The Strategy of Turkish Immigrant to Hold on to the Life in France: The Case of Evry Suburb

Hasan Güler

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts and Science, Uşak University, Turkey

Copyright©2016 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

Abstract In this study, we try to analyze Turkish migrants to Paris and their migration process as well as their adaptation strategies. We refer to this study the result of the academic literature on immigration and the findings from the interviews date discussed. Study consists of four sections. Research methodology and problematic is mentioned in the introduction part. In the second section, we discuss a brief historical review on the phenomenon of migration in France. In the third section, how people coming from Turkey adopt this process is explained. (Based on the findings of our field study the strategy that people coming from Turkey used while they try to adopt the life of Paris). The last section, study concluded with general overview.

Keywords Migration, France, Integration, Evry, Identity, Turkey

1. Introduction

“Her husband, Martin, has the same dreams as well. Every morning they tell each other the frightful return to their country. Then, while she was talking with her friend, a polish girl who took refuge in like herself, Irena understood that all refugees, without any exception, had the same dreams. First, she was affected in the course of this night-brotherhood who did not know each other; then she got a little bit angry. How is it possible that the confidential experience in dream can be collectively shared? Then where is the uniqueness of spirit? However, what is the good of the question without answers. One thing was certain: thousands of refugees have the same dreams together with many countless variations during the same night. The dream of refuge: one of the weirdest facts in the second half of 20. Century.” [1, p17]

The main purpose of this study is to examine how the integration modal determined by the dominant ideology is bended, through the daily practices of Turkish immigrants in Paris. For this purpose, Michel de Certeau’s conception of “strategy” and “tactic” will be used. Shortly, according to Michel de Certeau [2] strategies are rules, which are

formerly established by a power in a society. Instead, tactics are seepage attempts created in daily life against these rules. One of the fundamental characteristics of tactic is necessarily to play in area imposed itself; it is a process of utilizing the possibilities given without going out of area. From this perspective, the forms of participation in the labour market of Turkish migrants living in France, their marriage organization, their friendly relations, their visibility by the places (mosques, coffee, restaurants, etc.) established in the public sphere, and spare time activities are the leading tactics the migrants carry out.

Upon underlying a few points related to the scale of this study we will touch upon the fact that what kind of method we will follow in terms of methodology. First of all, we are planning to carry out the study not in whole France but in Evry¹ [3, p38] region where largely the immigrants from Turkey live.

Within the process of this field work the research techniques of sociology and anthropology disciplines were used. Qualitative research techniques were used to find an answer to the basic problematics stated in the introduction chapter of the study. Thanks to the ethnographic observation anthropology discipline uses in the long range field Works a rich set of data was obtained pertaining to the Daily life practices of immigrants. Further, some information that is impossible to express in formal interviews is collected by means of informal interviews. In many fields like living in

¹ While Evry was a small place with less population in 1960, its destiny changed on 29 October 1965 by becoming the centre of the region and it also became one of the application areas for the new “city project”. Evry designed as a “new city” is the production of a certain urbanization perspective. Some journalists and political parties criticized this perspective and especially its method to have an authoritarian character. But the idea of necessity to build housings for the new people who just arrived without changing the characteristic of centre of Paris prevented to discuss effectively the problem of authority. There are two arguments about the fact that Evry was selected as opposite centre against Corbeile, older than Evry: first argument is technical. According to this argument, corbeil does not have sufficient residential areas and places for the administrative buildings such as office of the governor. Another argument is political. Since the worker population is more (red generation) and the communist party is effective in Corbeil, it should be thought that there would be strong objections against the implementation of the settlement policies; for this reason this situation led to take the decision about Evry.

the suburb with immigrants, unemployment, education of children, neighbourhood relationships, living in the community, commercial organizations and praying activities with survey and other research techniques the details that are difficult to permeate are obtained. In addition to the ethnographic observation, the other basic research technique of our study is half-structured in-depth interviews. With the aid of questionnaire that consists of about 60 questions basic data related to immigrants' immigrancy process, working lives, daily life activities, political participations, suburb lives and identities were sought to be obtained. Half-structured in-depth interview enables the researcher to collect data about social and personal problems in depth. The basic authenticity of half-structured interviews is the fact that it provides the researcher opportunity and flexibility to discover important issues freely during the interview. This method clearly builds the opportunity to collect data more detailed about the problem and experiences. Because this method provides significant advantages in revealing people's views and explanations about subjects the researcher does not expect or think. [4, p148]

For the point of expressing statistically the demographic data of immigrants mentioned within the scope of research a one page questionnaire and quantitative research technique also was included in the study.

