



Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi / The Journal of Social Sciences

Akademik Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi, Yıl: 6, Sayı: 34, Şubat 2019, s. 201-211

ISSN: 2149-0821 Doi Number:<http://dx.doi.org/10.16990/SOBIDER.4788>

Dr. Vildane DİNÇ

Uludağ Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü,

vildanealieva@yahoo.com

RESISTANCE AGAINST NAMECIDE IN COMMUNIST BULGARIA

Abstract

The term of *namecide* defines the systematic forcible destruction of the native names of individuals belonging to different ethnic, cultural, religious or national minorities. In the dominant literature, the *namecide* is known as “forcible changing names” or “renaming”. During the period 1984-1989, the Bulgarian Socialist Government carried out a massive namecide on the national Turkish minority on the scale of ethnic genocide. To legitimize this process, it calls it a “revival process”. This is the most obvious rapid method of destroying the culture of a minority in Europe in the 1980s. The article presents various aspects of the reaction of victims of the “revival process” on the basis of empirical data and information.

Keywords: namecide, name-anomie, ethnic genocide, expulsion, crime, resistance, victim

KOMÜNİST BULGARİSTAN'DA ADKIRIMINA KARŞI DİRENİŞ

Özet

Adkırımı kavramı, bir politik otorite tarafından etnik, kültürel, dinsel ya da ulusal azınlık grubu mensuplarına ait doğma adların sistematik olarak zorla yok edilmesi uygulamasını tanımlamaktadır. Yirminci yüzyılda Avrupa’da adkırımının en belirgin ve hızlandırılmış örneği, sosyalist Bulgaristan’da yerli ulusal Türk azınlığı mensupları üzerinde uygulanmıştır. 1984-89 döneminde sosyalist Bulgar politik otoritesi, adkırımını ‘soya dönüş süreci’ adıyla uygulanan zorla Bulgarlaştırma kapsamında gerçekleştirmiştir. Makalede sosyalist Bulgaristan’da adkırımına karşı Türklerin gösterdiği tepki ve direniş kalıpları, 1984-89 dönemine

odaklanılarak keşfedilmeye çalışılmaktadır. Makalede gözlem ve görüşmelerden elde edilen birincil kaynak niteliğindeki verilerden yararlanılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: adkırımı, ad-anomisi, etnik soykırım, kovma, suç, direniş, mağdur

1. Introduction

In the period of 1984-1989, the Bulgarian Socialist Government conducted a massive namecides (the forcible changing of names, renaming) on the Turkish minority on the scale of ethnic genocide. In order to legitimize it, it calls it a “revival process”. In the dominant Bulgarian, Turkish and English-language literature, this ethnic genocide is known as the “revival process”, “so called revival process”, “assimilation” or “forced assimilation”. This article presents various aspects of victims’ reaction and resistance. The methodology of the study is based on in-depth interviews and observations including over twenty years. The empirical material used includes data from primary sources provided during interviews and author’s observations between 1984 and 2015. For security reasons, the names of the respondents were changed in the article. The author is a direct participant and a victim of what happened in the country in the 1980s.

At different periods in Bulgarian history, the namecide is also applied to other minorities (Roma, Pomaks, Macedonians, etc.). This study is limited only to the namecides on Turks (including Tatars and Turkish-speaking Roma) between 1984 and 1989.

The text includes, in the first place, the official definitions that post-socialist rule has used with regard to forced Bulgarisation of national Turkish minority. The following is a presentation of the forced replaced of the native Turkish names with “Bulgarian/Russian/Slavs” ones, analyzed by the concept of the namecide. Thirdly is discussed the patterns and dimensions of the resistance of the Turkish minority against ethnic discrimination. Fourthly, the dysfunctions of the namecide, defined with the concept of name-anomie (anomie of the name system), are presented in its main dimensions. Lastly, the namecide, name-anomie and victim’s reaction and resistance are discussed in the context of the European framework for the protection of national minority rights.

