and this is clearest in the Razgrad region. With the young people, and the young single people in particular, and most of all in city families, there is a strong tendency against accepting the traditional model. This is not liked by the old and they criticize it. The traditional reverence and respect of the old in the Muslim family has a projection also in the larger local community. Here it must be noted that in the honoring of the old in mixed areas, the Muslim population does not use religious identification as a moral yardstick. In this way, in the village of Glodjevo (Razgrad region), the man most honored by Turks is the Christian Bulgarian Kossyo (Ivan Kostadinov, aged 81). He is known as a "man of gold". Conversely, within the Muslim population – and in Razgrad in particular – there is a diminution of the respect for the religious leader, the Hodja. During the period of the study, the influence of Muslim religious functionaries was limited to the group of the oldest and the most religious. This is seen in a remark made by a middle aged person: "I work the vineyards and of course I drink. The Hodja? Who pays any attention to the Hodja?" (Ostrovo)². This fall in the prestige of the Muslim cleric is seen in a number of different cases. The clerics themselves admit this with regret.

If we were to expand the circle and take the local community as a whole, we would see several basic types of behavior. In the villages, where Muslims and Christians have lived together for a matter of centuries, they live, according to their own evaluation, in peace and friendship. In many cases, the image of life before the 1980s is idyllic and conflict-free. The notion of the once-existing harmony is almost the image of the patriarchal family relations. This can be seen clearly in the words of 83-year-old Nedyalka Dobрева: "On Kurban Bayryam they call in the neighbors. I've never been missed. When they see me at the bread shop, the Turks say – "make way for the old woman to get her bread first!" The neighbor Moustafa, we had him as a son. When they were leaving (for Turkey in 1989), we all wept. His wife, Seyde, said, 'My mother has not been so good to me as you have been!' (Glodjevo)³. This oral image has had in the past, and has in the present, only a partial expression in the real extent of sharing festive days, both Christian and Muslim, like St. Triphon's Day, the Midwives' Day, Easter, Ramazan Bayryam, Kurban Bayryam, Hudreles etc. Diko Bochev says something curious about this: "At Christmas, we eat one quarter of the pig with them (the Turkish neighbors). I'm satisfied with them and have never said an ill word about them." (Dyankovo)⁴. Here, cultural interpenetration and the common ways of life have lead to active changes in the way of life of Bulgarians and Turks alike. "Today they (Turks) drink too. Look in the pub – you see them all sitting there. They eat pork too. But they tend to buy sausages. They are afraid to have their own pig." (Glodjevo)⁵. "The Turks are very hard working people. Some even have 60-70 pigs. They tell me, 'If we will make a profit, the Koran does not interfere.'" (Ostrovo)⁶. It can be

generalized that in the communities of mixed population in Razgrad there is an active – and long-standing – process of cultural interpenetration and religious tolerance. In such a situation, representatives of the other faith are accepted without reservations, openly, as honored equals.

In the stories told by representatives of both communities, this idyll ends somewhere around the changing of the names (1984/85) and the beginning of the "revival process". The dramatic events thereafter leave behind a residue of suspicion and throw doubt over the previous way of living together. It must be said, however, that even before these events, Bulgarians in some Razgrad villages, where they are in a minority, have been expressing old fears and doubts about the sincerity and openness in the attitude of local Turks towards them. At times, what they told us revealed a kind of non-focused and diffused fear: "They are very good people and very hard working, but their souls are Turkish. They are resentful. I'm with them half-way." (Dyankovo)⁷. "They are devious, for one hen they give a duck... You can be his best friend, but behind your back, he is digging your grave. A Turk, that's a different faith. They are very secretive. We Bulgarians always quarrel among ourselves, and they support each other." (Ostrovo)⁸. A similar fear we can see at work in the many rumors of sabotage in this part of the country. Exactly the same can be seen in the Muslim communities, but projected out onto the Bulgarians.

It is significant that, in oral narratives of either groups, the image of the near neighbor and the villager is always positive, while the more abstract Turk from the next village, or the recent immigrant, is more reserved, or even negative.

If we look at relations between the two ethnic groups in the Kyustendil region, where the Muslim population is composed only of seasonal workers, we will see that images of them are far from specific. The absence of constant contacts at all levels in everyday life is a prerequisite for images in which darker and negative tones are dominant. This is one of the reasons the Bulgarian population does not accept the Muslims as a group – it fears that the latter are a threat to its interests and very existence. In places where the two groups are in constant contact in everyday life, and work together – particularly in the tobacco industry – images and relations are very different and close to reality. There, Muslims are seen as good, hard working, honest. The realities of the situation find their expression in the sphere of relations: "As workers, and I can say this openly, they are very good. They really do know their work. As people, and as workers... there have been no problems. Their children were at the kindergarten, in the school. There was never anything to make them different from the rest of us... And do they hit the bottle? Particularly on pay day, with the rest of us." (Gyueshevo)⁹. There is a certain amount of tension between the two groups, and that can be traced to the economics of the situation: the pay, perceived as unreasonably high, given to migrant Muslim workers in tobacco. This tension pre-dates the negative effect of the political events of the 1980s. An illustration of this can be seen in the words: "The seasonal workers, when they came in, they made their parties over there – with their friends, whom they worked with. Would they ever invite the whole village? And when they said, 'come', no Bulgarian ever went. Why should he? We saw them as temporary, and they were paid better." (Tavalichevo)¹⁰.

It is worth noting that, when it came to forming an image of the Turks, the Kyustendil population drew on memories from decades back, as well as on images from centuries ago, kept in the popular mind. These did not correlate with actually existing relations, but they do serve as elements for the creation of a deformed generalized image. It is quite possible that the upheavals of the 1980s switched on primeval fears and complexes in the Bulgarian population in Kyustendil, as it happened in the Razgrad region. An example from Kyustendil is the following:

"You trust them, but not completely, isn't that so? We think that's because, in olden days, under the Turkish empire, they mistreated people... People used to flee from Turks. I know this from my mother in law." (Tavalichevo)¹¹. It can be concluded that, in the case of Kyustendil, the attitude of the Bulgarian population towards the migrants is motivated, on the one hand, by notions grounded in contemporary work relations, and on the other, by rather old-fashioned and unreal notions connected with the social life, spiritual life, manners and everyday culture of the Turkish population. After the events of the 1980s, the negative tones in the image have intensified. Only constant everyday contacts are capable of cleaning the image from the burden of accumulated negative ideas.

