

# **BULGARIA AND EUROPEAN UNION: MINORITIES'S SITUATION IN BULGARIA DURING THE INTEGRATION PROCESS FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Berna Türkdoğan Uysal\*

## **Abstract**

The Bulgarian Government approved the first report on the Frame Convention on the Protection of Minorities. It states that those are Bulgaria's citizens belonging to the ethnic, religious and lingual minorities. Bulgaria stands on the understanding that the protection of minorities is executed by the real guaranteeing of individual rights and freedoms of individuals belonging to them – the introduction to the report reads. They are to work on the problems of the minorities. In this paper, we will deal with the identity and the possible situation of minorities in Bulgaria after EU integration.

**Key Words:** European Union, Bulgaria, minorities

## **Özet**

Bulgar Hükümeti Azınlıkların Korunmasına İlişkin Çerçeve Sözleşme ile ilgili ilk raporunu onayladı. Bununla etnik, dini ve dil olarak azınlıklara mensup Bulgaristan vatandaşlarını kapsadığını belirtiyor. Raporun giriş kısmında - Bulgaristan azınlıkların korunmasını, bireysel haklar ve bunlara ait bireylerin özgürlüklerinin gerçek anlamda teminat altına aldığını ve Bulgaristan hükümeti tarafından yürütüldüğünü ifade ediyor. Azınlıkların sorunları üzerinde çalışacaklarını belirtiyorlar. Bu yazıda, AB üyeliği sonrasında Bulgaristan'ın kimlik ve azınlıkların olası durumuna yaklaşımı ele alınmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Avrupa Birliği, Bulgaristan, azınlıklar

The foreign policy of Bulgaria is based on the values of freedom and democracy and the philosophy of the Euro-Atlantic co-operation. In practical terms, the strategic landmarks for Bulgarian foreign policy are accelerated accession to the EU and NATO, as well as full partnership with the countries of world regions in compliance with the country's priorities.

---

\* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Akdeniz Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü. bturkdogan@akdeniz.edu.tr

Bulgaria has lived in amity with the minorities which are within her frontiers of 1878. The Turks, the largest minority in Bulgaria and numbering nearly 10 percent of the population, are relics of the old Turkish rule in the Balkans. The Pomaks are "so-called" Bulgars by origin and language, but Mohammedans by religion. They are a truculent peasant people living in the Rhodope mountains. The Tatars and Gagauz are small ethnic remnants. The Gypsies are put at 134,000 and are mostly Moslems. The Roumanians or Vlachs are in part half-assimilated relics of earlier immigrants from Roumania living chiefly round Vidin. Bulgaria has been anxious to reduce this minority and there have been complaints of forced assimilation. No Roumanians live on the Bulgarian side of the old frontier of the Southern Dobrogea and the Roumanians of the Southern Dobrogea reacquired by Bulgaria in 1940 have been exchanged against Bulgars from the Northern Dobrogea. The Jews were in 1934 and old-established body of Sephardim and until the advent of Nazism lived on good terms with the Bulgars. Only about 10,000 Greeks remained in Old Bulgaria after the war of 1914-18 and the subsequent exchange of populations. The preponderantly Greek population of eastern Macedonia and western Thrace was persecuted during the Bulgarian occupation of 1941-44. The 23,000 Armenians who are largely at Plovdiv, have kept their language and belong to the Gregorian Church. The other minorities of Old Bulgaria are Macedo-Slavs but they were treated by Bulgaria. (Document 37, v.6. p.26)

The population balance has been changed after the Ottoman-Russo War 1877-1878. Before the war, in Bulgaria there was 3.2 million people (half of them muslim), the Bulgarian population was the minority. (Türbedar Turan'dan 2003:19) Between 1878-1908, Bulgarian Turks had been suffered. Their population was about 600.000.

Eventhough that there was an inconsistent population datas. It should be expressed without detailing, it is known that 450.000 Turkish people were killed and 1.5 million had migrated forcibly from Danube before the establishment of Bulgarian State. Within the aspect of war history and war sociology, the population which has the power to be able to resist and with the arming they can be potentially important militia forces, has been removed.

In general view, French Revolution (1789) in European aspect and in Ottoman caused the national independence movement. However, in the Balkans, it can be false to bind the reason of the Bulgarization movement to this idea. Because, sociological units such as community and nation which were under the dominance for along time, did not need to wait the French Revolution for counter attack. In addition, it is stated that the German philosophers Herder and Fichete's romanticism caused the Panslavic movements. According to the Bulgarian writers, Bulgarian national awakening (vizrajdeniye) has been commence with the Paisly. This monk tried to

awake Bulgarians and with his book titled as "History of Slavic Bulgars" to remember their national conceits. In 1803, the priest Sofroniy, tried for the liberation of Bulgaria with the help of Russia. Slavic idea has been matured with the Panslavizm. With the 1828 Ottoman-Russo war, Russia came to the border of Adrinople and began to contact with the Bulgars whose they saw them very close. Until 1835 Bulgars educated Greek language and Ortodox teaching, after that date, with the effect of Panslavism they began to establish Bulgarian national education. (Şimşir 1989: XXXIV-XXXVIII)

In 1944, the Bulgarian government which has the Big Bulgarian Dream, consider the aim of "artificial Communist Bulgar-slav community", they tried forcibly to change the names, religions and languages of Turks, Macedons, Roma, Albanis, Serbians and the other minorities in the name of "Priobštavane" (Combine-Unit) thesis with the theory of "Edina Natsiya" "one nation" After the 1946 census, it is ended the classification according to the religion, with the 1956 census it is decided to classify according to the "so-called" nationality status. Look at the Table 1. We can not accept that these numbers are coherent. Turkish population was almost 1.451.000 people in 1940s. With the accession of Dobrudga inwhich Turkish people were inhabit, to Bulgaria, this number has been increased. By 1985, it is known that Turkish speaking people is above 2 million. (Alp 1990: 181, 5, 7)