2. Forced Bulgarisation and Latest Definitions

On January 25, 2006 in Strasbourg, head of the Bulgarian parliamentary delegation, Yunal Lyutfi, said in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe that the communist regimes carried out many repressions and criminal acts, some of them remained repressive and criminal until their end. The most striking example of this is the so-called “revival process” in Bulgaria that affects more than one million ethnic Turks and other Muslims, which is essentially an ethnocide policy (Narodno Sybranie na Republika Bylgarija 2006¹; Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly 2010²). The ethnic genocide was conducted in the framework of a cultural genocide accompanied by a series of murders (Associated Pres 1986) and imprisonment in prisons and concentration camps (such as Belene, Bobov dol, etc.), home arrest, forced labor,

¹ <http://www.parliament.bg/bg/news/ID/759>, публикувано на 25 януари 2006 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

² <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4bdadc1b0.html>, публикувано на 29 март 2010 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

displacement, expulsion from the country, etc. The goal of the political power is to implement a project to build a “socialist Bulgarian nation” (see Angelov 2008: 223, 383) and in this context to legitimize the so-called “revival process”.

By the end of 1985, the native names of all Turks in Bulgaria were changed to “Bulgarian”. The use of all elements of Turkish culture was banned and subject to sanctions. Vesselin Dimitrov summarizes that the “revival process” is a case of the fastest destruction of the “cultural” in modern European history (Dimitrov 2000: 1).

In the summer of 1989 there was an ethnic expulsion (in the dominant discourse: ethnic cleansing), in which the number of members of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria declined by almost half (Народно Събрание на Република България 2006³; Демократи за силна България 2012⁴). “Ethnic cleansing” means creating an ethnically homogeneous territory by removing persons from ethnic, national, religious, and so on. minorities from the area using force or intimidation. Ethnic cleansing brings many aspects of genocide (United Nations 1994: 33⁵; Hayden 1996: 731).

For two and a half months in the summer of 1989, Bulgaria left 400,000 Turks (Демократи за силна България 2012⁶). On January 11, 2012, the Bulgarian Parliament defined this process as “ethnic cleansing” (Демократи за силна България 2012⁷; Народно Събрание на Република България 2012⁸). Almost all displaced and displaced Turks are granted refugee status and find shelter in Turkey. Ethnic cleansing was legitimated by the officially created term of “big excursion”, as those who leave Bulgaria, entered with a tourist visa to Turkey. This is the largest population displacement from an European state since World War II, and Victor Bojkov analyzed it by the term of quasi-genocide⁹ (in other words, almost genocide) (Bojkov 2004: 344).

In addition to the concepts of ethnic genocide and ethnic cleansing proposed by post-socialist Bulgarian political power to define the political pressure on the national Turkish minority in the period 1984-1989, on September 17, 2015, the Bulgarian Parliament adopted a bill condemning the crimes against humanity, committed during the socialist regime (Народно Събрание на Република България 2016¹⁰). Accordingly, ethnic genocide (so-called “revival

³ <http://www.parliament.bg/bg/news/ID/759>, публикувано на 25 януари 2006 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

⁴ <http://dsb.bg/bg/blogs/article/3065>, публикувано на 11 януари 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

⁵ http://www.icty.org/x/file/About/OTP/un_commission_of_experts_report1994_en.pdf, публикувано на 24 май 1994 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

⁶ <http://dsb.bg/bg/blogs/article/3065>, публикувано на 11 януари 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

⁷ <http://dsb.bg/bg/blogs/article/3065>, публикувано на 11 януари 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

⁸ <http://www.parliament.bg/bg/news/ID/2348>, публикувано на 11 януари 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

⁹ По-скоро – псевдо-геноцид, бел. съст., Е. А.

¹⁰ <http://www.parliament.bg/bills/43/654-01-8.pdf>, публикувано на 27 януари 2016 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

process”) and ethnic cleansing (so-called “big excursion”) carried out by the socialist Bulgarian authorities are categorized as crimes against humanity (United Nations 1994¹¹).

