

Economic consequences of immigration from Turkey

Dr.Bulent Acma
Anadolu University, Department of Economics
Unit of Southeastern Anatolia Project(GAP)
26470 Eskisehir/TURKEY
Tel:+90 222 3350580ext.6171 Fax:+90 222 3353616
E.mail:bacma@anadolu.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

Immigration to other countries, particularly to Europe, from Turkey has been going on since the beginning of 1960's.

Surplus of young population and continuous unemployment problems in the country has been encouraging the tendency of immigration. As a result of this, legal and illegal immigration to other countries is still lasting.

The aim of this study to analyze immigration to other countries from Turkey and find out the economic reasons of it. For this reason, especially, the immigration in Turkey will be shown through statistical data according to the years. Secondly, the reasons for socio-economic conditions which cause the immigration. Third and last section, the economical and social renovation in the source country(Turkey) will be investigated and the impacts on the host countries will also be analyzed.

JEL Classification: J1, J11,N35

Keywords: International Migration, Consequences Economic-Social of Immigration from Turkey, Turkish Economic and Social Structures.

A SHORT BRIEF OF THE PAST OF IMMIGRATION IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

At the end of the 19th century, the market economy had become the dominant form of economic organisation in Europe. Economic fluctuations became more pronounced and the consequences were perceptible all over the world. The economic crisis in the thirties was an example of such a fluctuation with large and widespread consequences (OGDEN, P., 1989).

During the first half of the 20th century a growing gap developed between a small number of technically advanced, powerful, rich countries and the rest of the world (UNECE, 1993 a).

The demographic proportions had changed at the end of the 19th century. Ever since the second half of the 18th century the "white" population had been growing faster than the others, this situation now altered. In most Third World countries, population grew faster than economic growth and massive poverty was the result.

Europe agriculture started to decline, especially after 1950 and urbanisation increased. There were fewer people than ever who owned land and the industry was situated in the cities. Rural industry had lost the competition with urban industry. Due to developments like higher education, higher productivity, mechanisation and lower prices, the countryside was abandoned by many (KRITZ, M.M. and KEELY, C.B. (Eds), 1983).

Although these people were available for the new growing industries, there still was a need for extra labourers to work in the industries doing the undesirable jobs. People in rich western countries went to school longer, did not work the long hours they used to, there was a low birth-rate and many war casualties, all which increased the deficiency. There were enough countries in other parts of the world however, with much demographic growth and little capital, which were subdued to the world economy. Even though there were strict rules concerning migration, many people were invited to the West and rules about the temporary character of the migration were not maintained very strictly because of the enormous labour shortage (APPLEYARD, R., 1991).

Already before the economic crisis of 1930, as a result of the First World War and the Russian Revolution, states started regulating migration. All countries adjusted the immigration to the needs of the labour market. People that were needed for the industries were allowed to come, others were not. Because of the better means of transportation and communication the rich countries feared to be overwhelmed with poor immigrants from other parts of the world.

The economic crisis accelerated this process. Labourers were allowed to come on a temporary basis only and needed a permit to work in many countries. For instance, between the first and second World War labourers from Germany, Italy, Poland and Slovenia went to the Netherlands, Italians went to England, France recruited many labourers from Spain, Portugal, Poland, Italy, Greece, Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, Irish workers went to England.

Because of the ongoing urbanisation the short-distance agricultural migration almost vanished after the Second World War. Many people now moved to the cities permanently. To further increase the number of labourers countries even recruited labourers officially. (For instance France, the Netherlands, England, Belgium and Germany got workers from Italy, Spain, Morocco, Turkey etc.) Besides that, many them came spontaneously. They did jobs nobody wanted to do and wanted to make money quickly to support their families back home (GOLINI, A. and BONIFAZI, C., 1987).