The sampling universe of the study has been identified as +18 female/male born in and out of France among the Turkish immigrants after signing of April 1965 workforce agreement with France. In order to enable a full representation of the field interviews 30 people from all segments of life (female, male, worker, boss, young, old) was conducted.

2. The Transformation of France into Migration Place

The migration to France is not only the reality of today but it has also a long historical background. Although the history of migration to France was based on long history, the second half of the 19th century characterizes the modern migrations. We can define two characteristics distinguishing the modern migration from the old as follows: First, the intersection of boundaries and the separation of the national and non-national and connecting with a base. Second, the role of migration in France is generally unskilled labour. The common ground between the domestic migration after the dissolution of rural area in 19th century and external migration coming from other places is to find job. [5, p17-8]

We can evaluate the movement of migration towards France in the early twentieth century as in "economic migration" category. This migration appears as a male origin, young and individual, and close neighbour motif. According to the 1911 census, about 85% of foreigners are neighbours (Italy, Belgium, Spain, Germany, and Switzerland). The new characteristic is added to this structural character of migration with the arrival of Algerians, with the limited and

seasonal migration of Belgian and Spanish. [6, p4]

Migration between the years 1921-1931 is shifted to "hand-crafting" [6, p20] which is the economic needs. French government attempts to organize the migration with its migration politics as well. Especially "National Migration Office" is the most important one among these political regulations, which established after the Second World War. The general aim of this institution is to regulate and control the attractive and intensive migration in a centre; to constitute new politics leading migrants to integrate easily into French society. At the period after the war, France population has taken a new multilingual and multicultural natural form with newcomers, "strangers."

The history of Turkish migration in that variety we tried to define above based on the result of the agreement made in 1965 and renewed in 1969. Priority in adoption of applicants to labour migration organized by the employment agency was given to the persons whose places they live are damaged due to drought and flood, the persons who live in underdeveloped areas, and the persons who first write their names and wait. This organized immigration transformed its place into family reunification and illegal immigration with the termination of the treaty in 1974. With the effect of Mitterrand amnesty after 1980, France has become the migration place for "expats".

The story of Turkish migrants in France has become an academic interest after 1980s. The essay of Catherine Gökalp [7] written on Turkish migrants in Europe, in particular her descriptive article on France, is one of the early studies in this field. Riva Kastoryano's [8] study, "Etr Turc en France" (To be Turkish in France), based on the interviews made with Turkish families is full of rich knowledge from the structure of the first arrivals to daily life practices; became an important resource for the researchers coming after him. Michele Tribilat' [9, 10] quantitative studies about the migration based on the wide date set inspired interest. The definition of "communitarian covered" (reply *communitaire*) used by Tribilat in order to define Turkish migrants leads the Turkish identity closed to integration to place into academia and popular area. Some studies after Tribilat indicates that this view is not sufficient and criticizes his reductive logic. Particularly the method of Tapia [11, 12] which considers the variety of the arrival country demonstrates much more convenient way to understand the experiences of Turkish migrants. Moreover, the article of Derya Fırat [13] in *Toplumbilim* special issue is highly effective to indicate the deficiency of Tribilat's perspective.

The studies made by the students who went to France for PhD in 2000 are very important part of literature on the Turkish migrants. Fırat [14] attracted attention with her research on Turkish youth based on field study. The article of Gaye Petek [15] written on the Turkish organizations in France and the article of Elif Aksaz [16] on the activities of Turkish women in French suburbs are remarkable researches. With this study, we aim to make a significant contribution to this literature on migration.