It can be said that the resistance from the victims against these crimes committed in the recent past was rather weak. Even today, there is a deep silence on the part of the victims about these events. One reason for this is the victims’ inability to produce knowledge and initiate a discussion of the crime, another is the intentional engineering of information and memory within a certain political context. This construction is based on contemporary ideological values, which have a decisive role for the whole of Europe, including Turkey. These ideological values determine what crime and punishment are, which victims will be interested, what crime will be punished and what not, how political pressure will be determined, and so on.

3. Concept of Namecide and Implementation of Namecide

The concept of namecide defines the forcible change of the native names of members of an ethnic, cultural, religious or national minority. Also, it determines completely or partially the change of names of towns, villages, mountains, hills, rivers, streams, fields, fountains, tombstones and others belonging to ethnic, national, religious, etc. minority culture. Typically, these names are replaced by “new” ones belonging to the dominant group.

The concept of a namecide in social sciences was first proposed and used by me (Özkan 2010) in my doctoral thesis to define the forcible change of the names of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. The concepts of genocide, ethnocide and cultural genocide served as an inspiration and a model. As already mentioned, the namecide is most often called as “renaming”, “changing names”, “forced changing names”. It can be said that with regard to the definition of the process, the concept of namecide is more specific and more operational than these mentioned three expressions.

According to V. Dimitrov, the forcible change of names is the most extreme nationalist policy in eastern Europe in the 1980s: “This is one of the most comprehensive and certainly the fastest assimilation campaign in the history of Europe. Changing the personal name, this is something that was not applied earlier in any communist regime. Even Ceausescu in Romania (...) did not go so far as to change the Romanian minority names [for example Roma, Turkish (including Tatar), Hungarian, etc. minorities]” (Dimitrov 2000: 2).

The forcible change of the names of the Turks and Muslims in Bulgaria are described in detail and analytically most in the Bulgarian literature (for example, see Gruev & Kalyonski 2008, Anastasova 1993, Madjarov 1993, Georgieva 1993). Though less, there is also Turkish literature on the same case (for example, see Atasoy 2011).

In this article, the basic patterns of the namecide on the Turkish minority in Bulgaria are derived as a result of a research among the victims of the namecide:

1. *Using the strategy “we do it to others, but we will not do it to you”*: The ethnic background of individuals in the family is used to determine the direction of the process as well as its explanation or argument. It also serves to justify what is happening. According to the narratives of the interviewed victims, the namecide on mixed Turkish-Pomaks families began before 1980. Initially the names of the members of these families and then of the ethnically

¹¹ http://www.icty.org/x/file/About/OTP/un_commission_of_experts_report1994_en.pdf, публикувано на 24 май 1994 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.

homogeneous Turkish households were changed. Political power explains what happens in the following way to Turkish minority: “We just change the name of the families of mixed Turkish-Pomak marriages, they are not Turks, they are mixed, so we change their names, we will not touch your names.” This explanation / declaration has the function of legitimizing the namecide over the mixed families and of preventing the resistance of the ethnically homogeneous Turkish households. However, after the forced change of names within the mixed families, Turkish families are coming. During this period, according to many informants, the authorities explained the need to conduct this policy towards individual villages without mentioning that the same would be applied in all settlements with Turkish-speaking population. Before and in 1984, the purpose of such a strategy was to prevent collective resistance and uprising of the Turkish minority (Vildane Dinç’s Personal Archive: data from the narratives of interviewed victims recorded by Vildane Dinç in 2009-2015 in Turkey and Bulgaria; Vildane Dinç’s Personal Archive – hereafter: P.A., V.D.).

2. *Namecide on the dead:* The ethnic namecide implemented by the Bulgarian authorities on the Turks is extremely diverse and diverse. It also affects their dead ancestors. During the forced renaming was changed the names of the dead parents because of the surnames of the victims. The non-Bulgarian inscriptions of the tombstones, written in Latin and Cyrillic, are deleted.