Between 1944-1989 after the Second World War, the communists were in charge in Bulgaria. With the 1947 Dimitriv Constitution, the ethnic minorities have been recognized, they gain the education in their native-tongue. Between 1946-1973, Turkish schools have been nationalized with the application of education programs. In 1959, Turkish lessons were in the curriculum of Bulgar shools. By 1973, these lessons abolished. In addition, when we look at the language of journals and newspapers, generally Bulgarian language confused with the Turkish, lateron Turkish letters decreased in the newspapers for an half, by 1984, using the wrong Turkish, it is eliminated to use Turkish in newspapers. Interview with Ömer Engin Lütem, Sofia former Turkish ambassador, 12 June 2003, Ankara-Turkey. Bulgarian Communist Party, in the beginning of 1950s, they deal with the primarily subject of struggle with the nationalism and religious fanaticism inside of Turks. With the increasing of pressure during this period, 154.393 Turks had migrated between the years of 1950-51. (Türbedar Turan'dan 2003:24)

In 1956, in the governing of Todor Jivkov, it is aimed to create "one socialist Bulgar nation", as a conclusion, it is restricted the opportunities to the Turks. Eventhough, Pomaks also began to be Bulgarization. In 1971 constitution, there was no article regarding the minorities. Between the years 1950-1958, the number of refugees and immigrants are as enclosed table 2.

According to the 1965 census, the number of Turks in Bulgaria were 780.928. In the frame of “22 March 1968, Treaty of Bulgarian Citizens Originated Turkish Those Their Relatives Immigrated Before 1952 From Bulgaria to Turkey”, 130.000 Turks also immigrated to Turkey. Pomaks were not included in Turkish population in Bulgaria. This high number is very effectively walnut in the democratic state. According to the 1992 formal census, there were 250.000 Pomaks. Bulgarian state tried to show that Pomaks are not minority, they are Muslim Bulgars thus it is aiming that they are not Turks but muslim Bulgars so it is tried to be shown as more less the population of Turks. (Mandacı-Erdoğan 2001:109)

The acting of Bulgarization from the beginning of 1877, it reached to the top in 1984-85. Making atheist, pressure, changing the names were supported by the signing of baseless formal documents forcibly, it lasts the ethnic cleansy of Bulgarian Turks. (Alp 1990:12)

The table in enclosed is based on 1992 census. Pomaks were also given as Bulgars. The contradiction between language groups and population is in direction of that they showed or they have been showed themselves as Bulgars. (Demirtaş, ASAM 2001:20) Look at the table 3 as enclosed.

The Bulgarian Government approved the first report on the Framework Convention on the Protection of Minorities. It states that those are Bulgarian citizens belonging to the ethnic, religious and lingual minorities. Bulgaria stands on the understanding that the protection of minorities is executed by the real guaranteeing of individual rights and freedoms of individuals belonging to them – the introduction to the report reads. They are to work on the problems of the minorities. In this paper, we will deal with the identity and the possible situation of minorities in Bulgaria during the EU integration.

## **THE CONDITIONS OF MINORITIES IN BULGARIA**

Bulgaria and also Romania are kept aside from the wave of the European union’s enlargement. The factor of variation is to be sought in the differentiated position that the homeland of every minority occupies in the race for integration in the European Union. Both countries integrated with the EU in 2007.

When we look at the international law, 4<sup>th</sup> article of 1878 Berlin Treaty guaranteed the national minority status for Turks after the establishment of Bulgaria Kingdom. According to this article, the minority in Bulgaria is Turks. In addition, article of 5<sup>th</sup> is regarding rights and freedoms, the article of 12<sup>th</sup>, arranged the rules about the real estate of Turks. In 1909, signed the İstanbul Protocol that re-arranged the rules such as land-owning and organization. In 1913, the peace treaty between Ottoman State and Bulgaria confirmed the aforementioned rights of Turks. Neuilly Peace Treaty brought generally the place for the rights of minorities in Bulgaria. The

rights in question thus entered under the guarantee of National Covenant. In 1925, within the frame of "The Friendship Treaty and Foundation Contract" between Turkish Republic and Bulgaria, the new arrangements has been made about the Turkish minority rights. The rights of minorities have been taken under guarantee with the Peace Treaty at the end of Second World War. (Mandacı vdl 2001:110)

The Turkish minority of Bulgaria is strongly established in two confined regions: Razgrad-Shumen, in the Dobrudja plain, and Kardzhali, in the Rhodope Mountains. In the course of violent campaign for changing the names in 1984 and 1985 more than 350,000 Bulgarian Turks left the country. The beginning of 1990 was marked by the adoption of the Declaration of the National Assembly on the National Question which rejected the previous policy and served as the basis for the reform of Bulgarian legislation in the sphere of minority protection. It was followed by the passing of the Names of Bulgarian Citizens Act (5 March 1990) which allowed Bulgarian citizens whose names had been forcibly changed to restore their former names. In the course of democratization, all restrictions were abolished regarding the religious rights and freedoms of Bulgarian citizens of Turkish origin and Bulgarian Muslims. In Bulgaria, there are presently more than 950 functioning mosques, a large number of them having been built in the past 5-6 years. There are four secondary religious Muslim schools and one undergraduate Islamic institute in the country. The measures of accommodation were not enough to defuse the conflict. Being based on the notion of the unity of the nation, the Constitution does not provide for collective political rights of ethnic or religious groups of the population. The scope of the rights enjoyed by ethnic Turks does not satisfy but by adopting the principle granting collective rights, it can be satisfy the minority Turks. Legislative measures are introduced by the Bulgarian authorities so as to satisfy them and to prevent them from making violent demands. The Public Education Act (1991) reaffirm and specify the constitutional right to study one's mother tongue in public and private schools. Last but not least, Bulgaria signed the Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities on behalf of the Republic of Bulgaria on 9 October 1997. Bulgaria became 36<sup>th</sup> state which signed the document and thus expressed its positive attitude towards the prevailing understanding within the Council of Europe that national minorities need better protection. (Roger 2003:13)