Demographic Facts of Turkey

Population (000) in 2000	66,591	Annual population growth rate (%).....	1.43
Population in year 2015 (000).....	80,284	Total fertility rate (/woman)	2.23
Sex ratio (/100 females).....	102.0	Life expectancy at birth (years)	
Age distribution (%)		Males.....	68.0
Ages 0-14	28.3	Females	73.2
Youth (15-24).....	20.6	Both sexes	70.5
Ages 60+	8.5	GNP per capita (U.S. dollars, 1998)	3160

Sources: Data are from the Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, *World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision*; GNP per capita is for the year 1998 from the UNDP, *Human Development Report 2000*, based on World Bank data (World Bank Atlas method).

Population Density, Distribution, and Settlement of Turkey

Population density has increased along with the relatively rapid growth rate. For example, although Turkey had an average of only twenty-seven inhabitants per square kilometer in 1950, this figure had nearly tripled, to 72.5 persons per square kilometer, by 1990. Population density was estimated at 78.5 people per square kilometer at the end of 1994. According to the 1990 census, the most densely populated provinces included Istanbul, with 1,330 persons per square kilometer; Kocaeli, with 260; and Izmir, with 220. The most lightly populated provinces included Tunceli and Karaman, with seventeen and twenty-four persons, respectively, per square kilometer. Turkey's overall population density was less than one-half the densities in major EU countries such as Britain, Germany, and Italy (KORNER, H., 1987).

Although overall population density is low, some regions of Turkey, especially Thrace and the Aegean and Black Sea coasts, are densely populated. The uneven population distribution is most obvious in the coastal area stretching from Zonguldak westward to Istanbul, then around the Sea of Marmara and south along the Aegean coast to Izmir. Although this area includes less than 25 percent of Turkey's total land, more than 45 percent of the total population lived there in 1990. In contrast, the Anatolian Plateau and mountainous east account for 62 percent of the total land, but only 40 percent of the population resided there in 1990. The remaining 15 percent of the population lived along the southern Mediterranean coast, which makes up 13 percent of Turkey's territory.

In 1990 about 50 percent of the population was classified as rural. This figure represented a decline of more than 30 percent since 1950, when the rural population accounted for 82 percent of the country's total. The rural population lived in more than 36,000 villages in 1990, most of which had fewer than 1,000 inhabitants (see *Village Life*, this ch.). For administrative purposes, a village can be a small settlement or a number of scattered rural households, jointly administered by a village headman (*muhtar*).

By 1995 more than 65 percent of Turkey's population lived in cities, defined as built-up areas with 10,000 or more inhabitants. The urban population has been growing at a rapid rate since 1950, when it accounted for only 18 percent of Turkey's total. The main factor in the growth of the cities has been the steady migration of villagers to urban areas, a process that was continuing in the 1990s.

The trend toward urbanization was revealed in the 1990 census, which enumerated more than 17.6 million people--more than 30 percent of the total population--as living in nineteen cities with populations then of more than 200,000.

The largest was Istanbul, with a population then of about 6.6 million, approximately 12 percent of Turkey's overall population. Two other cities also had populations in excess of 1 million: Ankara, the capital (about 2.6 million), and Izmir, a major port and industrial center on the Aegean Sea (about 1.8 million). Turkey's fourth and fifth largest cities, Adana (about 916,000 in 1990) and Bursa (about 835,000), have been growing at rates in excess of 3 percent per year, and each is expected to have more than 1 million inhabitants before 2000. Gaziantep in the southeast and Konya on the Anatolian Plateau were the only other cities with populations in excess of 500,000 in 1990. The ten largest cities also included Mersin (about 422,000), Kayseri (about 421,000), and Eskisehir (about 413,000).