3. *Imposing a “Bulgarian name”, which begins with the first letter of the native Turkish name.* Typically, the new forced name begins with the first letter of the victim’s native Turkish name. If the Turkish name is “Sevinch”, for example, the Bulgarian one also begins with the letter “S”. Thus, Sevinch turns to Svetlana, for example. However, the “Bulgarian name”s were also imposed in an arbitrary way. For example, one of the victims, Mehmed (a construction technician born in 1954 in Krumovgrad, Kardzhali), confined to the concentration camp in Belene¹² because of his resistance to the namecide process, told: “A Bulgarian officer who name is Georgi said me that let me be a namesake with you and me gave the name Georgi” (P.A., V.D.).

4. *Refusal to change with Bulgarian names and surnames that resemble Turkish names and words.* For example, some Turks are not given these Bulgarian names and surnames: “Nina” (resembles the Turkish word “nine”, meaning “grandmother”); “Bashev” (resembles the Turkish “baş çavuş” and means “big boss”); “Йосиф [Joseph]” (resembles the name “Yusuf”, which the Turks also very often use). This is paradoxical, because during this period the Bulgarians bear these names, although they are similar to Turkish ones (P.A., V.D.). In the

¹² In the totalitarian regime, the official definition of Belene camp is a “labor-educational dormitory / camp” (see eg Özkan 2010: 224-248). During this period, this definition has the function of concealing the illegal detention and imprisonment of persons in connection with the forcible change of the names of some citizens.

Recent Belene camp researchers have been more defined as “concentration camp”. For example, Gruev and Kalyonski (2008: 139) refer to Belene, which was opened for the third time in socialist Bulgaria for Turkish victims of namecide as a “concentration camp”.

For the period from 1944 to 1989 in Bulgaria “in 92 concentration camps people were sent without a conviction for political reasons because they opposed the regime or even because they were not its supporters” (National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria 2006: <http://www.parliament.bg/bg/news/ID/759>, published on 25 January 2006, last entry on 8 June 2016). One of these concentration camps is Belene.

context of these cases, it can be said that the Turks are given more strictly Bulgarian names than the Bulgarians themselves carry.

5. *Ethnic discrimination after namecide.* The namecide was made as a result of the official thesis that there are only Bulgarians in the country and people who speak Turkish but are “descendants of Turkified Bulgarians”. But even after 1984-1985, the ethnic discrimination against the Turks (already bearing “Bulgarian names”) continued. For example, in the education system - almost no Turkish teachers, the Turks have no right to practice certain professions - for example, they can not become pilots and military, the freedom of movement is restricted, etc. (P.A., V.D.).

4. Reactions and Resistance Against Namecide

Foucault (2005: 63) distinguishes three types of resistance to: 1. Forms of domination (ethnic, social and religious); 2. Exploitation (economic); 3. Yourself and the situation. In the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, the resistance against namecide is usually of the first type.

The socialist power views the cultural differences of the Turkish minority compared to those of the Bulgarian society in a dualistic way, as Bulgarian culture being considered “correct” while the Turkish is “wrong”.

In order to correct this “wrongness”, the processes of assimilation, ethnic genocide, namecide, ethnic discrimination, and ethnic expulsion were carried out. Reactions to this happen for a short while exploding in the streets of the affected villages in the form of collective protests: “Because only our names remained in our hands” (Zümbül, January 2015, Bursa – P.A., V.D.). In this sentence, Zümbül (a teacher born in 1957 in Kardzhali) reveals the biggest reason for the collective resistance against the namecide, and not so against the other forms of discrimination against Turkish culture: for example, the prohibition of speaking in Turkish, religious belief practices, etc.

All forms of resistance to members of the Turkish minority were punished. The tools and methods of persecution were different: prison, home imprisonment, oversight, prohibition of communication, concentration camps, exile, torture, mutilation, dismissal, pressure on the family, close relatives and friends, even murders.

