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1. Introduction

One of the most important dilemmas of modern societies is the policies set forth against minorities and foreigners and their reactions in the society. Today, concepts widely accepted as universal values such as equality, justice, human rights, etc. are not paid the necessary attention in practice.

We confront with a paradox in developed western countries carrying out apostolate of human rights and democracy in the world. On the one hand they are involved in the problems about human rights and democracy which arise at different points in the world and they even perform military interventions if needed, on the other hand they do not show due diligence themselves towards minorities and foreigners. It is observed that necessary measures against the rapid rise of xenophobia which has arisen in western societies cannot be taken and even sometimes discriminatory practices towards minorities and foreigners occur as a result of the government policies.

The issue of minorities is one of the major topics encountered in the international agenda. Although some practices set forth regarding this (minority schools, foundation properties) seem problematic, it can be said to be justified within the scope of reciprocity principles in some cases. The fact that some responsibilities which the Treaty of Lausanne imposed on Turkey were not fulfilled should not hinder another fact from being seen: Greece does not fulfill an important part of its responsibilities towards the Turks living in Western Thrace.

Despite some problems arising in legal sense, the historical background and social structure of Turkey have been quite tolerant towards the minorities and foreigners. Xenophobia in western sense and a negative point of view of differences in the social structure are out of question.
2. Concepts of Culture-Multiculturalism

In social sciences, one of the concepts the biggest challenge is experienced in making a common definition of is the concept of culture. Many different definitions have been made in respect of this concept, which means agriculture in the field in Latin (Cultura). Sometimes the concepts of culture and civilization have been used instead of each other and sometimes the difference between them has been set forth.

Culture is usually defined with reference to some beliefs and ideologies. It is observed that definitions which are completely opposite of each other are made for this concept. Due to the excessive meanings attributed to the concept of culture, it is required to refer to culture in almost every respect. It is stated that more than 164 definitions of culture have been made. This is an indicator of how difficult it is actually to define culture. (Temizkan, 2007: 247).

Fernand Braudel (from Annales School) states that the difference between culture and civilization expresses an opposite situation like belonging to primitive and developed one. Braudel reaches this conclusion based on the researches of English anthropologists, especially Tylor (Braudel, 1996: 30; Temizkan, 2007: 250). This approach is an indicator of how higher the West positions itself than the other societies and the fact that it humiliates the others. Western anthropologists categorize the East in accordance with their own view. It can be said that this West-centric approach is one of the main factors of racism in the West. (Temizkan, 2007: 250-251).

While defining culture, historical depth is usually mentioned. UNESCO’s definition of culture also features historical depth: “Culture means the consciousness a community has regarding its historical development; thereby this community shows its determination to continue its existence with reference to this historical development conscience and ensures its development.” (Temizkan, 2007: 252).

According to Arslan, the most important feature of culture is that it is something surrounding almost all the lives of societies: “Culture is the whole of the values and material and ideological phenomenon which gives a community its characteristics, personality, and identity as a community and distinguishes it from the other communities... The ones which are individual and temporal are not cultural. However, the ones which are repeated, have gained a historical breadth and depth, have become widespread are cultural.” (Arslan, 1999: 200).

As a result of attributing excessive meanings to culture and therefore leaving it out of the discussion and having no communication, culture is dehistoricized. In the cases such a cultural structure is imposed, intolerance atmosphere will occur. It will not be possible for the individuals to think freely and approach critically. This will bring about a repressive structure. (Temizkan, 2007: 253).

It is observed that a view of essentialist culture proposed by Gottfried Herder and later matured by Franz Boas is still effective today. They try to explain the peoples and races within the framework of their culture and traditions. They tried to gather all the accumulations of the past. They showed great respect to the popular culture which was belittled by the elite. This approach sees culture as the common heritage of a group. Culture was considered as a phenomenon shaping lives. This approach casts an active role to the phenomenon of culture. However, the point not to be forgotten is that culture is produced by people. Although culture shapes people to a certain extent, people continue to affect culture. In this context, cultures can be said to change and be produced again. (Baumann, 2006: 31-33).

Nationalism should not be seen solely as an ideology or a kind of social movement. Nationalism is also a form of culture and identity. (Smith, 2007: 118; Gökalp, 2007: 281). One of the major factors of identities can be said to be culture. (Övet, 2007: 98). The phenomenon of nationalism is not only a phenomenon which arises merely in conflicts or the moments of crises, but it is also a phenomenon related to identity and individual identity which is decisive in the formation of collective identity. In this context, the phenomenon of nation is also a kind of identity which is accepted to exist by culture. (Gökalp, 2007: 281).