Background of Immigrations to Turkey

After 1925 Turkey continued to accept Muslims speaking Turkic languages as immigrants and did not discourage the emigration of members of non-Turkic minorities. More than 90 percent of all immigrants arrived from the Balkan countries. Between 1935 and 1940, for example, approximately 124,000 Bulgarians and Romanians of Turkish origin immigrated to Turkey, and between 1954 and 1956 about 35,000 Muslim Slavs immigrated from Yugoslavia. In the fifty-five-year period ending in 1980, Turkey admitted approximately 1.3 million immigrants; 36 percent came from Bulgaria, 30 percent from Greece, 22.1 percent from Yugoslavia, and 8.9 percent from Romania. These Balkan immigrants, as well as smaller numbers of Turkic immigrants from Cyprus and the Soviet Union, were granted full citizenship upon their arrival in Turkey. The immigrants were settled primarily in the Marmara and Aegean regions (78 percent) and in central Anatolia (11.7 percent).

The most recent immigration influx was that of Bulgarian Turks and Bosnian Muslims. In 1989 an estimated 320,000 Bulgarian Turks fled to Turkey to escape a campaign of forced assimilation. Following the collapse of Bulgaria's communist government that same year, the number of Bulgarian Turks seeking refuge in Turkey declined to under 1,000 per month. In fact, the number of Bulgarian Turks who voluntarily repatriated--125,000--exceeded new arrivals. By March 1994, a total of 245,000 Bulgarian Turks had been granted Turkish citizenship. However, Turkey no longer regards Bulgarian Turks as refugees. Beginning in 1994, new entrants to Turkey have been detained and deported. As of December 31, 1994, an estimated 20,000 Bosnians were living in Turkey, mostly in the Istanbul area. About 2,600 were living in camps; the rest were dispersed in private residences (CHAMPION, A.G. and KING, R., 1993).

In 1994 the government claimed that as many as 2 million Iranians were living in Turkey, a figure that most international organizations consider to be grossly exaggerated. Turkey is one of the few countries that Iranians may enter without first obtaining a visa; authorities believe that the relative ease of travel from Iran to Turkey encourages many Iranians to visit Turkey as tourists, or to use Turkey as a way station to obtain visas for the countries of Europe and North America.

Consequently, as many as 2 million Iranians actually may transit Turkey--including multiple reentries for many individuals--in a given year. Specialized agencies of the European Union and the United Nations that deal with issues of migrants and refugees believe a more realistic figure of the number of Iranians who live in Turkey, and do not have a residence in Iran or elsewhere, is closer to 50,000.

In the 1960s, working-age Turks, primarily men, began migrating to Western Europe to find employment as guest workers. Many of these Turkish workers eventually brought their families to Europe. An estimated 2 million Turkish workers and their dependents resided in Western Europe in the early 1980s, before the onset of an economic recession that led to severe job losses (COLEMAN, D.A, 1992).

The Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) initiated the program of accepting Turkish guest workers. In the 1990s, however, Germany adopted a policy of economic incentives to encourage the voluntary repatriation of Turkish workers. At the end of 1994, an estimated 1.1 million Turks continued to reside in Western Europe as semipermanent aliens. About two-thirds of these Turkish migrants lived in Germany, and another 10 percent in France. Other European countries with sizable Turkish communities included Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland. In addition, at least 150,000 Turks were working in Saudi Arabia and other Arab oil-exporting countries of the Persian Gulf (BOHNING, W.R, 1991).

Factors of Migrations from Turkey

Today, more than ever, the tumultuous movements of people occurring throughout the world are pushing the problems of *migration* and forced displacement to the top of the *international* agenda. A complex mix of economic, demographic, social, religious, ethnic and political processes occurring simultaneously at the local, national and *international* levels are forcing people to move away from their homes and countries (PRYOR, R.J., 1983).

Today, there are over 20 million refugees and persons of concern to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) who have been forced to flee their country in fear of persecution, war and violence. The majority of refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR are in Africa (7.5 million) and Europe (6 million), followed by Asia (5.7 million) and the Americas (1.4 million). The number of migrants worldwide is estimated to be over 100 million (UNFPA, 1993).

The movement of Turkish citizens to fill in the gaps created in the labour markets of the rapidly developing Western European countries has started in the early 1960's. Originally, the common goal of the Turkish "guest workers", mostly of rural background, going abroad in search for employment was to save enough money to open up a small shop or atelier or to invest on the plot of land already in their possession thus enabling these workers one day to come back home to take over a business of their own. With this in mind it was no surprise that most of these "guest workers" went alone to their destinations leaving their families back home (STRAUBHAAR, T., 1992).