3. The Strategies for Clinging to Life among Immigrants from Turkey

When we look at the socio-economic structure of immigrants from Turkey that appeared in France in early 1970's, it is seen that this migration movement is largely rural.

"...we were dealing with agriculture and animal breeding mostly. Finally we decided to move to Europe. Our conditions were not good; there were poverty and poorness. We had unemployment in our country. Especially in our region.. and finally we made up our minds. In 1960s, there were many people moved to Germany. I applied at Public Employment Office in 1965 for moving to Germany. There was a specific quota for workers for Germany, but at that time, there was no open quota. Excess quota was dedicated to Tunceli since it was a poor city; and mostly to East Anatolia. I registered myself as constructor, but I did not have any idea about this work. Then, I started to work as gateman, but conditions were still hard. At the end of 1972, I was listed for going abroad. I took my criminal record and went to Istanbul for physical examination. I passed the examination, and selected for France. I took and passed a vocational exam. They told me that I will be leaving to France by train, the coach no 401. We were 16 Turkish, from different cities. We were given yellow cockades by the French Liaison Office in Istanbul. They told that a translator would meet us in France. We just had our clothes with us" (Male, 74)

In the beginning of immigration, the immigrants who left their countries for the sake of work were mostly young men both single and married. This group of immigrants arriving in France was mostly low qualified handwork men coming from villages. We can say that this has a structure similar to the internal immigrations in Turkey. Coming from different regions with non-agricultural lands, these immigrants have very low working experience in the industrial regions of west Turkey. Germany has been the leading country to receive immigrants coming from the industrial region in west Turkey. We witness that a migration process, chiefly from the rural parts of eastern, central and Blacksea regions of Turkey, that is motivated by struggling with poverty, a better life, climbing to upper layers in social status and whose economic character predominates emerges. Therefore, as Riva Kastoryano [8, p15] indicates we can evaluate the migration of Turks to France within the scope of "economic migration".

The key motivation element of the first generation was the strategy based on earning money and going back to Turkey in short period. Looking at the actors of immigration, the myth of "migratory birds" which aims at going back to hometown is shared both by the hosting country and the immigrants. The core argument of this myth is that, in accordance with the economic nature of immigration, the

immigrants would go back to their countries after saving some capital. In this context, the overall tendency of the first generation immigrants is to preserve their cultural values and show resistance to be assimilated to the cultural codes of the hosting country. However, most of them stay in hosting countries [17, p128]. The illusion of going back appears in almost all immigration cases. The first aim of the immigrant is to earn money, "set the future", achieve it and then go back to home country with a "glorious" feeling [18, p62]. Soon, some unpredictable factors occur and the myth of going back evolves gradually and postponed to the age of "retirement".

"I came to France from Sivas in 1973, through the village community. We aimed at going abroad no matter what. France was not my own choice, I was sent there. After arriving here, people have plans to go back while kids are small. Then they say, let's buy an apartment before going back; then, let's buy a store. They want to save some capital and then go back to home country. They don't spend any extra penny, just save. Kids get older by time, start schools and then the dreams of going back disappear. If you take the kids back to Turkey at secondary or high school, their Turkish level is not enough. I spent 40 years here. Now, whenever I visit Turkey, I feel as a foreigner. I believe that most of the people living in France cannot go back. They have their children and even grandchildren here. Besides, they don't have any place to go back in Turkey... no chance to go back." (male, 66)

The migration process that continued until 1974 with the workforce agreement (1965) through official channels was followed by family unifications and illegal means. Due to the family reunifications (regroupement familial), Turkish community got feminized in short period. In 1975, female population ratio was 25,7 %, while 42,3 % in 1982, and 44,8 % in 1990 [19, p91]. Only after some years passing over the first arrival, wives and children got involved in the immigration process as well. This specific delay created some difficulties in "integration" to the immigrated country:

"I arrived in France in 1997, through family reunification. My father applied for reunification and we arrived here as whole family, me, 3 sisters and my mother. My father was alone here from 1977 to 1997. He was visiting Turkey for summer in every 2 to 3 years. If my father had taken us with him when he was first accepted, everything would have been better. We would have studied or spoken French more fluently then. It was really difficult when we first arrived. We had no French, no job, and no acquaintance. The main difficulty in France is the language. This is still valid. Turkish people have this challenge. Young ones speak French, but the first generation had real problems. My generation speaks average. Speaking French is a must. Older ones always had someone to translate for them, in hospitals, in pharmacies, etc... I think in France, Turkish people speak French the least; because they are not willing, not concentrating" (male, 37)

Protecting the sense of belonging to home country, the central role of women in parenting and transmitting of cultural values, smoothed the way for marriage arrangements; and this ensured the increase of female ratio in Turkish immigrant population. In the early years of immigration, women had to step back and take care of children, instead of being a part of immigration process:

“When my husband left for France, I was alone in Bergama with my children. It was really difficult to take the whole responsibility of them by myself. They were 4, 2 and 1 year old. My husband stayed away for 7 months and I had to deal with kids and housework alone then. I had to take kids to doctor, do the shopping, prepare food, do the cleaning...and we had to survive on the money that my husband left before leaving” [20, p51]

Although the migration had largely an economic character, especially after the September 12 1980 military coup, the new home of political immigrants became France, especially Paris. The intensification Turkish population in France started with the Mitterand amnesty after which those desiring refuge and could not get legal residence permit in other cities of Europe made their ways to France:

“Our fellows from Eleşkirt started to migrate to Netherlands, Germany, France and Belgium little in 1970's. There were more immigrants from the mountain villages. As the financial situations of people from valley villages were a bit better there were not many immigrants from them... Let's say my father is in France. And with my father there were 4-5 more people. What was special with France compared to Germany and Netherlands, people there were more hospitable... Also for seeking asylum it was a better place. At that time Mitterand was the president. After 1980's. after all, Mitterand gave some social rights to these *sans papiers* after his election. I was a child at that time... My father was about 30-35 years old, he applied to public employment Office, it was 1971-1972. He applied in Ağrı. He already had some foreign city experiences like in İstanbul and Adana. We did not land in village, we had only a small shop.... Meanwhile a peasant informs my father that his paper is ok.... At that time, there was no such thing like plane after you got your paper, people were going to Europe by train. People were going through various checks that disturbed them. After those checks a document would be given to you. OK this man is healthy he can go to Europe to work.... This was announced in all Turkey. Not just in the east. For example Gümüşhane neighbourhood they were also a downtrodden region. Also from there many guest workers came. For example, also from the Blacksea region many guest workers came. France applied to Turkey and said that we need workers. And Turkey announced this in its own country. At that time, you had to be very healthy. 5 out of 10 people were denied”... [21, p299]

The first comers were advantageous compared to following generations in terms of accommodation and finding a job as they came through official sources with

worker status. As an immigrant talking about this process states the French car factories needed “man-handling” and because of this the first comers were warmly welcomed. Even when they first came they were welcomed by their French boss and had lunch together which is quite a different attitude in labour market:

“I arrived in France by train in 1973. The owner of the factory who hired us travelled with us. He took 10 of us from İstanbul Public Employment Office, took the train and came here with us. They had dormitories next to the factory, single or double rooms with kitchen and bathroom. First we moved there. We did not know a single word in French. The factory was 300 km away from Paris. I worked there for 2 years and then brought my kids to France. At that time, there was a lack of workers. Factories were chasing after workers; while we were earning 5 to 6 francs per hour, another factory was offering 7 francs. Now, there is unemployment. When I arrived, Peugeot factory had 30.000 workers, Citroen had 20.000 to 25.000. Simka had 30.000 workers. These factories have 3.000 to 4.000 workers now” (male, 66).

This is a migration experience that is not accompanied by the sense of “ostracisation” reflected by the younger generations as their migration motivation was economy focused and they had plans to return within a short time. Their dream when they return to their homes was to become a powerful man in terms of financial situation and gain prestige, that's why the word to succeed is quite important in the literature of first generation immigrants.