It may be of secondary importance, but it is worth noting that among the Turkish population of Razgrad the image of Rhodopes and Kurdjali Turks is loaded with a number of negative characteristics. The latter are seen as illiterate, brash, devious, dreaming of territorial autonomy and speakers of a lower kind of language, with Kurdish elements. And :*"They are conservative, more religious, fanatics. They have few atheists. Here the young don't go into the mosque. The mosque is hardly ever full, and it's mostly old people. There it's jam-packed always."* (Razgrad)¹². *"They are like us, but different. We know, they've been down here to work... They are Turks, but we don't speak to them. They walk around in baggy shalvari, hide. We speak more with Bulgarians."* (Ostrovo)¹³. Razgrad Turks have a different image of themselves, seeing themselves as democratic, welcoming, intelligent, more orderly, more united, more peaceful and less religious.

The relations in these regions make possible the understanding of some of the basic causal links in the adaptation processes, particularly following the migration waves of the 1980s. Notions and their tangible expressions – the images created by thought and word – are grounded on the relations achieved over the past decades and, under pressure of events, change in different directions.

Before seeing how the population of the two regions in the study reacted to the forcible change of names and the attendant propaganda, it is worth noting that these events, although sudden, were not entirely unforeseen. For a number of years rumours had been circulating, among the Turkish population, about the possibility of such drastic official action. But the Turkish population, secure in its good relations with the local Bulgarian population, had refused to believe that such an injustice could take place. Even when the first news of forcible name changes in other regions reached Razgrad, it was not believed, or dismissed as isolated atrocities, like with the change of names of Gypsies some years previously.

An important element in the understanding of the individual and group tragedy of the Turkish population in Bulgaria is the fact that in its collective mind the form (the sound) and the content of a name is directly linked to the religious – and by extension ethnic – identity, with the opposite also being true (religious identity defines the name). That is why the changing of a name is taken to mean that the person has lost the membership to a certain religious and ethnic community. This is seen as a tragedy in many acts and as an irreplaceable loss to both these communities. This acute internal tragedy can be seen in the words of a servant of Allah, Imam Hadji Sali: *"The name makes the person. For example, for me to become Simon (as he did at the time). When I was born, a prayer was read in a different name – Sali. It's not decent, when you die, for them to read a prayer for, in effect, someone else. It's the worst thing, for them to change your name, worse even than banning you from attending the mosque. During the name-changing, for a whole week I thought, I almost went mad. My soul was going to leave me, Allah can't allow this. For it is said: 'You are a Turk, and you are a Bulgarian. Your name comes from your religion, and the religion makes the name'. Wars are waged for religion"* (Glodjevo)¹⁴.

Among almost all representatives of the Turkish ethnic group the act of changing the name is grasped entirely in its tragic aspect. Only a few individuals are the exception, primarily among the young. There are, however, differences in the ways in which people describe what they have been through, and their adaptation to the new environment. Many people are still incapable of accepting what happened, it is, for them, always identical with "horror" and "death". Many say that at the time they were thinking of committing suicide – individually, or together with their families. For many these were not plans only, for many dozens did take their life. There are also numerous old people who found it impossible to come to terms with what was happening and died of heart attacks. Naturally, the desire for revenge is born and this takes on a life in words. These words are pointed to by Bulgarians, when they describe their own new fears and suspicions of the Turks. For many of the re-named, to continue living as before proved impossible, and they solved the inner tension in different ways: leaving their usual environment, while others took the road of individual opposition, which landed them in prison, led to deportations and other forms of persecution. Many of these, in their own mind, and in the eyes of the group, have become heroes, people surrounded with great respect.

The change of names is identified with a loss of decency and honour. In the words of S.H. – a Muslim Gypsy who, in 1982, went into hiding for six months, in order to keep his name and, on getting caught, to the words of one policeman, "What a nice house you have!", replied "Leave me with my name, and you can have the house!" (Ostrovo)¹⁵. The tragedy can also be seen in the words of an intellectual Turk from Razgrad: "During the name changing, people were committing suicide. People were hanging themselves. 'All of that just for a name?', wondered the Bulgarians. A Turk can retreat, but in matters of honour, a name – never!" (Razgrad)¹⁶. From such circles came the people who were deported, and had to face a double adaptation – to their new name, and to their new place of living.

The changing of the names must be seen not only as a change on the individual level, but also in the social and cultural space in the regions and in the country as a whole. The change imposes changes and a re-thinking of relations in the social and cultural space of the village community, and also a re-thinking of the past, a changing of the collective memory of a nation and of groups in it. These elements of the so-called "revival process", the annihilation of key elements of the collective past and the deeply humiliating changing of the names of the dead, hurt profoundly the honour and self-respect of one ethnic group, and even provoke the dissatisfaction of the rest of the population. The events have also been felt as a disruption in the links with relatives in Turkey. As a whole, the Turkish group felt that its communications had been cut not only with the Bulgarian majority, which fails to provide the expected (at least passive) support, but it feels abandoned and humiliated by the world at large. The Turkish population simply cannot accept what happened and cannot overcome the disappointment with the passivity of the surrounding world, which can be seen in the words of one school teacher: "We are biologically the same, and we have a good life together with the Bulgarians; but nobody stood up to defend us. Nobody dared. Very few defended us. Everybody believed that the thing was irreversible." (Glodjevo)¹⁷.

In the regions of mixed population, the Bulgarians have their own version of what happened. It is almost universally believed that the changing of the names was a huge mistake, but different areas have their own different accents within this. Some condemn the very idea of changing names as an aggression against personal freedom and are horrified by what happened; others accept the idea of an "external" homogenization of the nation, but condemn the methods used as unsuitable, too drastic, ineffective or too late. There are also those, who had noted

the process – already existing before the re-naming – of a gradual and spontaneous adaptation by way of the use of a Bulgarian name in the sphere of friendly contacts, particularly among the young and in the cities. The young even in the villages condemn the violent act precisely because it broke this natural process and provoked exactly the opposite reaction in the Turkish population. Many of the Turks themselves admit to the existence of this process, and see it as something natural. "Things had started under their own steam. I was called 'Old man Abcho', and people called my daughter Ani. There was a hairdresser, Seliha, they called her Sashka." (Razgrad)¹⁸. Another opinion, of an old Turk: "Why did they have to change the names? So that we could become a united nation. But the young would have done this by themselves, had they been left in peace for another five-six years. Emine – they called her Emi." (Dyankovo)¹⁹. This is confirmed by the words of a 28-year-old man from the same village: "This 'revival process' wasn't so terrible as an idea, it was the methods used." (Dyankovo)²⁰. Among the Bulgarian population, and primarily in circles of intellectuals closely connected with the then Communist Party, there is also opposition against the changing of the names, but for nationalistic reasons: "Why should we change their names? Leave them Turks – so that we can know them! Whoever asked me whether I'd be pleased when, one day, a Turk would carry a Bulgarian name – Ivan, for example." (Razgrad)²¹.