Ethnic communities separate their own members from the other communities while connecting them to each other with the common culture understanding. The thing that is determinative here is the phenomenon of common culture. Religion and language are the most distinctive factors. Except from these, traditions, clothing, folklore, music, different skin colors, etc. are also effective. Ethnic communities try to show that they are not only different but also incomparable to the other ethnic communities and also their own culture is specific. (Smith, 2002: 51-53).
As a matter of fact, it can be said that all societies derive a large part of their culture from the others. (Güvenç, 1995: 17).

Culture is not static but dynamic and it changes over time. Cultures both take something from the other cultures and give them something from themselves. Heated debates are also carried out about whether cultural exchange is positive or not. Those who support the idea of preserving their own culture strictly give Japan experience as an example. According to them, Japan has only taken the science and technology of the West, but preserved its own cultural values. These cultural values have not undergone changes. However, in reality the situation is different. Japan also experienced a big social and cultural transformation in the years it ensured its rapid development. In other words; it could not preserve its own culture as much as it was supposed. (Temizkan, 2007: 254). As Isaiah Berlin also pointed out, transferring the technology alone but not taking the cultural values is not possible. Technology transfer brings along the culture of that country as well. (Berlin, 1998: 61). Two types of fear which push the societies to behave in a self-closed way are observed; xenophobia (fear of strangers) and heterophobia (fear of difference) (Temizkan, 2007: 255).

Language is the main conveyor of culture. Culture is conveyed to the other generations through language, which is called “acculturation”. Corruption also shows itself in language and then cultural degeneration is confronted. In one aspect, cultural degeneration is the state of not understanding each other despite speaking the same language. The thing that changes the hardest is the core of the culture, in other words; it is the abstract cultural areas whose emotional aspect is predominant. (Temizkan, 2007: 255-256).

Gellner refers to two types of cultures: wild culture and garden culture. Wild cultures grow and reproduce spontaneously as part of the human life without any special processing. There is a common system of communication and rules in wild cultures as well. However, they transfer themselves from generation to generation and reproduce without any conscious design or control (Gellner, 1992: 95-96).

Garden cultures or civilized cultures are obtained from wild cultures, but they become quite different from wild cultures. These cultures are supported with schools and specialized staff and they have a complicated and rich structure. They rot unless they are supported by the education system. Not each wild culture can become a garden culture or in other words; a superior culture. Hopeless cultures quit the scene and do not create a nationalism movement. The ones who have such a hope start to fight for land for their own population and state. (Gellner, 1992: 96-97).

Changes occur in cultures even slowly in the historical process. However, the general approach is that culture is homogeneous and remains the same. This situation is rather valid for modern societies formed in the nation-state structure. This approach is used for the building of a society constructed. (Geisen, 2006: 39).

Dominant culture distinguishes itself preponderantly and discriminates against all the other cultures. As a result of the process, “popular culture” and “high culture” distinction arises. (Geisen, 2006: 46).

As the duty of the superior culture becomes heavier, it needs political support and protection a lot. Each superior culture in the industry era seeks for a state that belongs to it. (Gellner, 1992: 97).

Multiculturalism refers to an understanding underlining that a society has more than one linguistic, religious, regional and ethnic identity and all these identities should take place in the social and political life. (Akkurt, 2010: 238). When it comes to multiculturalism, co-existence of a lot of cultures in the same country is referred. However, the word does not have certain boundaries. Identity being associated with the concepts which can have different meanings such as society and culture causes the concept to be hard to understand and to have more ambiguous boundaries (Mollaer, 2006: 135).