Due to the non-qualified labour structure of first immigrants most of them could work in ready wear industry, construction, factories and road works. In spite of about forty years upon this also the children of immigrants from Turkey paradoxically share the same “destiny” which is an important phenomenon. In the interviews and observations conducted it was found out that the unemployment was high among the young people and most of them can find job in construction industry as unqualified labour in temporary works. To Tapia [12, p94], most of the first generation immigrants are either little qualified or not qualified at all. They have become qualified within the working life. We also see that for the children of the first generation immigrants (2. and 3. Generation) a similar scheme is repeated. They are unemployed or get little salary or very little qualified.

The problems of immigrants from Turkey that became permanent population got diverse. With the abandoning of going back home dream, the education of children, language, accommodation, identity and adjusting to the system of country migrated became vital. The population that intensified in the suburbs where the rents are relatively low has adopted various adherence strategies. Looking at the information obtained during the field work we can collect adherence strategies under the titles of labour process and entering labour market and Daily life practices/social organizations.

In terms of the fact that they correspond to the last periods of factory regime where the Fordist applications based on full employment was dominant the mobility of first generation immigrants within the labour market was much easier compared to other generations. In narrating the working life of an immigrant that came to Paris by means of employment agency in early 1970's those words "we could find job wherever we wanted, even we would quit a job in the morning and work in another factory at noon" are important for understanding the atmosphere when the labour force was at its peak. The strategies of first generations that did not feel work worry deeply for adjusting life in Paris were shaped within the work life. They were married but because they came as "single" the conversations made in the foyers or barracks that belonged to their Works were accompanied by the longing felt for home and this created the sense of living "at home" in a foreign country. As their priority was "working" they were in search of integration with the French society with working without caring about "strange" things they encountered in the social tissue of the country they came from.

When we look at the first generation immigrants [3, p312], sending Money to the country they came from is a vital issue and because of this they developed an approach in which some details did not matter much. They even worked in jobs which were rejected by many French people due to the fact that they caused physical wearing. The people coming through family reunifications and illegal ways after the first generation tried to create a loyalty to the country they came by moving within the network constituted by the first generation. The most important problem of people coming to the country through illegal ways is the problem of legalisation. Many problems of "illegal immigrants" like accommodation and finding a job (*sans papiers*) have been solved under the guidance of previous generation. This state of immigrancy accompanied by the language problem has been the chief obstacle in communicating efficiently with the French society for a while. As they had to participate the working life by staying within the relative or larger countryman group the process of developing language was interrupted. The fact that they were illegal and unqualified made it difficult for them to find a job in the French companies and out of the construction sector:

The construction. I didn't have experience beforehand but here the business is usually construction... That's my entourage. You don't even need to be a craftsman. A craftsman can handle with two men. That is to say, you don't have to have a skill, you can easily manage everything in the construction. You are an illegal immigrant, you learn the difficulties. When they talk about work to you you feel like that you won the lottery... When you are an illegal immigrant you got a bit less money. You wear off more you spend more effort. They give more work load to you because you got no other choice but you do the work of 3-4 men... This remains between us. You don't feel like to go to another one. Now you feel secure. That's to say, when

you work with someone you know you are not scared. You are an illegal immigrant, if you are caught there exists risks and you say ok. You got a job it is as if you got the world. But this serves to them. You make your life. But on the other hand, in some matters you suffer. Because they don't guide you, you always have to follow them. After you get the residence permit you have a voice. You get some more rights. And then they abandon you. You get some opportunities. You can pass them in one year if you want. You can found a company or do something else... When you get the permit you guarantee your life. *Korkun azaliyor*. You can work comfortably... There is kind of grouping in the social circle. ..But how will you manage it? You have to speak French. Of course, there was the language problem when I first came. In the first years, I used to come to coffee house and sit with acquaintances, my own people. I don't walk out. Because I am an illegal immigrant. Therefore, you can't learn the language. And then, when you get your permit you can't talk to Frenchman, why? Because you speak the language... And this makes you scared. Well, you can go to school for a while and what you can do? You have to work. Not knowing French alienates you from the society and then it is too late... That you don't have residence permit (paper) takes 3 years from you...