The changing of the names is not seen only as a tragedy for the Turkish population. There are examples when people saw it as a farce with many comic elements. For example: "Our family, we did not cause trouble, not even my parents. I thought it all very funny. Yesterday I was Hayrie, today I've become Ani." (Slokoshtitsa)²². There are also those who have completely rejected the reality of those events, and replace them with positions which justify their own behavior at the time: "I never even realized they were changing our names. The neighbors called me Veska and my Bulgarian name was Veska Ivanova. We don't bother about these things... Banning the use of our language – that was different." (Ostrovo)²³. It can be said with a great deal of confidence that the whole of the population in the mixed areas finds it very difficult to adapt to the situation created by the changing of the names, and does this rather unwillingly. In the Bulgarian population, one senses a feeling of guilt and shame from the fact that it had done very little to alleviate the tragedy of friends and neighbors: "It was unpleasant, but you couldn't openly express indignation. You hang your head low. That's how it was." (Glodjevo)²⁴.

In the memory of the Turkish population, the head hung low, the helplessness and the passive resistance is what shapes the image of Bulgarian behavior at the time, although there have been individual expressions of open defence of the honour of the neighbor. Expressions of sympathy and the refusal to carry out official instructions also become forms of protest, such as: "We could do nothing for them. So we at least addressed them with their Turkish names. They were grateful even for this." (Glodjevo)²⁵. Possibly, this mass passive resistance by Bulgarians, who went on calling their neighbors and colleagues at work with their Turkish names, has contributed to the failure of the whole exercise. The population never accepted the new names of people, nor the new names of places. This behavior helped recover, up to a point, the trust of the Turkish population. After a while, the process of recovering neighborly and friendly relations started up. There was a slow process of adaptation to the new situation and a search for ways of living together under it.

The process of adaptation to the new situation can be seen in the very act of the name changing. The most frequent occurrence were people's attempts to make sure that the new names preserved at least the starting letters of the old, with the way names sound – or their meaning – being similar. The choice of new names identical

with those of Bulgarian friends or neighbors was another form of trying to preserve one's identity in the environment following the change. A similar approach can be seen behind the choice of names originating from the flora and fauna of the birthplace. On the other hand, the choice of names which don't sound Bulgarian (although they don't sound Turkish either), or of names with a hidden threat or promise of revenge (Kamen – the Rock, or Martin, after the famous rifle) reveals an intentional resistance against the new imposed situation. In many of the cases, this is understood by the Bulgarian population, and is not condemned. Feeling uneasy about the events, in most cases Bulgarians made a point of not even knowing the new name of Turks they had relations with. Even years after the event, many Bulgarians still don't know what names their everyday acquaintances had during the change.

The changing of the names lead to such ravages in the personality that even as late as 1992 not a few Turks have not recovered – i.e. changed again – their names. Some explain this with the fear of new persecution, others – with unemployment and the fear that people with Turkish names might not be given a job. Others still find it difficult to violate their sense of honour and explain to their children that another name change is necessary, and that this time it is a good thing. Seen from this angle, the process of recovery of names needs another painful – but this time at least, voluntary – period of adaptation to a changing situation. In some cases, the desire to recover the old name is grounded in the desire to turn the clock back to the problem-free idyll of the "golden age" of peace before the 1980s.

Among the acts which followed the changing of the names, the Turkish population reacted most acutely to the ban on the use of the Turkish language. This is a curious fact because, with very few exceptions, the Turkish population is bilingual. It speaks equally well the local Turkish dialect and Bulgarian. The local Bulgarian population in Razgrad is also almost entirely bilingual. In almost all cases, the migration into Turkey in 1989 is explained by the ban on the language, not by the changing of the names. Although the Turkish population has no problems with living its daily life with the use of Bulgarian only, the ban on Turkish touched the most emotional and delicate point – honour, dignity, the right to speak one's mother tongue, the most important element in ethnic consciousness. In spite of the illusory disappearance of the Turkish language from public spaces, unlike the previous situation, when the Turkish young preferred to use Bulgarian even in the home, the Turkish language following the prohibition became the only medium of communication inside that ethnic community. The effect of the language prohibition was exactly the opposite of what was intended and, instead of adaptation to the dominant Bulgarian-speaking environment, there was the opposite trend. This was attended with a shrinking of contacts with the Bulgarians and the closing up of the older generation – and, in some cases, of the Bulgarian community itself.

Together with the ban on the use of the Turkish language, other prohibitions concerned the wearing of Turkish clothes (the shalvari baggy trousers), the listening to Turkish music and the practicing of the Muslim rituals. The population was stunned, disorientated, confused. It can't afford to have any public presence, fearing it might fall foul of some ban or other. In front of outsiders – people not from the area – it fears to speak Turkish, it fears to speak Bulgarian – so it does not speak at all. Turks gradually began to see the world as a hostile place, without having been given cause for this hostility. This is seen in the tale told by a Turk from the village of Lozno: "And suddenly, what happened when they changed our names? Suddenly we were the biggest criminals, and we hadn't done anything wrong. They started throwing us dark glances, but we never quarreled with them!"²⁶. It is with the birth of hopelessness and desperation in people's souls that Turks and Bulgarians alike explain the sudden liking of the younger Turks for alcohol.

The Turkish population did find ways of adapting against the bans, the persecutions and the prohibition on its rituals. In the rituals, after 1984-85 there is a clear duality: an external side, the public side of rituals, which did not infringe the bans; and the private, inner side, understandable only by the initiated. In the inner rituals, the community keeps to the rituals in the form they have settled in the 20th century. There are the following documented examples: the syunet continues to be celebrated, but its outward presentation is that of a birthday or a name day; the ban on attending mosque services was circumvented by way of secret gatherings for common prayer in the home; similarly, solutions were found to burial rituals. At death, the hodja would come secretly to the house of the deceased to whisper into his or her ear the Turkish name, as is required by Muslim practice. (Before the ban this was done in the cemetery itself.)