Some parties deserve particular attention because they have been continuously represented in Parliament and proved capable of waging parliamentary battles over particular legislative texts: the Movement for Rights and Freedoms (Dvizhenie za Prava I Svobodi=MRF) which is supported by the Turkish minority in Bulgaria; the Democratic Association of the Hungarians of Romania (DAHR= Uniunea Democrata a Maghiarilor din Romania) which represents the Magyar minority in Romania. According to the datas

from the population census of 4 December 1992, Bulgaria has a population of 8,487,317 with ethnic Bulgarians being the most numerous – 7,271,185 (85.7 % of the population) and some way behind in second place ethnic Turks, numbering 800,052 (9.4 %). Of the 240 Members of Parliament elected to the 38<sup>th</sup> National Assembly (19 April 1997) there are 15 ethnic Turks. In the last local elections, the MRF won 25 municipalities and now has a total of 670 mayors across the country and over 1000 municipal councillors. (Roger 2003:9)

The Sofia Vlach Society states the one should be careful to distinguish between the Vlachs who number 2,000-3,000 and live mainly in the south of the country; and the Romanians who live mainly in the north and number 20,000-30,000. According to the 1994 statistics, there are 5,200 Vlachs in Bulgaria while leaders of the Romanian community argue that the number of Vlachs in Bulgaria exceeds 50,000. Most of the Vlachs living in Bulgaria are children of people who emigrated from Macedonia and northern Greece between 1850 and 1914. Vlach identity has never been strong in Bulgaria because of the small population and their dispersed settlement. In 1931, 17 teachers and 147 students in four Romanian schools. However, in the communist era, all minorities were suppressed in the country to create a homogeneous Bulgarian state. The Communist Bulgarian government closed down the Romanian Cultural Institute in 1948. After that date, the Vlach community requested the reopening of the institute and its school but they have had no positive answer. (Demirtaş ASAM 2001:41, Şimşir 1992)

In 2001 March, the population of Bulgaria was 7.977.646. The %87,7 of country is Bulgar, %9,4 is Turks, the Gypsies are %13,7 of population. Look at the table 4.

Being member of European institutions, Bulgaria did consider to recognize the cultural rights of minorities which is provided by the international treaties and in this connection she confirmed “Framework Convention For the Protection of National Minorities” by European Council. Bulgaria is one of the Balkan states most acknowledge to be right for the minorities. Besides the rights to be given for the other minorities, it is proceeding that Roma minority would be participate in daily life. On September 2000, signing with the agreement between Bulgarian Ministry of Defense and the representative of Roma minority, it is decided that the Ministry will provide the job opportunity for Roma minority. After the signing of agreement, 15 Roma young people declared that they requested to work in the Ministry of Defence. (Demirtaş 2001:80)

In the declared report of EU Commission dated by 8 Nov. 2000, it is stated that Sofia is getting advance in implementing the criterias of Copenhagen. According to this report, Bulgaria continues to adjust the Copenhagen criterias about the political situation. However, paving the way in the integration of Roma people, the financial support could not be enough to

apply the prepared program. In the report, it is also stated that Turkish minority does not represent in the governmental institutions adequately and it is necessary to increase the number of Turkish instructors. In addition, it is attracted attention that the investments in the regions of Turkic areas are less and the unemployment rate is high. It is expressed that in the level of Primary and Secondary schools, it is getting the improvements in Turkish education. It is remembered that Turkish news began in Bulgar national TV channel. (Demirtaş 2001:85) However, the program is limited within the Sofia area and it is just for 20 minutes as a music and news program. In the country, eventhough there is an American, French and Greek Schools, it is forbidden to open the Turkish schools. Look at the table 5 and 6.

Bulgaria made the necessary arrangements for the structural and judicial reforms in minorities's favour. In this connection, it is emerged the concept of "Bulgaria Model". Turks whose are the biggest part of the minorities influenced by these progresses positively. However, the minorities with the Bulgars are equal de jure, there is no equality de facto.

Bulgaria appreciates highly the Turkish support for its candidacy for NATO membership. They noted with satisfaction the decision of the Turkish Grand National Assembly of October 21, 1998 on the necessity of Bulgaria's accession to NATO.

Bulgarian Turks are no longer an issue on the agenda of the bilateral relations. After the transition to political democracy in Bulgaria all conditions were created for these people to turn really into a bridge of good neighbourliness and co-operation between the two countries. It's Bulgaria's understanding that they should have every right to travel freely to both countries, the freedom to settle in the one they choose to and engage in economic activities. This freedom should also be established on legislative and administrative practice. (Mladenov, Annual 1998\1999:147)

During the Cold War, relations between Ankara and Sofia were marked by considerable hostility, in particular because of Bulgaria's mistreatment of the Turkish minority, which constitutes nearly 10 % of the Bulgarian population. However, relations have improved significantly since the collapse of the communist regime in Sofia in November 1989. The rights and property of the Turkish minority have been restored and more than half of the 320,000 ethnic Turks expelled in 1989 have returned to Bulgaria. Indeed, Turkish-Bulgarian relations today are the best they have been since before World War II. (Zalmay 2000:37)

In Bulgaria 1991 Constitution, the rights of minorities are given in the framework of individual rights and freedoms not in the collective shape. In addition, there is no mention about the minorities, just it is using the concept of "the citizens those their mother tongue is not Bulgarian" in the article of 36. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> articles of the Constitution, it is stated that the citizens those their mother tongue is not Bulgarian, must learn the Bulgari-

an language and besides the using and teaching rights of their languages and in the article 54, everyone has the right to develop the culture which they belong to ethnically. (Türbedar August 2003:35)