As the long quotation above indicates, the state of being illegal immigrant prolong your necessary residence and also shapes your life after you are legal. We can say that the generation born in France usually push the limits of moving within the system over the friendship groups. Based on the field research data, the duration of schooling of this generation is not too long. The young people believing in the inferiority of education in the *Banlieus*² [22, p18] and the existence of a hidden ostracisation mechanism in the French social life do not see the diploma as a means to change the conditions they live within. Their aim is "to save the day" by working in temporary and unqualified jobs. We can say that the young people put forward a style different from the dominant integration perspectives by "quarrelling", contrary to the previous generations that stressed "the financial baggage" by "making a compromise", bending the French republican values and creating hybridities; this indicates that the young people.

² Banlieu dates back to Word origin describing the rural within the jurisdiction of the city in feudal times. Ban means judgement, jurisdiction lieu means place. Banal that comes from the same root means the responsibility put on all the vassals of a lord and forced labour in feudal law. The Word banlieu that can be defined as exile place out of the walls of city as regards to origin has a two faced semantic meaning: "Being outside" and "dependency" (Rey, 1996: 15.). In XVII century it lost its legal meaning and started to be used for the settlements appeared around the city. But to associate the meaning of Banlieu in middle ages with its current meaning is an extreme interpretation. There is no state of consistency between them. The peripheries of cities realised their main developments with the construction of railways, mass industrialisation and appearance of new production forms. Thus, with the 19. Century got a completely new quality although in previous centuries considerably permeating things could be put forward related to the city.

Based on our observations we can state that the daily life mobilisations of the immigrants from Turkey do not go beyond the boundaries of suburb they live. Thanks to the “Turkish coffeehouses”, “Turkish shops”, “Turkish pastry shops”, “Turkish supermarkets” they found in the suburbs they live have a limited connection to outside.

Being formed with the motivation of resistance to the cultural assimilation and transmission of values and customs to next generations, the associations appear as organizations to meet immigrants’ concerns of origins. While the first generation expressed their nostalgia for the home country they had left behind, associational activities that support increasing visibility of foreigners in public sphere widened its scope in 1901. Thus, the next generations concentrated on solving two major needs of their society through the founded associations. The first need was to deal with the integrational difficulties while claiming, remembering and rebuilding own values; and the second one was to be recognized by public authorities. Some associations emerged from the syndical experience gained by immigrant workers. “Turkish Cultural Association” (Association Culturelle Turque) that was founded in Verviers, Belgium in 1975 is an example for such associations. The first activity of this association was to celebrate national holiday as well as promoting national music and cuisine. After a while, they got in touch with the Turkish Consulate and expressed their request for Turkish teacher and imam. In 1983, a group of syndicalists and leftists went beyond these requests and concentrated on activities that put out projects for participation. Some of the associations were founded as the reflection of political activities in Turkey (Milli Görüş - National Vision), some were founded by members of Turkey based religious order (Süleymançılar - Sulaymanites); some associations were based on belief outside the ruling Islamic stream (Alevi associations) and the others were founded by initiatives of secularists on socio-cultural base (Elele, Acort). The associations serve two functions; ensuring “refreshing of faith while staying in community” for all, and making invisibles visible:

“Further to the hunger strike of illegal apparel workers in 1980, Acort association was founded by the organizers of this strike. The association had to build relations with its surrounding in short term. That’s why we left the political arena in Turkey as of 1985. France is our main political domain. Our scope is immigration. We were criticized by the leftists. Unless we get organized here, we would not have any voice in issues like discrimination. Our starting point was Turkish immigrants but we gradually developed relations with other immigrant groups and the French society.” (male, 45)

In and around Evry where we conducted our field study, there are 5 associations founded by Turkish immigrants in accordance with the framework mentioned above. Founded on the base of religious belief and with the aim to avoid “disidentification” of young generation, “Alevi Cultural