As was noted earlier, before the events of the 1980s, there was a gradual process of interpenetration and integration into the Bulgarian culture – a process in which, without losing its distinctive image, ethnic groups borrow from each other. This is connected with the natural dying away of older cultural forms, and their replacement with new ones. This is also linked to the secularization of everyday life. The violence of the 1980s halted this process in the Turkish community and achieved results which were extremely unfavourable for the very initiators of the official violence. These events played the role of a powerful ethnic consolidating factor, seen at its clearest in the mass and organized migration to Turkey in 1989.

Less important, but worth noting, are two other aspects of adaptation: the reality and the images (in thought and word) of the deportation of Turks into different parts of the country. These deportations concerned people who had openly resisted the official violence, refused to change their names, or trying to organize the resistance of the group as a whole. In most cases, these people had a very solid moral character. They were hostile to the political system which carried out the atrocities, and to the Bulgarian nation out of whose ranks the perpetrators came. The same people react negatively to their place of deportation. In our case, that place are the villages of the Kyustendil area. As has been pointed out in the beginning of the paper, in this region the Bulgarian population shows a greater degree of hostility to the Turkish group than is the case in mixed areas. In spite of this background, due to the refusal to accept the actions of the authorities and to believe the hastily constructed official image of the Turks as criminals, the local population accepts the Turkish deportees calmly, tries to establish everyday contact and integrate them into their environment. This is not universally the case, but in the majority of cases this holds true. By and large, the local Bulgarian population has judged the deportees good people, hard working and honest. There are very clear examples of the way old prejudice and suspicion changes under the impact of actual contact on a daily basis and how, even given the abnormal situation in the country at the time, this leads to natural empathy and readiness to help.

On the other hand, the stories of deported Turks reveal that their time as deportees was not as problem-free as the Bulgarian population believes. Their life was filled with internal pressures due to several factors: many were separated from their families; most couldn't practice their profession; they missed their own environment; they experienced nostalgia for their own birth places. Some enter into active relations with the local population; others remain self-isolated and maintain a very limited circle of contacts. It is interesting to note that the deportees hardly ever mingled with the incoming seasonally engaged Turks from the Kurdjali region. The deportees felt lonely in their new environment. As a rule, they fail to achieve a wide network of contacts, which are mostly with their landlords and neighbors, and this erects barriers before the full adaptation to the new environment. The internal pressures and the knowledge that this would be a temporary period in their

lives limited their adaptation efforts. A possible explanation about the mechanisms they found to pass the time of deportation could be their extraordinary immersion into the world of physical labour. The pressures which plagued their lives are also evinced in the great joy they demonstrated at the end of the period of deportation, on learning they could now go home.

From the point of view of the study, it is very interesting to trace the oral interpretation of the adaptation – or lack of it – of the Turkish population during and after the mass migration to Turkey in the summer of 1989, "The big tourist trip". The reasons for the exodus are clear from everything said thus far in this paper. Let us now concentrate on the three key elements of the adaptation process: the adaptation of the Bulgarian and Turkish population left behind; the adaptation problems of the migrants into Turkey; their re-adaptation problems on their return to Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian and the Turkish group agree on the factors leading to the exodus of 1989: the changing of the names, the ban on the language, dress, rituals, traditions. At the beginning of the exodus – May 1989 – new factors appear, such as the fear of a new bout of persecution, the greatly intensified feeling of general insecurity. For those who had not decided to go, the mobilizing factor was the fear that, with everyone else gone, they'd be left behind alone, far from family and friends. Among the Bulgarian population, we found an enthusiastic acceptance of the then official explanation of the exodus: that the Turks did not want to go, but were forced to do so by their covert organizations who threatened with death those who decided to stay behind. There is no way of knowing whether there was, in fact, anything of the sort and if so, to what extent in the different regions. What is important for us is the ease with which the Bulgarian population uncritically accepted this version of events. The Bulgarians refuse to believe that the people they've lived with together for so long, would suddenly (that's the operative word in these stories) up and leave, without regrets, without a backward glance, its neighbors, colleagues, leaving its work undone – and would plunge into a foreign country they had never even seen. This image-interpretation makes it easier for the Bulgarian population to cope with the disappointment of the exodus. The Turkish group also reveals fear – but a different kind of fear, the fear of the unknown if they stay behind, and the fear of the unknown awaiting them in Turkey itself. This is clearly seen in the words of one young man: "Here I was. And everyone was getting ready to leave. Now they ask, 'How did this happen?' Of course people did not want to go... How could they leave so much property, houses? And go somewhere. People left because of pride. That's what happened, because of pride." (Glodjevo)²⁷.

There are a multitude of heart-breaking images of leaving, of saying goodbye to the neighbors, but there are also stories of anger, viciousness and even threats made by the departing Turks. Such incidents were blown out of all proportion by the official propaganda in order to keep passions boiling.

Following the departure of the Turks from the mixed areas, many of them were depopulated – "the village has become poor", say Bulgarians. What is left behind is the Bulgarian and the undeparted Turkish population. For them, the lively space of the village suddenly became a howling emptiness: "When they went, it was death. Four-five houses with people in them were left." (Glodjevo)²⁸.

The migrants and those left behind both faced problems of adaptation. There was a drastic change in the spirit of the villages, there was a lack of events, the network of social contacts was suddenly contracted. The locals were suddenly aghast and disorientated. And the coming harvest suddenly turned out to be much more than they could handle. They were enveloped in a mood of isolation and insecurity: "Around 80 per cent of everyone from the village of Bissertsi (Razgrad region) left,

and they were all of the kazulbash group. Whole streets stood empty. Those left behind were weeping and wondering what to do." (Razgrad)²⁹. Some of the aged Turks left behind take refuge in suicide: "It was terrible, terrible. There were no suicides around here, just one elderly gentleman hanged himself. He was left behind when the others went. And he went into the woods and hanged himself." (Lozno)³⁰. The state of mind of those left behind can be seen in the words of one departing Turk: "Do you understand, Mayor, the whole village is going and you'll be left alone?" (Bagrentsi)³¹. The objects, empty houses, empty streets left behind by the migrants lead to a great suffering in the souls of their neighbors, often leading to unsurmountable pain. They feel listless, incapable of working. This applies to both Turks and Bulgarians in these areas. Where the Bulgarians are in a majority, there also appeared a measure of hatred for the departed, who had bought up all the goods and taken everything which was considered to belong to everyone in the area. Given the great increase of the harvest workload on those left behind, this also fed a measure of hatred. It must be noted that these negative feelings existed for a comparatively short time in the Bulgarian population. They reach their peak and then disappear during the mass protests against the return of the Turkish names in the winter of 1989-90.