During the period 1984-1989 the reactions and resistance of the Turkish minority against the namecide in Bulgaria can be classified into the following five categories:

1. *Hidden resistance* - a form of reaction in which the victim, on the one hand, fails to comply with the demands of the government, but on the other hand, does not openly disagree with the political authorities or the conspirators working for them. This is the most common pattern of resistance among the victims. Alpay (engineer, born in 1961 in Momchilgrad/Mastanlı, Kardzhali) says that as a student at the University of Sofia he is waiting for his friends to leave the room in dormitory and only then secretly reads the Turkish book he keeps under the mattress because: “Then in Bulgaria the preservation of a Turkish book was dangerous, as if to keep a weapon” (Alpay, January 2010, Bursa – P.A., V.D.). Another example of the hidden resistance of the Turks is the secret use of their native names only within the their families and close friend community.

2. *Open resistance* is a form of reaction in which the victim does not comply with the requirements of the government and openly disagrees. Active resistance can be divided into

two forms: individual and collective. In the history of the People's Republic of Bulgaria one of the largest mass demonstrations was held against the practices of the namecide. For example, this happened on 26 December 1984 in the village of Benkovski, Kardzhali, where thousands of Turks gather from the surrounding villages to express their dissatisfaction with the change of names in front of the local communist party (BKP) house with slogans such as "Forcible change of names does not correspond the principles of Lenin and Marx" (Alper, January 2010, Bursa – P.A., V.D.). Alper (a teacher born in 1946 in the village of Benkovski, Kardzhali) tells that in this protest several people were shot by the militia. Many of the participants were arrested in the following days, some were sent to camps, prisons, and so on. This type of protest procession is an open form of collective resistance. Those who openly do not accept "forcibly given their Bulgarian name" were the first expelled from Bulgaria in 1989, a few months before the collapse of the communist regime.

3. *Choice of the lesser evil* is seen as a choice of victims during the namecide. During this period the Turks were forced to choose Bulgarian names. Some who do not like their new name given by officials choose "more acceptable" Bulgarian names. For example, Shaban (a driver born in 1953 in the village of Yabalkovets/Almalı, Kardzhali) was given the Bulgarian name "Sharo", but he did not like that name because it is one of the names more called dogs, not people in Bulgaria. After this renaming he goes and takes the name "Sergei" instead of "Sharo". For Shaban the name "Sergei" is more acceptable than "Sharo" (Shaban, January 2010, Bursa - P.A., V.D.). Others stop on names that look like Turkish. For example, many elderly women choose the Bulgarian name "Ana", because that name in Turkish means "mom" (P.A., V.D.). There are also rare cases of choosing names that just like or are popular. For example, one of the victims tells that when she has to choose a Bulgarian name, she decides to stop on the name of her favorite Russian actress (P.A., V.D.).

4. *Adaptation* is a form of reaction in which the victims respond to the demands of the government for various reasons. However, a very small proportion of victims show total adaptation to the forced given names. One of the interesting forms is during the "family tree ceremonies": in restaurants in the villages, for example, they openly declare that they are "Bulgarians, not Turks" (P.A., V.D.).

5. *Türkiyecilik*¹³ (Turkish term) is the most common behavior against discrimination, assimilation, namecide, and so on., of the Turkish minority in socialist Bulgaria. The most accurate translation of "Türkiyecilik" is "Turkeyism". This reaction is both resistance and consent. During the totalitarian regime in Bulgaria for many representatives of the Turkish minority, departure to Turkey is the only solution for ending discrimination. "Türkiyecilik" is a Turkish word that is used by members of the Turkish minority in everyday life and is a unique model for resisting among minorities. In the historical situation, the escape from Bulgaria and the demand for asylum in Turkey is defined as "Türkiyecilik" and is the minority's response to what happened during the ethnic genocide including the namecide, or the so-called "Revival Process".

In the way of the democratic course that Bulgaria has taken after the end of the communist regime in 1989, the government did not change the forced given Bulgarian names, but in 1990 was recognized the victims' right to return their native Turkish names - initially

¹³ Türkiyecilik is not a form of nationalism.

through a free court procedure, and later by paid. However, almost half of the victims are no longer in the country.