Center” and “Turkish Families” associations’ central pillars are solidarity within the society and preservation of the “cultural entity”. “Voice of Youth” which was founded as reflection of the leftist movement in Turkey, and “Mesopotamia Cultural Center” linked to the Kurdish political movement, mostly focus on the actions in Turkey rather than the political life in France, and they aim at mobilizing their members and immigrants. “Les Amis Anatoliens” association differs from the rest with its structure that prioritizes the policies towards France. Executives of this association emphasize the importance of “Democratic integration” model for the creation of a common public sphere:

“Here, being an individual is a must. The new individual created by the democratic integration is important for us. We can act the same as Bretons in France, claiming own identities yet defending democratic values. Melting together the values of your home country and the ones of the country you live in. We believe that the democratic integration is a model for creating a common culture by respecting the cultural values. This process is effective when you are extroverted rather than introverted. It is the formation of an equal life” (male, 48).

For some of the Turkish immigrants, halal life style and its economic organization is a “European” initiative searching for the ways of living together without denying own identity. Especially, to find “halal” meat [12, p99] that compelled the first generation immigrants and that they strangled small cattle in the baths of houses is long in the past thanks to “halal markets”. This logically has become widespread in France from the trajectory of a “halal”, conservative political ideology with its economic self-seeking and guest worker nostalgia. In fact, halal is a pivotal issue from neighbourhood relations to eating out habits. Almost all the immigrants we talked stated that although they had non Muslim friends their relations with them remained only within the work. The answer given by a Turkish immigrant in the field work of Gilles Kepel in 1980’s to the question of “if a foreign, non Muslim neighbour of you invites you to dinner, will you accept the invitation?” is quite influential in terms of reflecting the mental World of Turkish immigrants:

“You asked such a question, it is over my head. In fact we do not accept it. But to perceive this as fanaticism is wrong. The reason why we don’t go is that our food is not slaughtered according to Islamic rules. We eat meat after it is slaughtered according to Islamic rules. They are definitely not dirty. They are clean and conform to rules according to their religion. But they eat the meat that is forbidden in our religion. On the other hand, they drink wine with food... You can definitely say that it is not necessary to drink. Probably, I don’t want to break heart of my friend but I don’t want to eat the meat that is not prepared according to my religion. It is better not to accept the invitation rather than breaking my friend.” [23, p35-6]

Although the neighborhood relations, marriage organizations and shopping practices of immigrants from Turkey give the impression of an independent island that is self-sufficient due to the dialogues they develop with the French public sphere via work life we can say that they have an integration strategy that does not conform to patronizing integration model credo and this strategy idiosyncratic and functions by staying within the community.

4. Conclusions

Although Turkish immigrants show "reluctance" to penetrate into the French social and public life, it is necessary to consider more comprehensive explanatory framework rather than explaining this through cultural arguments. Turkish immigrants, who are being defined by concepts as "communitarian closure" and "resistant to integration" especially in the early migration literature, have an approximately fifty years of experience in France. Both the duration of process and the heterogeneous structure of arriving immigrants compel a more dynamic perspective. Apart from the model defined by French Revolutionary values, here, we can mention an integration experience vivid by hybridisms emerged in its ground while seeming withdrawn yet being extroverted.