Out of the some 300,000 who left in the summer of 1989, up to a half later returned. From the point of view of the study, this indicates that a considerable number of people found it impossible to adapt to their new environment and took the extreme decision to return and try to solve their problems back in Bulgaria. This necessitates a complex operation of justifying this course of action in one's own eyes, and in the eyes of the world, without loss of face. Inside, these people feel extremely uneasy – both because of the crash of illusions for a better life in "the dreamed fatherland" – Turkey, and because of the need to return to the environment from which they ran in the first place. There is also the need to see again people against whom, on leaving, they either despised or, in more extreme cases, threatened. This extremely complex emotional situation gave birth to an unconscious defence mechanism which created very ambiguous images of what had happened. On the one hand, Turkey was a rich and beautiful country. On the other – it was not attractive, because it treated the immigrants as unwelcome and failed to take them to her bosom. Whereas the main reasons for the return are social and economic, in the tales to the forefront come factors of emotional and everyday nature.

We found that of great importance for the adaptation of the separate individual to the new environment abroad was the internal attitude and the motivation: whether he or she is motivated by emotion or by economic considerations, whether he or she has a preliminary idea of the actual conditions inside Turkey, and whether this idea is in fact true of what is found on arrival. Last but not least are the personal qualities of the individual.

It is necessary to emphasize that in our study what we in fact observed were not the problems of adaptation to Turkey per se, but the impossibility to adapt to Turkey revealed by those who had come back.

One of the reasons pointed out for the lack of adaptation was the appearance of a generational conflict in migrant families in Turkey. In most cases, the older people in the family refused to adapt first. And, as has been pointed out earlier, in the traditional Turkish family the weight of taking the common decision is on the oldest male, who would be expected to take the decision to go back.

Another reason for the failure to adapt is the subtle non-correspondence between the ability to settle the everyday problems (finding a job and a place to live) and the impossibility to adapt to the types of relationships (for example, patronage) prevalent in Turkey.

For a proper understanding of the contradictory image – "the inability to adapt" to the new environment in Turkey – it is necessary to bear in mind that the stories of these people contain internal contradictions born out of their experiences. On the one hand is the idealized image-notion of Turkey which they had before the exodus (in case this was their first visit there). In this, the unknown reality is idealized as a world of well-being: "a golden country". This is also the image of the country of distant origin, the mother, the defender who would take back under her wings her children. Following their return, however, having clashed with the sobering reality of everyday life in Turkey who did not treat them as the mother figure they expected to find – and even became the perceived source of all calamities and suffering – then we see the birth of the second image, which opposes the original image on all points. This second image contains the dissatisfaction with the failure to adapt, with the many problems plaguing the individual and the community while over the border. The birth of this image is preceded by something very important. Confronting the difficulties "over there", the migrants begin to idealize their past "over here". Bulgaria assumes the guise of the ideal, secure place of origin, a motherland. On this basis we see the formation of a very complicated structure of "here-there", with both countries being dear to the heart of the Turk, but with both having their dark sides. The place "here" outweighs all else and becomes the attraction which draws back the migrants.

In this case, the mechanism for the formation of notions and images creates a binary link, choosing those elements of the individual and collective memory which motivate and justify the actions of the participants. This mechanism brings to the fore the emotional and irrational reasons for the failure to adapt, while pushing into the background the factors of the everyday life.

In all the stories of Turks who have come back – as in the stories of Bulgarians who have visited Turkey – that country is a beautiful and wealthy place, but these characteristics are not considered sufficient for a person to stay on and adapt. Most point out the disruptive influence of the new environment. In order to understand the shock, we must bear in mind that the primarily village population which migrated to Turkey was accommodated in the very biggest cities of the country, near to other communities who had migrated from Bulgaria in the past. In the cases where migrants were sent to small villages, they still tried to find ways of getting into these cities. In our case, what is important is to envisage a village population suddenly finding itself in a bustling big city. The environment is not traditionally Turkish, because the cities are mostly made up of migrant masses. This is the reason behind the huge disruptions felt by the Bulgarian Turks across the border. The first is the culture shock³² resulting from the urbanization of the migrants. The second is linked to the crash of expectations and illusions and the appearance of growing disappointment.

The impressions of the first contact with the new environment are as a rule pleasing. But with the entry into the relations of everyday life, it is the differences which begin coming to the fore, making adaptation increasingly difficult. On the level of culture and behavior, the differences are as follows: "Those that go do not like the life and the way of thinking over there. Over there, people are more conservative. We are Europeans after all, live among Europeans. Bulgarian Turks are more intelligent. They find themselves in a big city, and still they are more intelligent. To say nothing of their villages. Ours avoid them. They stay in Istanbul, Bursa." (Razgrad)³³. "They are clean people, but everything hangs on your status. It's a matter of life style. Maybe I'm not rich, but I'm much more civilized. Over there they have many rich people who don't know how to live. They are not practical in their choice of life style." (Dyankovo)³⁴. The most prominent topic in the stories is the contrast between the wealth and lack of culture in Turkey. Then

there is the shock in seeing the great gap between rich and poor. This is something Bulgarian migrants, accustomed to a system of imposed social equality simply can't understand nor accept. They feel very insecure due to the lack of the usual social security: "Why should we go anywhere? We are well here. We have wages, old age pension, child benefit. Over there there is nothing like this. There, my older sister's daughter gave birth and had to be out at work on the fortieth day." (Ostrovo)³⁵. "One nurse came back because of this, she was pregnant and did not want to give birth over there." (Razgrad)³⁶.

There is also the shock of the conservatism in the general behavior in the new environment. This behavior was found to have been accepted by earlier migrants from Bulgaria. "They are very different over there. I went to see my sister's husband during the Bayryam festival. I said to him, I really fancy a beer, and I'm off to get one from the beer hall. He did not let me – if anyone saw me, they wouldn't sell him bread any more. Everyone would hate him for having let me into his house. He emigrated in 1954." (Razgrad)³⁷. Those who have left earlier show a greater degree of adaptation to conditions in Turkey, leaving behind elements of everyday culture which are typical of their earlier environment in Bulgaria. In their lives in a new environment, they begin to internalize elements of behavior and culture which are typical of the new environment with which they now wish to be identified. These changes, duly noted by the recent migrants in their relatives and friends in Turkey, lead to fears in the new comers. "The psychology of our people is different from theirs. Our values are different. You need time to adapt to their way of life." (Razgrad)³⁸. These are the words of a young male Turk who valued highly the opportunities for individual advancement available in Turkey, but returned for a number of reasons, among them the above. Although this has not been formulated clearly by the respondents, this process of uncritical adaptation abroad, accompanied by the abandonment of one's original norms of behavior, quite probably plays a significant role in alienating the new migrants from the environment in Turkey. In essence, this is a process of diffusion towards the culture of the migrating group which process is accompanied with changes in the group consciousness and changes in the identification of the group with the larger community.