The new Bulgarian Constitution adopted in 1991, states in the second paragraph of Article 4: "The Republic of Bulgaria shall guarantee the life, dignity and rights of the individual and shall create conditions conducive to the free development of the individual and civil society." The second paragraph of Article 6: "All citizens shall be equal before the law. There shall be no privileges or restriction of rights on the grounds of race, nationality, ethnic self-identity, sex, origin, religion, education, opinion, political affiliation, personal or social status or property status." Article 54 of the Constitution guarantees its citizen's right to develop their own culture in accordance with their ethnicity: "Everyone has the right to profit from national and international cultural values as well as to develop his own culture in conformity with his ethnic origin which is acknowledge and guaranteed by law. Vlachs do not have any educational or cultural rights in Bulgaria. There is only one church holding services in their mother tongue. With the improvement of democracy and pluralism in the country, the Vlach community hopes to get some cultural rights. (Demirtaş February 2001:42)

#### **INTEGRATION WITH EUROPEAN UNION**

Bulgaria, as a candidate of EU, completing the negotiations with EU, trying to provide the conditions for the membership, it is taking the 300 million EURO aid. ([http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/laenderinfos/laender/laender\\_ausgabe\\_html?type\\_id=15&land\\_id=28](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/laenderinfos/laender/laender_ausgabe_html?type_id=15&land_id=28) 1.6.2004) In Bulgaria, the situation of Turks and also other minorities unfortunately tried to be shown as a successful integration in regards of minority rights. There is no equality and protection of rights for Turks whose are %10 of population. The Balkan region has an important place in international system besides the geographical and historical closeness to Turkey. Especially, its demographical structure is important in the aspect of socio-historique. The demography of this area which has Turk presence is very significant in regards with the security of Turkey.

Turkey is the one country which supported the membership of Bulgaria and Romania by accepting the law in its National Assembly, and also welcome to the invitation of these countries to NATO in the Prag summit on Nov., 2002.



The Government approved the first report of Bulgaria on the Frame Convention on the Protection of Minorities dated 06.02.2003. On its sitting the Government approved the first report of Bulgaria on the Frame Convention on the Protection of Minorities. It states, for the first time, the subject of the ratified by Bulgaria Convention – those are the Bulgaria's citizens belonging to the ethnic, religious and lingual minorities.

Bulgaria stands on the understanding that the protection of minorities is executed by the real guaranteeing of the individual rights and freedoms of the individuals belonging to them – reads the introduction of the report.

A historical background of the attitude towards minorities in Bulgaria is done. The report states that some of the first steps undertaken following the collapse of the totalitarian regime were the restoration of the ethnic and religious rights of the minorities in Bulgaria. It states that the Roma and Turk minorities have suffered most of the economic crisis since 1989.

Besides reporting on the Bulgaria's relevance with the Convention's requirements the report registers some problems that are subject to solving – the achievement of full social integration of the Roma and Turk minorities, leveling of the economic, social and educational status of those people with the average for the country; state support for their culture; larger participation of minority representatives in solving their problems.

For the less of the two years of the mandate of the present Government considerable work has been done for solving those problems. The increase of the capacity of the National Council on Ethnic and Demographic Issues has been pointed out. In 26 of the 28 regional administrations some 30 experts have been appointed. They are to work on the problems of the minorities.

The amendments in the Law of Education are among the achievements of the Government. Minister Nezhdet Mollov, Chairman of the National Council on Ethnic and Demographic Issues, considers that there are no major differences between the requirements of the Convention and the conditions in Bulgaria and that the report has achieved the balance between the different opinions (<http://www.government.bg/English/293.html> 2004).

The Copenhagen criteria have been widely viewed as constituting a successful incentive structure and sanctioning mechanism for the European Union in the promotion of human rights and the protection of minorities. Minority protection has a significant historical resonance for many CEECs. Minority management whether by genocide, expulsion, coercion or accommodation in instruction to the historical emergence and development of many of these states, whose foundation was Wilsonian selective self-determination in the period after the peace treaties ending World War One in 1919-20. In fact, policy practice after 1989 in the CEECs varied, depending on the size of the minority, its location and resources, the history of relations between majority and minority groups, the constitutional desing

of the new regime and the nature of its transition in the CEECs as these states prioritized the strengthening of central state capacity and the position of the majority nation. What factors, then drove the development of new minority protection regimes in the CEECs during the 1990s? (Hughes 2003:1,4)

Between the years 1990-1997, Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) which is successor of Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP), did reforms for establishing the liberal market economy and the democracy during its power, improving the affairs with the European Countries, to be able to member of NATO and EU was the priority of the foreign policy. Signing the Joint Agreement in 1993, bringing into force in 1995, Bulgaria is entered into cold period with the affairs of EU due to not closing the Kozluduy central. However, in 1999, international crisis especially the Kosova crisis showed the geopolitical importance of the country. The negotiations began in 2000 with EU and confirming the Protocol numbered 6 of "the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" by Sofia government, it is abolished the Capital Punishment, these are the important steps within the aspect of EU's political criteres.