One of the most crucial conclusions of our field survey is that a critical approach is needed towards the policies which tend to see only one single colour in suburbs. It is obvious that an atmosphere with high unemployment rates and increasing anxiety for future is prevailing especially among young people there. Hierarchical integration policies that impose themselves as the unconditional truth are one of the major risks in suburbs which are overwhelmed by religious based radicalization accompanied by ethnic and cultural marginality. We can underline that regarding the young people developing "performance" based relation with Islam at a more secular level beyond the known means, considering all of them as radicals does not conform to the reality of suburbs. Also the Imam of the mosque where immigrants from Ağrı (city, east of Turkey) frequent changed his radical ideas and coined "European style Muslim." If the space of these types of hybridization extend, a non-assimilative integration motivated by common values can be initiated. This new experience also may be the means to a better integration which does not exclude differences and immigrants living in community may not be so resistant to integration.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kundura M. Bilmemek, 12th ed. İstanbul: Can Yayınları; 2014.
- [2] De Certeau M. L'invention du quotidien. Paris: Gallimard; 1990.
- [3] Guyard J. Evry: Ville Nouvelle 1960-2003: La Troisième Banlieue. Paris: Espaces Sud; 2003.
- [4] Pope, C. Qualitative methods in research on healthcare quality. *Quality Safety Health Care*. 2002; 11: 148-152.
- [5] Tripier M. L'Immigration dans la Classe Ouvrière en France. Paris: L'Harmattan; 1990.
- [6] Tapinos G. L'Immigration Etrangère en France: 1946-1973. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France; 1975.
- [7] Gökalp C. L'emigration Turque en Europe et Particulièrement en France. Institut National D'Etudes Démographiques. 1973 Şub; 28(2): 335-360.
- [8] Kastoryano R. Être Turc en France: Reflexions sur Familles et Communauté. Paris: L'Harmattan; 1986.
- [9] Tribalat M. Faire France: Une enquête sur les immigrés et leurs enfants. Paris: La Découverte; 1995.
- [10] Tribalat M, Simon P, Riandry B. De l'immigration à l'assimilation enquête sur les populations d'origine étrangère en France. Paris: La Découverte; 1996.
- [11] De Tapia S. Les migrations turques vers l'Europe: tendances récentes. 2003 (cited 2004 May). Available from: http://www.oriv-alsace.org/wp-content/uploads/oriv_actes_conference_migrations_turques.pdf
- [12] De Tapia S. Migrations et Diasporas Turques: Circulation Migratoire et Continuité Territoriale (1957-2004). Paris: Maisonneuve-Larose; 2005.
- [13] Fırat D. Göçmenler ile İlgili Fransız Sosyolojik Düşüncesinin Çözümlemesi: Fransa'daki Türkiye Kökenli Gençlerde Bütünleşmenin Bir Sonucu Olarak 'Ötekileşmiş' Kültürel Kökenin yeniden Keşfi. *Toplumbilim Göç özel Sayısı*. 2003; 17: 73-85.
- [14] Fırat D. Les Jeunes de l'Immigration de Turquie en France. Paris: EHESS; 2005.
- [15] Petek G. Le Mouvement Associatif Turc en France, Hommes et Migrations. 2009; 1280: 22-33.
- [16] Aksaz E. Immigration Familiale Turque et Activités Quotidiennes des Femmes: Le Souci de Réputation Dans une Cité HLM de la Banlieue Parisienne. *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* (Internet). 2006 Mar (cited 2009 décembre 31); 22(3): (about 12pp.). Available from: <http://remi.revues.org/3341>
- [17] Morice A. Le mouvement des sans-papiers ou la difficile mobilisation collective des individualismes, Ahmed Boubeker et Abdellali Hajjat, Histoire Politique des Immigrants (Post) Coloniaux France, 1920-2008, Editions Amsterdam, Paris, 2008 ; 125-141.
- [18] Temime E. Emigration 'Politique' et Emigration 'Economique'. L'Emigration Politique en Europe aux XIX. et XX. Siècles, Ecole Française de Rome; 1991: 57-72.
- [19] Bozarslan, H. Immigration et intégration au féminin: femmes originaires de Turquie en France, Cahiers D'Etudes sur La Méditerranée Orientale et Le Monde Turco-Iranien. 1996 ; 21: 91-119.
- [20] Coquart, A. Les Mariages Mixtes des Turcs en France: Influences de l'Islam et de la Laïcité. Paris: Université de

Paris XII de Communication et Insertion dans la Socite
Departement de Sciences Sociales; 1989.

- [21] Güler H. Ağrılı Göçmenlerin Fransa'ya Tutunma Stratejileri.
Sosyoloji Dergisi Göç Özel Sayısı. 2013 Mar; 27(3):
295-317.

[22] Baron-Vieillard H. Les Banlieues ou le Ghetto Impossible.
Marseille: Editions de l'Aube; 1994.

[23] Kepel G. Les Banlieues de l'Islam. Paris: Editions du Seuil;
1987.