According to Mustafa Erkal, multiculturalism is far from the sense of belonging to the national society and citizenship. As it tries to create autonomous individuals and groups, it disintegrates nations. Multiculturalism conflicts with national identities and national states. (Beşirli, 2011: 143).
3. Background of Multiculturalism

The expression “Multiculturalism” started to be used to express the cultural needs of the Non-European foreigners emigrating to English speaking countries in 1960s. (Gencer, 2011: 191). Multiculturalist movements and discussions first developed in Canada and Australia before the beginning of 1970s and in England and the US later. Multiculturalism, which gained great popularity in 1980s, started to be discussed intensely even in France, which is accepted as the homeland of the nation-state understanding. Multiculturalism is not a political doctrine with a certain program, but it is a philosophy which brings up the discussions about where the individuals’ places are in the world to the agenda. They rose on the homogeneous identity understanding of nation-states and were based on the sense of “national identity”. However, interactions increasing worldwide due to the globalization brought about the disappearance of the cultural boundaries. Multiculturalism is the expression of an understanding which is in the position of anti-thesis of the sense of “national identity”. Now it is necessary to abandon the homogeneity discourse as a result of the acceleration of the population movements and to feature a new understanding which will take “differences” into account and produce the necessary solutions to keep them together. (Türköne, 2008: 234-235).

According to Türköne, multiculturalism basically includes three main principles: (Türköne, 2008: 234)

1- People are born and live in culturally specific structures. This way of living also causes individuals to produce certain meanings, values and symbols in the process of interaction with their environment. In the course of history, these meanings, values and symbols somehow undergo a change.

2- Different systems represent different cultures, meanings and values. Therefore, each culture is “unique” and “valuable”. This state of being “unique” and “valuable” corresponds to the quality of “having a specific functioning logic” of cultures.

3- Each culture has, in fact, a plural appearance internally and reflects a dialogue ongoing with different traditions.

Today, nation-states have to act according to one of the alternatives of multiculturalism or republicanism in terms of the management of the religious, national, ethnic and cultural differences. As republicanism acts with an assimilationist political perspective, it remains insensitive to the identity-oriented ethnic and cultural demands. On the other hand, multiculturalism paved the way for minorities to mobilize themselves culturally and ethnically. Both approaches tend to exclude minorities and immigrants in public sphere. The fact that there is only one Muslim member of parliament in the parliament of France, where 3 million Muslims live, is the proof of it. That is to say, both of these approaches have the risk of causing minorities to further become minorities. Understanding of republicanism, which aims to create political citizens through education without discrimination against language, religion, race or gender, ignores the differences. It does not approve of giving privileged group rights to ethnic, religious or cultural groups. It argues that such practices pose a threat to the integrity of a country. Individual rights are fundamental and it is based on the understanding of the power of majority. It exhibits a standardizing and homogenizing approach (Kaya/Tarhanlı, 2005: 19; Kaya, 2005: 43-44). The first reaction the immigrants exhibit is to conceal their differences and therefore not to catch attention. The secret dream of majority of the immigrants is to be considered as the descents of the country they have immigrated. (Maalouf, 2009: 36). The immigrants who feel that their own religion, language and traditions are humiliated and made fun of in the country they live in will start to reflect their differences in a more exaggerated way. However, if these people feel that they are welcomed warmly by the society they live in, they will not bring their differences forward and exhibit a positive attitude. (Maalouf, 2009: 39). Those who demand more complicated identities than the society offers them are excluded from the society. A young Muslim born in a Western country can have a sense of belonging both to the country his parents come from and to the one he was born in and grown up. However, in real life, this leaves people in a difficult situation. Individuals are forced to identify with a single identity in such cases. If this person identifies himself with the identity of the country his parents come from, he will be excluded in the society he is in. If he brings forward and emphasizes the identity of the country he lives in, he will be treated like a traitor by some people. A Turk who was born in Germany is not considered as a German by German people. On the other hand, he is no longer considered as an exact Turk in Turkey. Neither mentalities nor legal framework allows that person to live the unified identity which is the result of his formation. People have belongings which sometimes contradict with each other and force them to make a choice. (Maalouf, 2009: 10-11).
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Supporters of multiculturalism approach argue that if minorities are given the collective rights, the members of these groups will use their individual freedom better. It is observed that multiculturalism approach is perceived as a threat to the integration of the country (Kaya/Tarhanlı, 2005: 20). Although an important part of today’s modern nation-states define themselves in the discourse of multiculturalism, it is observed that they resort to narrow the framework of the citizenship excluding ethnic and religious minorities. (Kaya, 2005: 42-43). The separation of public and private areas mainly served the majority to establish hegemony over the minority (Kaya, 2005: 46). Multiculturalism causes people to feel themselves freer. This situation may lead to the disappearance of the imbalances in the economic relations. Such a feeling might become an obstacle to the economic and political demands of individuals (Kaya, 2005: 47).