During the period of post-communism, at the level of individual behavior, the reaction and resistance of the victims against the namecide can be classified into the following seven categories:

1. Today some of the victims continue to live with the severe trauma of the past and do not even want to pronounce the forcibly given name.

2. Part of the victims recovered their Turkish names and surnames, but without the suffixes – ov, ova.

3. Others leave the suffixes (ov, ova) in their surnames names, as they used to be before.

4. Some of the migrants who expelled in the summer of 1989, who are now living in Turkey, are telling about their wish to return Turkish names but have no economic or health opportunity to do so.

5. In some cases, some of the victims today volunteer and proudly use their forcible given names during the period 1984-1985 in Bulgaria.

6. Some of the Turks still reluctantly bear the names given to them during the ethnic genocide of 1984-1989 in Bulgaria. According to them, this gives them the opportunity to travel in Europe or even in Bulgaria, where with their Turkish names they will be welcomed more badly than with the Bulgarian ones.

7. Part of the Turks originally restored their Turkish name, but after a while they returned to the forcible given Bulgarian name in order to cope with the restrictions imposed by the state. Some say they can not find a job with their Turkish names in post-communist Bulgaria and return their Bulgarian names in order to find a quicker job (P.A., V.D.).

David Popenoe (Popenoe 1974: 351) and James Zanden (Zanden 1983: 311) analyze four patterns of minority group reaction against discrimination by the dominant groups: acceptance, avoidance, assimilation and aggression. The members of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria show the first three reactionary patterns of behavior (acceptance, avoidance and assimilation), but neither in communism nor in post-communism they respond with aggression (except for some isolated examples).

5. Destructive Consequences: Anomie of Name System

In post-communist period, the namecide as a kind of Bulgarian communist political violence against Turks, Tatars, Roma, Pomaks, etc. have been terminated. However, it continues to influence different aspects of the lives of victims, no matter in which country they live today. The victims continue to experience the destructive consequences of the communist namecide. These consequences can be defined as name-anomie, ie, anomie of name system. It can be said that when there is a great degree - to anomie - of change and inhomogeneity in the social system of a social group, it means that there is inhomogeneity and anomie in the structure and culture of the minority group itself. The concept of name-anomie defines the destructive effects of namecide on the integration of a social group into the post-namecide period.

Today the dysfunctions of name-anomie have the following three main dimensions:

1. *Impossibility to return the native names:* Many of the victims who were expelled from the country in the summer of 1989 and already live in Turkey, Europe, etc., want returning their native Turkish names in the framework of Bulgarian citizenship and passport, but for various reasons they are unable to do so. The reasons for these barriers are different in different countries and different victims. Among the most important are economic difficulties, lack of leisure time, health problems, continuing ethnic discrimination, and so on.

2. *Difficulties arising from official mistakes:* The victims who expelled from Bulgaria received passports with a forcibly imposed Bulgarian name, but very often these names are improperly written. This creates difficulties for the victims today. For example, one of the victims of the namecide of December 1984 had been given the name “Vera”, but when she left the country in the summer of 1989, “Vora” was recorded in her Bulgarian passport and the name in her act of birth was “Ayla”. If she does not have the chance to regain her Turkish name in her Bulgarian identity documents, then she remains with two names - Vera and Vora, which is a prerequisite for a number of administrative difficulties.

3. *Destruction of Group Integration:* The names of individuals fulfill one of the most important functions for the integrity and integration of ethnic, national and other groups. The namecide violence on the names of a community contributes to the destruction of its integrity. Changing the names of the deceased destroys the integrity and sustainability between the generations. An example is a family in which some of the members have restored their native Turkish language, but others continue to live with the names given during the communist namecide.