In the Document of Participation Joint submitted by EU in 1999, in the short run in the political area, it is requested that Bulgaria should start to apply the framework agreement regarding the Roma Gypsies and strengthening it in the National Council of the Ethnic and Demographic Subjects and also it should be struggle against the discrimination. It is also stated that the financial support should be provide to apply the taken decisions to Bulgaria. (Demirtaş, February 2001:30)

In the Salonika summit of 19-20 June 2003, it is offered that it should be new initiative for the EU members to control more actively in the countries of outer border lines. And also, it is offered that it should be provide the coordination between the third countries, to start the necessary undertakings to adopt the present refugees and immigrant to the society and to provide the support to finance the immigrant policy. This proposal by Greece is accepted mostly and it is agreed the 140 million EURO protection budget. Second progress was about the enlargement. On 16 May 2003, after the signing of the membership agreements in Athens, it is made the referendum in the candidate countries. In conclusion, Bulgaria became the member of EU in 2007. It is expressed that the enlargement of EU could not be completed without the Balkan States and these countries are encouraged to integrate with EU. (Türbedar August 2003:7)

The first Copenhagen criterion stated that "Membership requires that the candidate country has achieved stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, human rights, the rule of law and respect for and protection of minorities". (<http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/intro/criteria.htm>)

The Treaty of Maastricht entrenched, for the first time in the history of the EU, specific provisions on fundamental rights, but its only provision relating loosely to minorities amounted to a vague recognition of the requirement that member states respect “national and regional diversity” (Article 151). Other EU and European institutions also had an impact on the development of policy on minorities during the 1990s. (Hughes 2003:9)

The paradox of the EU attempting to enforce minority rights protection on states outside the EU, while foregoing it for its member states raises commitment and compliance dilemmas of three main types. Firstly, of all the “Copenhagen criteria”, minority rights protection is the most weakly defined by the EU as it lacks a clear foundation in law and there are no established EU benchmarks. This absence of content is the essence of the EU’s policy commitment problem. Secondly, the EU’s priorities are evident from the fact that its own mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring compliance on minority protection in the candidate countries are very weakly developed compared with other areas of the *acquis*. Consequently, the EU tends to rely on proxies (primarily external bodies such as the Council of Europe, OSCE and NGOs) to perform the monitoring functions. Thirdly, commitment to minority rights is weakened by the fact that it is a concept that is deeply disputed in international politics, with few generally accepted standards and confusion over the very definition of the term minority. Within the EU itself, the practices of member states vary widely, ranging from elaborate constitutional and legal means for minority protection and political participation such as language rights, autonomy or constitutional quota arrangements, to constitutional unitarism and denial that national minorities exist. Policy on minority protection is wholly within the remit of the national governments and outside the influence of the Commission and the Court of Justice. The combined effect of vague and contested international standards, the diverse approaches of member states and the weak influence of the Commission and the Court in this policy area, strengthen the perception on the part of the candidates that the Copenhagen criteria were a grand EU double standard. This perception weakened their commitment and compliance. In the absence of clear benchmarks on minority protection how did the EU proceed with the monitoring and reporting this area? (Hughes 2003:13)

The Commission’s annual Regular reports, following on from the opinions of 1997 and the Accession Partnerships, have been the EU’s key instrument to monitor and evaluate the candidate countries progress toward accession. The reports indicate the main trends and results in the field of minority protection within the CEECs. Firstly, although eight of ten CEECs have significant minority populations (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Romania and Slovakia) the conditions of only two minority groups are consistently stressed in the Regular Reports. These two minority

groups are: the Russophone minority in Estonia and Latvia, and the Roma minorities of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia. Two other sizeable minority groups (the Hungarians of Romania and Slovakia and the Turks of Bulgaria) are mentioned in the Reports though considerable less attention is paid to them than to the previous two groups. (Hughes 2003:14)

The Reports illustrate that the EU lacks clear benchmarks to measure progress in the field of minority rights protection. The emphasis on acknowledging the existence of formal measures rather than the evaluation of implementation. For example, the Reports track and note the adoption and change of laws critical for minority protection (principally on citizenship, naturalization procedures, language rights, and electoral law), the establishment of institutions that manage minority issues (whether within governmental ministries, in parliaments or at the local government level) and the launch of government programmes to address minority needs. Trends are evaluated by numerical benchmarks such as the number of a minority granted citizenship tests, the number of school or classes taught in the state and minority languages, the extent of media and broadcasting in minority languages and so on. (Hughes 2003:15)

EU and candidate countries sometimes appear to be jointly acting out a charade on Roma policy. For example, the 1999 Report on Bulgaria states that: "Significant progress was achieved concerning further integration of Roma through the adoption of a Framework Programme for "Full Integration of the Roma Population into the Bulgarian Society" and established of relevant institutions at central and regional level. By what measure this formal adoption of a programme marks significant progress is not clear. Two years later, little of this programme had been implemented. More lip-service can therefore be paid to the Roma issue by the CEECs without it raising political tensions about minority challenges to the territorial integrity of the state. The Roma issue is the most indicative of the limitations of the EU's monitoring mechanism and the lack of a correlation between the Reports and an improvement in minority protection or their integration. (Hughes 2003:18)

EU conditionally on respect for and protection of minorities is not clearly temporally correlated with the emergence of new political strategies and laws on minority protection in the CEECs. Nevertheless, perhaps one of the main achievements of the EU in the area of minority protection was that it successfully implanted the objective of minority protection as an integral part of the political rhetoric for EU speak in the CEECs. It may be that learning EU speak is a step in the transmission of values that will be internalized and reflected given time, in institutional change and modified political behaviour. Alternatively, the language of European norms could be seen by some countries as the end in itself.