Something which the migrants have found impossible to accept is the widely demonstrated religiosity of the population in Turkey – something not typical of the newcomers. This demonstrated religiosity, which includes the behavior of the individual, the choice of clothing, the fulfillment of the sexes in public life, as well as the expression of liberty, equality and openness in personal relations – all of that is something which has shocked the young migrants. Here is the story of a young girl: "We were in Bursa. I did not meet a single boy there. I had the time. But they have a peculiar opinion of us. They would ask me, 'How's life over there?', and I'd tell them about how I had no restrictions on going where I wanted to go, how my father never once refused to let me have his car. Young people over there are not free. My father had to pick me up from work every day. I was afraid. I was even afraid to get into a taxi." (Glodjevo)³⁹.

In its stories, the group of migrants points out that the basic reason for the inability to adapt and the return was the impossibility of having full and equal relations with the local population. It is almost universally emphasized that, originally, they were met well – particularly the first wave. But with the entry into the new environment they began to come across unpleasant characteristics. They noted the lack of enthusiasm of friends and relatives (earlier migrants) to come to their aid in critical moments, the distance kept between neighbors, the local communities and even the state when it came to solving their problems. That is why one of the most negative points that comes through in their stories is the absence of good neighborly relations – the komshoulouk: "Wealth there is as much

as you'd want, but there is little sympathy, little humanity. They are complete vagabonds. One of them told me, 'Here we are, trying to get away from the Bulgarians, and they are all over the place'" (Glodjevo)⁴⁰. "They don't have our komshoulouk over there. In Bulgaria we have a different way of life than Turks in Turkey itself. We are mostly from the countryside and have a good komshoulouk. In the exodus, many of us ended up in Istanbul and Bursa. They were shattered by the cold attitudes there. They had lost the necessary conditions for life." (Dyankovo)⁴¹. "Over there, even the neighbors don't know each other." (Ostrovo)⁴².

With the settling into a new environment, the migrants from Bulgaria passively or actively entered into the living space of the local population. In this way, without themselves knowing or understanding this, with their very presence they provoked conflicts. The environment in which they found themselves – primarily populated by earlier migrants – there were very limited avenues for the satisfaction of their needs. In this situation, the new migrants are seen as competitors, even by the earlier migrants from their own group. "They did not take us as equals." (Ostrovo)⁴³. "They were telling us, 'You messed up our life here'" (Glodjevo)⁴⁴. The heavy psychological atmosphere which was formed around the presence of the new migrants was further exacerbated by the aid which the Turkish state gave them. This became an object of envy for the rest of the community, made up of migrants from many countries. This fact further intensified the negative emotions around the new migrants: "Some treated us well. Others were saying, 'Here I am, I'm from Anatolia, the Turkish hinterland, and the state helps them!' Many were irritated with us: 'Why have you come? What have the Bulgarians done to you?'" (Ostrovo)⁴⁵.

The original welcome given to migrants from Bulgaria was transformed very fast into a very different emotional mood. Following the first months of the influx, the original sympathy evolved into a hostility. The reasons for this are many and various and are beyond the scope of this paper. The hostility of the local population is seen in the new names they came up with for the migrants: "heathens", "Heathen Bulgars", "hit-and-run people", "mongrels". "This is why we came back. They told us our women were corrupted. And the hodja wouldn't let their children play with ours." (Glodjevo)⁴⁶. This is a painful blow to the Turk's honour and pride. They also undermine their preliminary expectation that, finally, in Turkey they would find justice and understanding. What in effect happened was the opposite. This situation plays havoc with expectations and emotions. To add to the injury, they were accused of being too emotional about the changing of the names. The lack of understanding for their most intimate hurt, the loss of the name, which is synonymous with the loss of honour and pride, together with the accusations levelled against them in their new community, combined to form an explosive emotional mixture. This gave birth to the heretical thought that possibly they would not be able to adapt to the environment, that they might have to go back. The following reported accusations reveal some of the extent of the hurt: "You had stereos, cars, television sets – that means you lived well. You lived well, but a few trouble makers spoilt it all." (Ostrovo)⁴⁷. "If life in Bulgaria is as you say it is, I'd be over like a shot – and let them call me whatever name they want, and let them even push me into a Christian church." (Glodjevo)⁴⁸. "If it was me, let them call me Ivan, Dragan, but I'd know I was a Muslim. What's the big deal about a name?" (Glodjevo)⁴⁹. "So you upped and left? For a name? There are many Turks in Europe and they all say that the main thing is to live well, no matter what your name is." (Dyankovo)⁵⁰.

The hostility of the environment, which hinders the adaptation of the newcomers, found an expression also in the dismissive attitude towards their origins, knowledge

of the Turkish language, education, intelligence. The locals treated them as a lower category of people: "In Turkey they thought we were not European Turks, they said we must have come in from Afghanistan. They even thought we didn't know Turkish – and even on their TV they speak the kind of Turkish we do." (Glodjevo)⁵¹.

It must be pointed out that the discomfort they felt in the new environment had a different effect on different individuals, depending on their psychological stamina and the individual disposition towards change. One thing seems to have been universal. The young proved more resilient to the influence of the new environment, whereas the older age groups were traumatised by the hostility around them. The loss of one's own, dignified place in the social hierarchy, the limited scope of relations in the community, the lack of respect for them – all of these proved fatal for the original enthusiasm and for the intention to make their new home in the new place. One remark makes this clear: "And even when everything is OK, nobody greets you with a Good Afternoon!" (Glodjevo)⁵². That is why the elderly were the first to decide to go back.

One attempt to cope with the pressures of the new environment was the limitation of all social intercourse inside the group of new migrants, cutting off the rest. People tended to settle in places holding earlier migrants from Bulgaria, or people from the same place of origin. There is intercourse with migrants from other parts of the world similarly treated by the local population – such as the Kurds. Parties and festivities are held primarily within the group. This further complicates the process of adaptation to the new environment: "You can't go round anybody's house. They might go out with you to a restaurant. But you could only go to the house of another migrant." (Dyankovo)⁵³. "Over here, in a wedding you'd go out to dance on the streets. Over there it's not acceptable. In weddings they never serve dinner – just sweets. They (the migrants) don't go to weddings, just local ones, unless it's one of their own's. And then they dance until they fall. All dance." (Razgrad)⁵⁴.