6. Conclusion

Analyzing the reactions and the resistance of the victims against the namecide shows diversity of them. Reasons of diverse reactions patterns can be classified as economic, social, urban, occupational, cognitive, and so on. Despite the differences, in the communist period, the reaction to the namecide was largely in the forms of: latent resistance, apparent resistance, and *Türkiyecilik*. Today, in the post-communist period, the counteraction of the victims against the namecide and name-anomie has three main trends. The first is directed primarily at ignoring the violence and forgetting the namecide. In the second, the victims’ memories show a decrease the violence in their oral histories of the namecide. The third is directed to requests for justice in respect of what happened in the namecide period of 1984-1989.

On the other hand, although in the socio-cultural and political context there is an original form, the namecide is not adequately studied by the social sciences and has not been conceptualized in a specific and analytical way from the dominant definitions. Today, the concrete conceptions of the situation and problems of national minorities in the European Union must be related to their rights. Need to be able to use appropriate concepts when discussing the problems of crimes committed by the communist authorities, as the inappropriate terms continue intentionally or unintentionally to injure the victims. For example, the use of terms such as the “Revival Process” and “Big Excursion” that were introduced in the 1980s’ communist party were highly problematic. However a high percent of researchers of these process continue to use Jivkov’s terminology to define Jivkov’s crimes, such as the namecide.

In the post-communist period, the civil status of the Turks in Bulgaria is complicated because in the Constitution they are not defined as a national minority (the term minority is

missing in the Constitution, but - paradoxically - Bulgaria has ratified the European Convention on the Rights of Minorities). In some areas extreme Bulgarian nationalism continues today, manifested in different types, sizes and forms, still strongly influencing (for some examples, Özkan 2012) the situation of victims. In order to analyze and define in a concrete way what is happening, there is a need to collect more empirical data and primary sources. Free access to archival documents on this issue, as well as the need to collect more stories from living witnesses, are a prerequisite for further exploration of the subject.

REFERENCES

- Анастасова, Е. 1993. Аз и Другият. Митология и идентичност. – В: Марушиакова, Е. (първа статия). Етническата картина в България. Издателство “КЛУБ’90”. 156-163. [Anastasova, E. 1993. “Az i Drugiyat. Mitologiya i identichnost”. Etnicheskata kartina v Bŭlgariya. Izdatelstvo “KLUB’90”. 156-163].
- Ангелов, В. 2008. Строго поверително! Асимилаторската кампания срещу турското национално малцинство в България 1984-1989. Документи. София: Фондация Либерална интеграция. [Angelov, V. 2008. Stogo Poveritelno! Asimilatorskata Kampaniya Sreshtu Turskoto Natsionalno Maltsinstvo v Bŭlgariya 1984-1989. Dokumenti. Sofiya: Fondatsiya Liberalna Integratsiya].
- Демократите за силна България. 2012. Декларация, осъждаща опита за насилствена асимилация. [Demokratite za silna Bŭlgariya. 2012. Deklaratsiya, osŭzhdashta opita za nasilstvena asimilatsiya]. (<http://dsb.bg/bg/blogs/article/3065>, публикувано на 11 януари 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Георгиева, И. 1993. “Възродителният Процес” и “Голямата Екскурзия” (Опит за рална история). – В: Марушиакова, Е. (първа статия). Етническата картина в България. Издателство “КЛУБ’90”. 105-109. [Georgieva, I. 1993. ““Vŭzroditelniyat Protses” i “Golyamata Ekskurziya” (Opit za Oralna Istoriya)”. Etnicheskata Kartina v Bŭlgariya. Izdatelstvo “KLUB’90”. 105-109].
- Груев, М. & Калъонски, А. 2008. Възродителният процес. София: Ciela. Институт за изследване на близкото минало. [Gruev, M. & Kal’onski, A. 2008. Vŭzroditelniyat Protses. Sofiya: Ciela. Institut za izsledvane na blizkoto minalo].
- Народно Събрание на Република България. 2006. Изказване на заместник-председателя на НС г-н Юнал Лютфи пред Парламентарната асамблея на Съвета на Европа. [Narodno Sŭbranie na Republika Bŭlgariya. 2006. Izkazvane na zamestnik-predsedatelya na NS g-n Yunal Lyutfi pred Parlamentarnata asambleya na Sŭveta na Evropa]. (<http://www.parliament.bg/bg/news/ID/759>, публикувано на 25 януари 2006 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Народно Събрание на Република България. 2012. Започна Осмата сесия на 41-то Народно събрание. [Narodno Sŭbranie na Republika Bŭlgariya. 2012. Zapochna Osmata sesiya na 41-to Narodno sŭbranie]. (<http://www.parliament.bg/bg/news/ID/2348>, публикувано на 11 януари 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Народно Събрание на Република България. 2016. Законопроект за изменение и допълнение на Закона за обявяване на комунистическия режим в България за престъпен. [Narodno Sŭbranie na Republika Bŭlgariya. 2016. Zakonoproekt za