The Treaty of Amsterdam, which came into force on 1 May 1999, was a major leap forward in the fight against all forms of discrimination in the European Union. It reinforced existing provisions in the EC Treaty on preventing pay-related discrimination between men and women (Article 141). But it went beyond this by carving out a new role for the EU in promoting equality between men and women in general (Articles 2 and 3). The Treaty bans all discrimination on the basis of nationality (Article 12). And in a ground-breaking new Article 13, the Treaty empowers the EU to combat all discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion, disability, age and sexual orientation. On the basis of Article 13, the EU adopted in 2000 a package of anti-discrimination measures consisting of two directives and an anti-discrimination action programme to run from 2001 to 2006. ([http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice\\_home/fsj/rights/discrimination/fsj\\_rights\\_discrim\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/fsj/rights/discrimination/fsj_rights_discrim_en.htm) 1.6.2004)

Gypsies in Bulgaria continue to experience gross human rights violations despite the political changes that have occurred since Todor Zhivkov's resignation to Nov. 10, 1989. The government's educational policies also discriminate against Gypsies. Most Gypsies attend segregated schools where they are denied an equal opportunity to learn the Bulgarian language. They have never the opportunity to attend university. They are discriminated against in the workplace. Some told Helsinki Watch that they were denied promotions because they are Gypsies. The government restricts Gypsies' political rights. They can not form political parties based on ethnicity. And, not a singly political party defends the interest of them. The state media portray them in an unfair light and this instigates further discrimination against their community. (Helsinki Watch Report, 1991-June: 2)

Virtually no census data on ethnic groups has been published in Bulgaria since the mid-1970s. This was part of the government's policy to try to assimilate ethnic minorities but, it is possible to project the Gypsy population from old statistics. 475,000 in 1986.

Actually, Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provides: "In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language. (Helsinki Watch Report, 1991-June:18) International law requires states to take additional measures to promote mutual understanding and tolerance: Helsinki Watch Report, 1991-June, pp. 57. Bulgarian government should take steps to remedy past discrimination against the minorities. Prohibit all forms of discrimination against Gypsies and others, including harassment and intimidation by government officials. Assure free voting in all elections and protect against the intimidation and manipulation of the

minorities. Allow members of the minorities the right to establish their own political parties. Assure them the right to equal participation in local administration and local government. Local councils should make a special effort to recruit minorities to work with them as specialists. Guarantee them equal rights, in policy and practice, to obtain land, houses and workplaces. Guarantee them equal rights in policy and practice, to education. Ensure that the minorities have equal opportunities to learn the Bulgarian language and adequate opportunities to learn their mother language. Include teaching about the history and culture of them in secondary and elementary schools. Take additional measures to promote mutual understanding and tolerance among Bulgarians, Gypsies and other ethnic minorities. Direct the state-owned television and radio to provide objective and balanced reporting when airing stories about them. Conduct a census to determine the population of the Gypsies and other ethnic minorities in Bulgaria, as well as the religious affiliations and language abilities of all citizens. Helsinki Watch urges the Bulgarian Parliament to take all possible steps to implement these recommendations and to adopt laws that do the following: Clearly define the powers of local government officials, make their activities open to public scrutiny, and provide remedies to individuals who believe that their rights have been violated by local officials in the performance of their duties. Clearly define the authority of the police. Allow them equal opportunities to obtain land and property.

## **CONCLUSION**

There is a conflict between the European Union and the national states' identities. There is much talk about what the individual member states of the European Union have in common and what makes each one distinct. Some people say if the European member states were truly to be united, this would mean the end of their national, historical and cultural identities. Their national economic interests would also be sacrificed. Others say: only a truly united Europe can protect its states' national, historical and cultural identities and their national economic interests from the challenges of the superpowers. (Ruud 1995:141)

The nation-state has protected and fostered diversity. It has served as a vehicle to sustain or propagate national identity and nationally based difference in the global society of states. The model of the nation-state is premised on the mutually supporting effects of sovereign immunity, national identity and citizenship. And while the modern nation-state was established through the complex interaction of state formation and nation building, these processes were rarely complete nor are they necessarily irreversible. (Fossum 2000:202)

The European integration could also contribute to a strengthening of national identities, as has been the case for Ireland. European integration

has rendered Ireland less dependent on the United Kingdom. Part of the dynamic of the integration process has therefore been fuelled by the thrust for recognition of equal dignity, a process that has seen a certain convergence of certain national and European identities. But it is also quite clear that identity-based national opposition has affected the process of integration at several crucial junctures. (Fossum 2000:214)

When asking “whose Europe”? 10 million inhabitants are not part of the answer. They are “third country nationals”: nationals of non-EU states, residing lawfully in the EU. They have no right to move within the Union, nor can they vote in municipal or European Parliamentary elections, unlike citizens of Member States who also enjoy “Union citizenship”. Ironically, “Union citizenship” was established with the aim of bringing the Union closer to its citizens. But by putting citizens first, Union citizenship treats these third country nationals as second class. The European Union Migrants’s Forum puts the challenge eloquently: “the present situation undermines the Union’s expressed commitment to the elimination of racial discrimination, racism and xenophobia and the integration of settled migrants.” (Føllesdal 1999:105)

In recent years, the process of globalization has deeply affected the nation-state and has sparked a debate on its future. This debate highlights changes in interstate relations, changes in the overall capacity of the state to control and manage domestic society and changes in the principles on which political power is legitimated. The secularization, democratization and heightened interconnectedness that weakened the hierarchies associated with religion, culture and nobility have been transformed and now touch on the defining features of the nation-state itself. The result may be significantly altered conceptions of sovereignty, citizenship and identity. (Fossum 2000:203)

The most important problem of EU is immigration.. This situation especially is depending on the attitudes of Europeans to the under developed countries. The membership of Slavs and the subject of “who is the foreigners?” will be effect the racial and religious identity of Europe. (Fullbrook 1996:34)

Whether which integration model to determine the future of EU is accepted or not, Union should find the new tolerance order to hold the different ethnicities, different cultures in one judicial order together. Eventhough the idea of Union becomes the successful, the unity would be live with the problems of multi-cultural in member countries and would be similar to immigrant society which has very much minority groups whose are very separate and do not have tied between themselves. (Göka 1999:249) Although EU did not deny to use of the native languages for the member states, English then French is valid besides the native language. 2001 year is accepted as the Year of European Languages.