A frequent explanation for the impossibility of adapting is the influence of emotions, i.e. of memories of the house, neighbors, pets in Bulgaria. Nostalgia is ever present in the thoughts of the elderly, but sometimes in the young as well. "What did we find dear to our hearts in Turkey? There was nothing. At first I did not miss anything. Then I started missing my house. Where you are born, that's where your soul is. Here we live, here we will die. We are used to here." (Glodjevo)⁵⁵.

The following admission by an elderly man can be added to the picture of nostalgia: "When we started back for Bulgaria, I was uneasy. Then we passed the border, and I started relaxing. 'Oh,' I said, 'old woman – I can smell Bulgaria!'" (Dyankovo)⁵⁶.

With the migration into Turkey, tensions entered inside the group as well. The old proved unable to find work because of changing the village environment for the urban one. They began to feel dependent on the young for finance. This led to generational conflicts. The old wanted to return to the old environment – where they felt useful, strong, active, calm and full of life: "I could not stay on before the eyes of the young, they'd have stopped respecting me. In Turkey, they'd say to me, 'I make the money, I spend it' – and wouldn't listen to me." (Dyankovo)⁵⁷. Where the patriarchal spirit was strong in the family structure, the young swallowed their pride and ambitions for advancement in Turkey, and left to go back with the old.

Among the reasons for the failure to adapt, the respondents mention economic factors last. This is one of the most frequent contradictions between preliminary image and reality. There is dissatisfaction with the lack of social security, with the behavior of employers, with being cheated, with the fact that only the young can find work – and with the impossibility of petty pilfering. "One woman was sacked, because she pinched three potatoes. You can't steal things over there." (Dyanko-

vo)⁵⁸. That is why there is a common agreement that those who stayed on in Turkey were the obstinate, the honest and the hard working, whereas those looking for a fast buck, the lazy and the common people have returned. The re-emigrants tell of their shock on finding the great chasm in Turkey between rich and poor, the vast numbers of the poor, and also of their realization that to attain again the living standard which they had in Bulgaria, they would have to work very hard for a great number of years. This realization can be seen also in the following remark: "If someone comes and tells me I have to go to Turkey again and for good, I'd jump under the bus. Here, where we are all together, we have a life. It's a good life. Over there, you can starve and nobody would bat an eyelid." (Glodjevo)⁵⁹

This picture can be amended with the consideration that, among the factors hindering adaptation was the fact that the migrants tried, in their new situation, to live in the way they had been used to in Bulgaria, to follow a stereotype unsuitable for the new environment. If we add the inability, the lack of will and the impossibility to change their behavior, we can understand the fast appearance of conflicts inside the family and the group. It is also worth noting that adaptation depends to a great extent on the existence of a "regional everyday memory" – something the migrants lacked almost entirely. They did not know the region and the opportunities it may have had for providing the means to keep to the familiar life style. They don't know the way people relate to each other, what kinds of personal links are full of potential and are reliable, and capable of being the basis for mutual aid and the escape from the crisis situation they found themselves in. They were unaware of the social structure of relations between the members of this alien society, so they could not adapt to it and failed to use its potential for satisfying their needs.

The difficulties with adapting have also an ecological side. Although it exists in urban areas, it is strongest in those who migrated to the countryside. Most migrants are unfavourably impressed with the differences in climate and natural conditions: "the climate is heavy", "it's all barren and hilly, rocks, there is nothing." Here one can see particularly clearly the work of the binary opposition here/there: "Here nature is better. Over there, it's no good." (Glodjevo)⁶⁰. Migrants find the local meat too sweet in taste and explain this with the hypothesis that in Turkey animals are not given salt to lick – something which is factually untrue. There is a similar attitude towards milk, yoghurt, cheese (its absence) and other foods. There is an interesting attitude to flowers. Those who have stayed on "there" want to take buds of flowers from Bulgaria. In the choice of a new place to live "there", there is an obvious attempt to find a place with similar natural characteristics to the one left behind. All of these factors in some way are connected with the unacceptable of the new environment and motivate the actions on the basis of the opposition "life here – life there".

All the factors which hinder the adaptation of the migrants have found their expression in individual frustration which later grows into a collective story. Very frequently the disappointed individual tries to find the fault outside, with the family, the immediate group or the world as a whole. Here are some of the typical emotional explosions which form the basis for the collective story of the exodus: "Stupid people! Here is your Muslim state, take it! I shit in your mouths!" (Glodjevo)⁶¹. "I'm coming back, even if they bury me in a Christian church." (Glodjevo)⁶². "I hope this Ozal character dies, cheated us in this way. There people are wolves. Everyone will try to cheat you." (Dyankovo)⁶³. "If Allah had come down, even then I'd not have believed I'd leave. As brothers we lived here with the neighbors. Well, there were some less good. Should a hundred years pass, I'll still be thinking about here." (Ostrovo)⁶⁴. Here are some words which justify and fortify the belief that it was right to return: "Those who stayed on now regret it. Want to come

back, but haven't the money." (Glodjevo)⁶⁵.

Finally, we must note another problem connected with the subject, which is still in evolution today and has no clear image. It is to do with the re-adaptation of those who returned from Turkey and the changing relations between the ethnic groups in the villages. If we take the return to be a signal of some in-depth soul searching and of significant decisions having been taken, the taking up of the familiar life is a difficult, but not a dramatic process. The group has suffered many blows in just a few years, including complete or partial loss of property, family separations, the loss of faith in the "ancient motherland" (Turkey). Together with the joy of returning – and the good welcome received from their neighbors – come problems to do with the attempts to recover titles to abandoned property and with a completely unexpected problem – unemployment. A great proportion of people who had left their property for safe-keeping with relatives, friends or Bulgarian neighbors have had it returned untouched, which has helped the re-knitting of old relationships outside the work sphere, in the community. Some have been scarred by the trials and tribulations of the past few years, and they prefer to remain closed in themselves. There is the almost invisible, but existing, trace of mutual mistrust between the ethnic communities, which can be traced to the new situation of insecurity and suspicion. Time is needed for this to be overcome. This is evinced by the following remarks made by both ethnic groups: "We have returned to the old relations, but there's something missing." (Ostrovo)⁶⁶. "Again we have good relations, but this tragedy has not gone away. I'll never forget the tanks with the red berets on top. Now they've returned the names and people feel better, but this unemployment makes people harder. It's a good thing democracy calmed people down." (Glodjevo)⁶⁷. True, against this background there are some extremes, such as the new fear of Bulgarians that the Turks might extract revenge. Again, Bulgarians increasingly say that, on their return, the Turks have acquired a much greater confidence, in some places you hear nothing but Turkish spoken in public, a great part of the female population has put on the baggy trousers they'd never worn before, there is a deluge of mass culture streaming in from neighboring Turkey, and some have been using the high unemployment to circulate rumours that if they win the local elections, employers would start to sack ethnic Bulgarians and chase them out of the villages. On the other hand is the continuing wish by some Turks who have not been to Turkey, or have returned, to try again. There is also mounting dissatisfaction with the "unwillingness" of the state to tackle the high unemployment among the Bulgarian Turks, and a nostalgia for earlier preferences given to this group; there is dissatisfaction with the course of the land reform, which has left many Turks without the tools of making money when everyone else is doing just that. But, in the main, the population stands firm on the belief that, in order to live a good life, you need "Good friends, good neighbors. We want things to be like they were before. Let everyone live their lives in peace. Everyone needs to live." (Ostrovo)⁶⁸.