As a result of globalization, nation-states can no longer continue to claim that the cultural structure in their own boundaries is homogeneous. Now demands for different identities have become a common problem of almost all countries. It does not seem possible to control and direct these people within the boundaries of the national identity after this point. Now the senseof plural identity has begun to emerge. Great debates are carried out on this new situation, which is called with names such as multicultural citizenship, transnational citizenship, etc. (Yücel, 2006: 12). Apart from the exceptional communities, the population structures of almost all communities today indicate pluralism. In other words, they consist of different ethnic, religious and linguistic communities (Tunçay, 2003: 1; Smith, 2002: 29). In some cases, the political boundaries of a country may not cover all the members of the nation or may include some foreigners as well as the entire nation. Also, although the political boundaries of a country does not cover all the members of the nation, it may include foreigners. The members of a nation may even live under the roofs of different countries (Gellner, 1992: 19). Cultural pluralism is recognized within the framework of physical and symbolic limits in democratic societies. Identities are only recognized within the boundaries of the nation-state. Political representation of the identities which are symbolically recognized is not possible. Political representation is provided within the framework of belonging to the national culture. This is realized within the boundaries of the nation-state (Tekinalp, 2005: 83-84).

Religious and ethnic nationalisms, which stand out in almost every nation-state, become a threat for nation-states (Kaya, 2005: 42). It is not possible to argue that the problems will come to an end with the recognition of multiculturalism. In Belgium, which is known for its multiculturalism, the problems among the Liberals, Catholics and Socialists, depeen more each day as in the relations between the Flemings speaking Dutch and Wallons speaking French. Similarly, in the Netherlands, which is divided into ten different social layers and multiculturalism has reached the most advanced degree in, these groups have the right to broadcast on television in proportion to their population. (Tekinalp, 2005: 78-79).

The news about the failure of multiculturalism reveals itself in the European practices. The implementation of ethnic groups providing education in their mother tongue was terminated on the grounds that it made the adaptation difficult. The telecast which had been realized by the public channel NPS for 45 minutes a day for 30 years was reduced to 45 minutes a week. The reason here is in the same direction: Turkish broadcasting hampers the integration of Turks to the society. It is observed that discriminatory discourses became popular in Europe especially after the September 11 attacks. Fears coming from the past is rising from the grave and the perception of sub-cultures threatening democracies is starting to be voiced. There may be some people calling these developments modern apartheid. A new racism can be said to have risen from the dead. Examples of intolerance of differences are increasing rapidly in the media and the street. (Tekinalp, 2005: 79-80).

There are two words used as a synonym of nation in Turkish; “millet” and “ulus”. The concepts of “millet” and “ulus” should not be used synonymously. While an upper identity in the legal boundaries of the nation state is meant with the concept of “ulus”, the concept of “millet” has the power to have an effect in the socio-cultural level from the common ground of the general religious belief to the level of feelings belonging to individuals. It is the concept of “millet” that forms a legal frame within the boundaries of the nation states and has a socio-cultural basis far beyond the understanding of “ulus”, which provides the commitment of its citizens abstractly with the bond of citizenship, and refers to the commitment of people (Özdemir, 2004: 35-36).
4. Multiculturalism in Turkey

Multiculturalism based policies are valid in heterogeneous, in another word; complex societies and they function as cement for such societies. However, in homogeneous societies like Turkey, multiculturalism increases conflict rather than providing cohesion (Beşirli, 2011: 143).

The Ottoman Empire was the most prominent multicultural and multinational country in the world. Turkish Republic emerged as a unitary state after being founded over the remainder of the Ottoman Empire and chose to ignore the differences other than the minorities stated in the Treaty of Lausanne. As a result of the policies implemented, an intensive migration phenomenon occurred and these minorities came to the point of extinction (Akkurt, 2010: 238-239).

The Ottoman Empire, which came out of the World War I defeated, had lost a large part of its territory. Now the Arabs were outside the boundaries. By 1999, 50% of the population of Istanbul was Greek, and Armenian and Jewish minorities lived there to a large extent (Sonnenhol, 1982: 64). In other words, majority of the population of Istanbul consisted of non-Muslims. Also, when the attempt of Greece to invade Anatolia after the war resulted in failure, a lot of Greeks migrated to Greece from Anatolia (especially from İzmir). Within one month after the liberation of İzmir, approximately one million Ottoman citizens escaped to Greece through Thrace by Greek ships (Keyder, 2008: 91). All these developments increased the rate of Turks rapidly.