In the failure of EU integration, it would not be stability in the Balkans, Caucasia and Middle East and also it would be cause the new formations in these areas and it is a fact to be reason of regional competitions. In the case of this situation, USA will be one power and with its allies, she will balanced her global or regional interest. In the case of EU and Russia could be super power, USA will be hinder to birth of new global power and she would provide her interest in the global order which has the power center of China and Japan.

In this connection, EU should be evaluate as a developing process according to the quality of reciprocal affairs of monetary and political unity in the frame of regional integration concept. Even EU will reach to the political integration, it would be new nation-state which covered all the nation-states in its body.

Today's, the valid integration pronouncement and political compromise atmosphere in Europe is not the indicator regarding the losing the power of nationalism. On the contrary, it shows that the fails last about the not suppressing the nationalism thought.

Europe would not be federalism or re-nation, however, it lasts as inter-governments and supra-nationals mechanism. The nation-states will stay as a guarantee for the European integration. The integration increases the national feelings and also the nation-states could not be replace with alternative formation.

#### **SOURCES**

- ALP, İlker (1990) *Belge ve Fotoğraflarla Bulgar Mezalimi (1878-1981)*, Trakya Üniv.Publ.:90/1, Ankara.
- DEMİRTAŞ-COŞKUN, Birgül (2001) *Bulgaristan'da Yeni Dönem Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Ankara-Sofya İlişkileri*, ASAM Publ..
- DEMİRTAŞ-COŞKUN, Birgül (2001) "The Vlachs a Forgotten Minority in the Balkans", Ankara Paper 1, ASAM publ., London.
- DEMİRTAŞ-COŞKUN, Birgül, (February 2001) "Bulgaristan'ın AB'ye Üyelik Hedefi: Karşılaştırılan Sorunlar, Yakalanan Fırsatlar", *Stratejik Analiz*.
- Document 37, *Ethnic Minorities in the Balkan States 1960-1971*, v.6. p.26.
- EMINOV, Ali (1990) *The Turks of Bulgaria: The History, Culture and Political Life of a Minority*, ed.by Kemal Karpat, Isis Press, İstanbul.
- FOSSUM, John Erik (2000/4) *Citizenship, Diversity and Pluralism: The Case of the European Union*, ARENA Reprint.



- FØLLESDAL, Andreas (1999) Third Country nationals as European citizens: the case defended, The Editorial Board of The Sociological Review. ARENA Reprint, 00/3.
- FULLBROOK, Mary-CESARANI, David, (1996) Citizenship, Nationality and Migration in Europe. Routledge, London.
- GÖKA, Erol (Winter 1999) Helsinki'den Sonra Avrupa, Avrasya Dosyası, v.5, number.
- Helsinki Watch Report, (1991-June) "Destroying Ethnic Identity, The Gypsies of Bulgaria", New York.
- HUGHES, James - SASSE, Gwendolyn, (2003) Monitoring the Monitors: EU enlargement Conditionality and Minority Protection in the Central and Eastern European Candidates =CEECs, Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe, Issue 1.
- Interview with Ömer Engin Lütem, Sofia former Turkish ambassador, 12 June 2003, Ankara-Turkey
- MANDACI, Nazif - EEDOĞAN, Birsen, (2001) Balkanlarda Azınlık Sorunu: Yunanistan, Arnavutluk, Makedonya ve Bulgaristan'daki Azınlıklara Bir Bakış, SAEMK Research Projects Serial 5/2001, Ankara.
- MLADENOV, Branimir, (Annual 1998\1999), "Priorities of Bulgarian Foreign Policy and Bulgarian-Turkish Relations at the eve of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century", pp.147, Turkish Review of Balkan Studies, , 4, İstanbul.
- National Statistical Institute, (2000) Statistical Yearbook, The Economist Intelligence Unit, Bulgaria, Country Profile.
- ROGER, Antoine, (2003) "The European Union as a political incentive for ethnic minorities: evidence from post-communist Bulgaria and Romania, Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans, Volume 5, Number 1.
- RUUD, Særtykk fra de Moor, (ed.) (1995) Values in Western Societies, Tillburg Univ.Press, Beate Huseby-Ola Listhaug, Indetifications of Norwegians with Europe: the Impact of Values and Centre-Periphery Factors, ARENA Reprint, 96/14.
- ŞİMŞİR, Bilal (1989) Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri, TTK Public., v.II.
- ŞİMŞİR, Bilal, (1992) "Bulgaristan Türkleri ve Göç Sorunu", Bulgaristan'da Türk Varlığı-Bildiriler (7 June 1985) TTK Publ., 3. Print.
- TÜRBEDAR, Erhan, (2003) Balkan Türkleri Balkanlarda Türk Varlığı, ASAM publi.. Ankara, Ömer Turan "Geçmişten Günümüze Bulgaristan Türkleri".
- TÜRBEDAR, Erhan (August 2003), "Selanik Zirvesinin Ardından Batı Balkanlar Gölgeden Çıkıyor", Stratejik Analiz, v.4, number 40.
- TÜRBEDAR, Balkan Türkleri Balkanlarda Türk Varlığı, ASAM publi.. Ankara, 2003, Ömer Turan "*Geçmişten Günümüze Bulgaristan Türkleri*".

ZALMAY, Khalilzad, et.al, (2000), The Future of Turkish-Western Relations, Toward a Strategic Plan, California.