- izmenenie i dopълnenie na Zakona za obyavyavane na komunisticheskiya rezhim v Bŭlgariya za prestŭpen]. (<http://www.parliament.bg/bills/43/654-01-8.pdf>, публикувано на 27 януари 2016 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Маджаров, Дж. 1993. Адаптацията - реалност и образи. – В: В: Марушиакова, Е. (първа статия). Етническата картина в България. Издателство “КЛУБ’90”. 117-137. [Dzh. Madzharov. 1993. “Adaptatsiyata - Realnost i Obrazi”. Etnicheskata Kartina v Bŭlgariya. Izdatelstvo “KLUB’90”. 117-137].
- Associated Pres. 1986. Bulgaria Killing Ethnic Turks. Ethnic Turks Imprisoned During Bulgarian Assimilation Campaign: Amnesty International’s News.
- Atasoy, E. 2011. Bizden Olan Ötekiler: Asimilasyon Kıskacında Bulgaristan Türkleri. Bursa: MKM Yayıncılık.
- Bojkov, V. 2004. Bulgaria’s Turks in the 1980s: a minority endangered. In: Journal of Genocide Research 6 (3), September, 343–369.
- Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly. 2010. Post-Monitoring Dialogue With Bulgaria. Doc. 12187 (<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4bdadc1b0.html>, публикувано на 29 март 2010 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Dimitrov, V. 2000. In Search of a Homogeneous Nation: The Assimilation of Bulgaria’s Turkish Minority, 1984-1985. In: Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minorities Issues in Europe. 1/4: 1-22 (<http://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/downloads/publications/JEMIE/JEMIE01Dimitrov10-07-01.pdf>, публикувано на 23 декември 2000, последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Foucault, M. 2005. “Özne ve İktidar”, Özne ve İktidar. Преведено на турски: Ergüden & Akınhay. Второ издание. 57-82. İstanbul: Aygıntı Yayınları.
- Hayden, R. M. 1996. Schindler's Fate: Genocide, Ethnic Cleansing, and Population Transfers. In: Slavic Review, 55/4: 727-748.
- Özkan, V. 2010. Bulgaristan Halk Cumhuriyeti’nde Siyasi Otorite ile Ulusal Türk Azınlığı Arasındaki Güç İlişkileri Bağlamında Belene Toplama Kampı (1985-86), докторска дисертация, 2010 г., ръководителка Проф. Др. Айлин Г. Баран, Хаджеттепе университет. (<http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/>, публикувано на 15 май 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Özkan, V. 2012. Special Issue on Bulgarian Nationalism: 2001-2012. In: Umland, A. (ed.) Russian Nationalism Bulletin, 6/15(171). (http://groups.yahoo.com/group/russian_nationalism/messages/1208?threaded=1&m=e&var=1&tidx=1, публикувано на 10 септември 2012 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Popenoe, D. 1974. Sociology. 2nd edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs.
- United Nations. 1994. Letter Dated 24 May 1994 From the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council. (http://www.icty.org/x/file/About/OTP/un_commission_of_experts_report1994_en.pdf, публикувано на 24 май 1994 г., последно влизане на 8 юни 2016 г.).
- Zanden V.J.W. 1983. American Minority Relations, 4th edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.