During the exchange carried out in accordance with 1924 Lausanne Agreement, approximately one million people living in Anatolia were sent to Greece on the grounds that they were non-Muslims. Among these were the Karamans as well, who did not know Greek and said they were Turks. Conversely, there were Muslims who were brought from Greece and settled in Turkey, too. Therefore, it can be said that only religion was accepted as a measure of national identity in 1920s (Güvenç, 1994:159). In this context, although the Armenians whose mother tongue was Turkish and who lived in Anatolia were considered as minorities, the ones living in Hemşin and speaking Armenian were regarded as Turks (İnaç, 2006: 106).

Various figures are mentioned about the number of the Turks and Greeks who were subject to this population exchange. According to the given figures, while this number ranged between 1,250,000 and 1,700,000 for the Greeks emigrating from Turkey, the number of Muslims emigrating to Turkey was about 400-500 thousand (Binder-Krauthoff, 1995: 1080).

According to Kohn, the population exchange between Turkey and Greece was a great victory gained in the framework of nation-state principle for The Republic of Turkey (Kohn, 1928: 207).

The communities regarded as minorities in the Treaty of Lausanne, signed by the Republic of Turkey, were Greeks, Jews and Armenians. It is seen that these groups were different from the rest of the society in terms of religion, language and race. From the legal point of view, it cannot be said that there were any other minority groups in Turkey (Özönder, 2000: 66; Göçek, 2005: 66; Yumul, 2005: 89). One of the rights accorded to the minorities with the Treaty of Lausanne was to allow them to act in accordance with their own customs, traditions and laws in personal and familial situations such as heritage. As a result of the pressure put on minorities, they had to renounce these rights. In consequence of this development, as well as providing the legal unity in the country, the system in which communities were managed by their own religious leaders in the Ottoman Empire was terminated and the minorities gained the status of citizenship. The authorities of the religious leaders were limited only to the religious fields. Thus, intermediary institutions and people between the minorities and the state were eliminated. The members of minorities had dual perception: On one hand they were perceived as members of community because of the rights they were accorded due to being minorities, and on the other hand they were perceived as individuals because of the citizenship status they were given (Yumul, 2005: 89).

Another minority group living in Turkey was Armenians. The number of Armenians was never and nowhere higher than of Turks. When the Armenians were defeated in the Independence War, an important part of the Armenian minority immigrated to Armenia in Russia. The number of Armenians turned out to be 77 thousand in 1927 census (Caucig, 1936: 238-239). By 1927, the population of Turkey was 13 million and Turks constituted 11.5 million of it (Kohn, 1928: 11). This situation was naturally an indicator of the fact that one of the requisites required to constitute a nation state was realized. A substantially homogeneous population structure was provided.
In the East of Turkey lived a large Kurdish population. This situation posed a great danger in terms of the nation-state. In the first periods of the Republic, a lot of Kurdish revolts were staged. In order to Turkify these regions, a large number of Kurds were forced to migrate to the regions where Turks were in majority (Binder-Krautoff, 1995: 1080).

The main purpose of the settlement policy which was put into practice in Turkey in 1930s was to Turkify the citizens; in other words, to make the population more homogeneous in terms of both biological properties and the languages they speak. Now the unity of genealogy, race and blood became as important as the unity of language, which was tried to be provided (Yardımcı ve Aslan, 2008: 132). The settlement policy needs to be examined in the framework of two periods. The first one is the period when the population exchange was realized with the other countries, and the second one is the period when people living in different regions within the boundaries of the country were forced to leave the places they lived and settle in another region of the country. The differences in the senses of identity in these periods are compatible with these implementations. The first period includes 1920s and the nation is defined mostly referring to Islam. The second period coincides with 1930s and now the nation is defined in an ethnic discourse. While non-Muslims were deported and immigration of Muslims to the country was encouraged in the first period, the ones without the Turkish ethnic origin were settled in the approved regions of the country in order to be Turkified in the second period (Yardımcı ve Aslan, 2008: 135).