[http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/laenderinfos/laender/laender\\_ausgabe\\_html?type\\_id=15&land\\_id=28](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/laenderinfos/laender/laender_ausgabe_html?type_id=15&land_id=28), (1.6.2004)

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/intro/criteria.htm> (1.6.2004)

<http://www.government.bg/English/293.html>, (1.6.2004)

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice\\_home/fsj/rights/discrimination/fsj\\_rights\\_discrim\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/fsj/rights/discrimination/fsj_rights_discrim_en.htm) (1.6.2004)

**ENCLOSURE:****TABLE 1.**

<b>NATIONALITY</b>	<b>MEN</b>	<b>WOMEN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
BULGAR	3.236.760	3.269.781	6.506.541
TURK	334.844	321.844	656.688
GYPSY	99.611	98.254	197.865
MACEDON	94.994	92.795	187.789
ARMENIAN	10.627	11.327	21.954
RUSSIAN	6.246	4.305	10.551
GREEK	3.976	3.461	7.437
JEWS	2.954	3.073	6.027
TATAR	3.033	2.960	5.993
ROMA	1.644	2.105	3.749
KARAKAÇAN	1.064	1.021	2.085
CZECH	426	773	1.199
ALBAN	643	462	1.105
GERMAN	232	515	747
HUNGAR	261	410	671
VLACH	228	259	487
SERBS	257	227	484
OTHER	1.556	1.444	3.000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3.799.356</b>	<b>3.815.016</b>	<b>7.614.372</b>

**TABLE 2.***INHABITED FREE TOTAL*

<b>Departure Country</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Population</b>
From Bulgaria	37.351	154.393	33	55	37384	154448
Yugoslavia	-	-	31893	120182	31893	120182
Romania	-	-	3	3	3	3
Greece	-	-	3519	11797	3519	11797
Turkistan	564	1.892	320	796	884	2688
China	-	-	304	843	304	843
Pakhstan	-	-	16	26	16	26
Syria	114	366	9	15	123	381
Brasil	-	-	6	6	6	6
Jordan	-	-	25	36	25	36
Japan	-	-	4	11	4	11
Russia and Caucasia	-	-	2	2	2	2
Switzerland	-	-	2	3	2	3
Iran	-	-	5	14	5	14

Berna Türkdoğan Uysal

America	-	-	2	2	2	2
Egypt	-	-	4	4	4	4
Lebanon	-	-	1	1	1	1
Italy	-	-	7	7	7	7
Germany	-	-	6	12	6	12
Finland	-	-	1	1	1	1
France	-	-	9	22	9	22
Saudi Arabia	-	-	3	4	3	4
India	-	-	2	2	2	2
Iraq	-	-	6	8	6	8
Korean	-	-	4	11	4	11
Austria	-	-	3	4	3	4
Afghanistan	-	-	1	1	1	1
Cyprus	-	-	1	1	1	1
Lavrion	-	-	54	65	54	65
Rodos	-	-	1	8	1	8
Europe camp refugee	150	320	139	275	298	595
Other refugees	-	-	1311	2211	1311	2211
Other coun- tries						
(Unknown places)	16	64	-	-	16	64
	38.204	157.035	37.696	136.428	75900	293.463

SUMMARY FAMILY

38.204

37.696

75.900

POPULATION

157.035

136.428

293.463

**TABLE 3.**

Türbedar, *ibid.*, Ömer Turan "Geçmişten Günümüze Bulgaristan Türkleri" pp. 35.

**Bulgar Population according to the Ethnic, Mother Tongue and Religious Criterias (December 1992)**

<b>Ethnic Group</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Bulgar	7.271.185	85,67
Turk	800.062	9,43
Roma	313.396	3,69
Armenian	13.677	0.16
Tatar	4.515	0.05
Jews	3.461	0.04
Gagauz	1.478	0.02
Cherkez	573	0.01
Other	70.489	0,83
Unknown	8.481	0.10
<b>Mother Tongue</b>		
Bulgar	7.275.717	85,72
Turk	813.639	9.59
Roma	310.425	3,66
Armenian	9.996	0,12
Tatar	7.833	0,09
Jews	780	0,01
Gagauz	402	0,00
Other	60.044	0,71
Unknown	8.481	0,10

<b>Religious Groups</b>		
Christian	7.349.544	86,60
Muslim	1.110.295	13,08
Other	18.997	0,22
Unknown	8.481	0,10
Total	8.487.317	100,00

**Source :** National Statistical Institute, Statistical Yearbook, The Economist Intelligence Unit, Bulgaria, Country Profile 2000.

**TABLE 4.**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Bulgars</b>	<b>Turks</b>	<b>Total</b>
2001 March census	%87,7	%9,4	7.977.646
1992	7.271.185	800.052	8.487.317
1985			8.948.649

**TABLE 5.**

In the below table, it can be seen the groups.

Ethnic Groups		Religious Groups		Language Groups	
Bulgars	7.274.185	Ortodox	7.274.592	Bulgarian	7.275.717
Turks	800.052	Sunni	1.026.758	Turkish	813.639
Gypsy	313.396	Alawi	83.537	Romany	310.425
Tatar	4.515	Catholic	53.074	Tatar	7.833
Gagauz	1.478	Protestan	21.878	Gagauz language	402

**Table :** Erhan Türbedar, **Balkan Türkleri Balkanlarda Türk Varlığı**, ASAM publ.. Ankara, 2003, pp. 35

**TABLE 6.**

Ethnic Group	1946 numbers	Percent	1956 numbers	Percent	1965 numbers	Percent	1980 numbers	Percent
Bulgarian	6,073,124	86.4	6,506,541	85.5	7,231,243	88.2	7,601,880	85.8
Turks	675,500	9.6	656,025	8.6	746,755	9.1	806,260	9.1
Gypsy	-	-	197,865	2.6	148,874	-	230,360	2.6
Macedonians	-	-	187,789	2.5	8,750	0.1	221,360	2.5
Pomaks	-	-	138,643	-	-	-	80,000	-
Others	280,725	4.0	65,489	0.8	211,912	2.6	-	-
Totals	7,029,349		7,613,709		8,226,564		8,860,000	

**Table :** Ali Eminov, **The Turks of Bulgaria: The History, Culture and Political Life of a Minority**, ed.by Kemal Karpat, Isis Press, İstanbul, 1990, pp.222.