As any other form of oral creation, the stories about the events of the recent past and the images they contain have not been totally clarified or completed. They continue to evolve under the influence over the respondents and the general mood in the group. In the communal story which has been evolved, some elements gradually fall by the wayside, and new ones appear in order to motivate a particular explanation for past events. Despite the changes, the oral history of the recent past is a fact which cannot be ignored. This fact marks changes in the moral and values norms of the population and signals changes in the general values system. The experience gathered necessitates the thinking through of the recent history by the individual, the group and the entire Bulgarian nation, so that a clear image of these dramatic events is handed down to the coming generations.

NOTES

1. The field studies in the Razgrad region were carried out between 20 and 28 February 1992 by a team composed of: Professor Dr. Ivanichka Georgieva, Senior Assistant Krassimir Stoilov, Dr Ekaterina Anastassova, Donka Dimitrova, Meglena Koussseva, Dr Djeni Madjarov and Emilia Germanova. The following villages were studied – Glodjevo, Ostrovo, Dyankovo, Pobit Kamak – as was the town of Razgrad. From 4 to 9 April 1992 field studies were carried out in the Kyustendil region by a team composed of: Professor Dr. Ivanichka Georgieva, Senior Assistant Krassimir Stoilov, Meglena Koussseva and Donka Dimitrova. The following villages have been studied – Slokoshtitsa, Tavalichevo, Konyavo, Lozno, Bagrentsi, Gyueshevo – as was the district of Izgrev in the town of Kyustendil.
2. V.A. – Ostrovo, E.G., pp 4, 5.
3. N.D. – Glodjevo, E.G., pp 6, 7.
4. D.B. – Dyankovo, M.K., p. 37.
5. N.N. – Glodjevo, D.M. and M.K., p. 24.
6. S.A. – Ostrovo, D.D., p. 29.
7. S.S. – D.D., p. 63.
8. Y.S. – E.G., p. 22.
9. V.V. – born 1951, Gyueshevo, D.D. and M.K., p. 72.
10. C.P. – Tavalichevo, D.D. and M.K., p. 34.
11. C.P. – D.D. and M.K., p. 33.
12. Y.M. – M.K., p. 35.
13. V.A. – E.G., p. 27.
14. I.S. – D.D., p. 19.
15. S.H. – Ostrovo, D.D., p. 49.
16. A.A. – Razgrad, D.D., p. 45.
17. N.K. – Glodjevo, M.K., p. 11.
18. A.A. – D.D., p. 42.
19. E.A. – Razgrad, D.D., p. 67.
20. S.M. – Dyankovo, E.G., p. 36.
21. S.A. – a school teacher, female, near 50 years, E.A., p. 58.
22. A.Y. – Slokoshtitsa, D.D. and M.K., p. 17.
23. V.A. – E.G., p. 24.
24. N.N. – D.M. and M.K., p. 22.
25. M.A. – Glodjevo E.A., p. 21
26. S.B. – the region of Kurdjali, D.D. and M.K., p. 22.
27. B.Y. – Glodjevo, E.A., p. 27.
28. N.D. – E.G., p. 6.
29. E.P. – Razgrad, D.M., p. 5.
30. R.F. – Lozno, D.D. and M.S., p. 53.
31. F.V. – D.D. and M.S., p. 61.
32. - On the problem of the culture shock, see Laura Manninen-Rasanen, "Interaction and Crisis," *Social Networks*, 2, the Third Finnish-Hungarian Symposium on Ethnology in Konnevesi, Ethnos-Toinite, (1989).
33. Y.M. – M.K., p. 33.
34. S.M. – E.G., p. 37.
35. V.A. – E.K., p. 24.
36. E.P. – D.M., p. 7.
37. Y.M. – M.K., p. 32.
38. S.M. – E.G., p. 37.
39. S. – Glodjevo, D.D., pp 26, 27.
40. H.J. – D.D., p. 10
41. S.M. – E.G., p. 35.
42. I.I. – Ostrovo, D.D., p. 33
43. M.D. – Ostrovo, D.D., p. 37.
44. H.J. – D.D., p. 10.
45. I.I. – D.D., p. 33.
46. H.J. – E.G., p. 6.
47. H.C. – Ostrovo, D.D. p. 37.
48. B.Y. – E.G., p. 26.
49. H.J. – E.A. p. 6.
50. S.M. – E.G., p. 36.

51. I.T. - Glodjevo, E.G., p. 20.
52. H.J. - E.A., p. 6.
53. S.M. - E.G., p. 35.
54. Y.M. - M.K., p. 33.
55. I.S. - D.D., p. 20.
56. E.A. - D.D., p. 66.
57. E.A. - D.D., p. 67.
58. S.S. - D.D., p. 64.
59. These are the words of M.A.'s Turkish neighbor, Glodjevo - E.A., p. 20.
60. H.J. - E.G., p. 3.
61. These are the words of the informer's daughter, H.J. at the Kappi Kule border check-point.
62. H.J. - E.G., p. 23.
63. N.N. is quoting the words of her Turkish neighbor who has returned from Turkey - D.M. and M.K., p. 23.
64. The informer M.D. has remained in Turkey after emigrating in 1989 - D.D., p. 37.
65. These are the words of the informer's daughter-in-law H.J. - E.G., p. 4.
66. Y.S. - D.D., p. 30.
67. N.K. - M.K., p. 11.
68. S.K. - Ostrovo, and D.D. - Ostrovo, E.G., p. 32.