In order to Turkify the Kurds, Settlement Law was enacted in 1934. The Settlement Law aimed to resettle the population living in Turkey within the framework of the basis of race. Within the scope of this law, the regions were separated according to three different groups: Turks, those to be integrated into Turkishness and prohibited zones (Timur, 2001: 145). The purpose of this law was to scatter the people of the districts and villages not speaking Turkish as their mother tongue to the different regions of the country. Those who were not Turkish, Arabs and Kurds being in the first place and especially those who were suspected to be involved in the riots would be settled in the Turkish regions. An organization in which Turkish was not spoken by the majority would not be allowed. The Kurds would be scattered in the Turkish regions in a way not to exceed the 5% of the population. Tribes had the most basic function during the process of identity formation in the Kurdish society. It can be said that the removal of the tribal structure was aimed with this settlement law. Tribes provided security and protection for their own members and there was strict obedience to the head of the tribes among the members of the trial. Therefore, the effectiveness of the tribes, which could be considered as alternative formations in the state, was wanted to be reduced (Şahin, 2005: 107).

It cannot be said that there is a parallelism between the official policies and the historical reality. In Turkey, different cultures continued their existence in peace. An exclusionary understanding towards these cultures cannot be said to be dominant in public. Cultures constituting the social structure in Turkey are integrated and amalgamated with each other as in the art of marbling. Also, each color and design preserved its individual structure as in the art of marbling (Cırık, 2008: 36). Turkey continues its existence as a multicultural social structure due to both the historical heritage it took over and the communities continuing to exist in it from different religious and ethnic origins living together. An important part of the non-governmental organizations in Turkey are made up of the constitutions different ethnic and religious communities produced.

Although Turkey is very rich in terms of cultural and ethnic structure, national minorities and ethnic groups do not have the cultural and national rights (Akkurt, 2010: 238).

For the last 25 years, Kurds have been fighting for recognition within the context of multiculturalism. As the religion of Turks and Kurds is the same, the identity demand can be said to be set out in the framework of the language. The excessive ethnic emphasis on the “Turkish identity” caused the demand of Kurds for language centered social recognition to emerge more intensely. The overlooking and commanding attitude of the Turkish nationalism is effective in the rise of a reaction. Being in the oppressed position contributes to the increase in Kurdish nationalism. Kurdish nationalism is increasing even more each day no steps are taken in this field (Akkurt, 2010: 238).
5. Conclusion

Multiculturalism is a concept which has the key role in the continuation of existence of differences in today’s social structures. In the framework of nation-state understanding, homogeneous societies in all aspects were tried to be constituted. Different ethnic and religious communities which were considered as the most important obstacles to this were tried to be eliminated as a result of assimilation policies. Differences were not allowed to be visible in public sphere.

Along with globalization, the channels the differences could express themselves increased. On one hand national boundaries became meaningless and therefore globalization actualized, on the other hand demands for indigenization and exposure of differences emerged. Different groups in the country wanted to be recognized and be visible in public sphere as well. This situation can be referred as a kind of democratization of democracy.

Different ethnic and religious groups have lived together in Turkey for centuries. In the Ottoman Empire period, the existence of different nations in public sphere was accepted. As well as having their own religious institutional autonomy, these different nations did justice in their own courts in judicial sense. There was no obstacle to continue their existence for the differences in the areas reserved for them.

In the Republican Turkey, steps were taken in accordance with the spirit of the time and a uniter state structure was tried to be constructed with the sense of secularism. The founding staff struggling for independence considered the existence of the differences as a threat for the survival of the state. In this context, steps to construct a single nation were taken using all the opportunities as far as possible. The population exchange allowed for this. Only non-Muslims were accepted as minorities. Their population was not considered big enough to pose a threat for the country. In practice, steps were taken for the abolition of the privileges granted to these minorities.

Muslims from different ethnic backgrounds living in Turkey were not considered as minorities and all of them were defined as Turks. The biggest obstacle to this practice was the Kurds with a dense population. As well as enacting settlement laws to turn the Kurds into a part of the Turkish nation, no other language except from Turkish was allowed in education.

Although a multicultural appearance was not allowed in public sphere, a multicultural life continued its existence in social layers. A great tolerance was shown to the groups with different cultural properties. There being a mosque, a church and a synangogue in the same street and exhibiton of no negative approach to this situation in the society is the best indicator of the fact that there was no attitude against multiculturalism in social layers.

Some of the rights granted to the minorities not being allowed to be used in practice in Turkey should be associated with international politics. Greece acted insensitively to the rights of the Turkish minorities living in its boundaries and attached great importance to assimilate them. Even the right of Muslims to elect their own mufti was seized. Turkey acts in reciprocity principle.
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