The rising demand for foreign labour in those years had led to some irregularities in the flow of work force as employers and migrants tried to by-pass the cumbersome recruiting procedures. Therefore in order to facilitate the steady flow of work force thus satisfying the needs of both migrant workers and their prospective employers, Turkey has negotiated labour agreements with the receiving countries. The first of such labour agreements was concluded with the Federal Republic of Germany in 1961, followed by Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands in 1964 and France in 1965. The emigration of Turkish workers to Western Europe continued until 1974. From that date, Turkey began to direct its work force towards North Africa, Middle East, Gulf countries and after the collapse of the Soviet Union towards Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States. This change may be explained by the opening of the Turkish economy to outside world and the undertaking of infrastructural projects by Turkish contractors in those regions. The great majority of Turks living abroad reside at least for a period of 10 to 15 years. An important part of them has become permanent residents (ATALIK, G. and BEELEY, B., 1993).

Many have acquired the citizenship of the receiving countries. Today, the growth in the Turkish population living abroad is mainly the result of the family reunification and high birthrate. Starting from the early 70's the Turkish migrants realised that their presence in the respective European countries had changed from temporary to permanent basis. This was especially felt when following the recession caused mainly by the oil crisis of 1974 the concerned governments decided to stop the inflow of migrant workers, at the same time encouraging those who had arrived before either to return to their home countries or to reunite with their families with a view to integrating them with the local society (CASTLES, S. and MILLER M.J., 1993).

Turkish migrants and particularly workers have contributed to the economic development of the host countries. Turkey desires that Turks living abroad be fully integrated in their social environments. Without integration success is not easy to be achieved Turkey encourages its citizens to do their best for enhancing their social, economical, cultural and political status. Many Turks today participate in the social and economic life of the host countries, not only as plain labourers but also as academicians, researchers, experts, scientists, doctors, journalists, businessmen, artists and other professionally active persons. In the economic field, many Turks have already or are gradually passing from the status of simple worker to a self-employed status. The number of Turkish businesses set up in Germany alone has exceeded 50.000. These businesses have created job opportunities for around 330.000 persons. Present Situation The latest figures, (given in the table below) show that there are around 4 million Turkish citizens living in foreign countries of whom 3.3 million are settled in the countries of European Union. Among the receiving countries Germany with 2.3 million Turks living on its soil has the largest Turkish population (HASKEY, J., 1992). Turks living abroad as regards the countries of residence :

<u>Country</u>	<u>Population</u>
Germany	2.300.000
Holland	280.000
France	305.300
Austria	140.000
Belgium	130.000
Denmark	45.000
Great Britain	80.000
Norway	10.000
Sweden	50.000
Switzerland	80.000
Italy	15.000
Finland	3.500
USA	300.000
Canada	35.000
Australia	120.000
S.Arabia	120.000
Israel	30.000
Libya	6.000
Kuwait	3.300
Russian Federation	30.000
Azerbaijan	5.000
Georgia	1.200
Kazakhstan	7.000
Turkmenistan	5.000
Uzbekistan	3.700
Kırghızıa	2.200
TOTAL	3.937.200

Sources: İduyđu, A., Transit Migrants and Turkey, Bođazii Journal C.10, No:1-2, 1996,Istanbul.

Issues Concerning Turks Living Abroad

Education, employment, political rights and improvement of social and judicial status are the main issues of concern for Turks living abroad. These are essential elements for their integration and cohesion (HAWKINS, F., 1987).

The Turkish migrants should be regarded and treated not as aliens but as individuals sharing the same responsibilities and therefore should enjoy the same rights as other members of the society.

In the field of education; Turkish children should benefit fully from the educational opportunities available at the host countries. At the same time, the education of Turkish children in their native language, culture and history is of particular importance. For this purpose, Turkey sends qualified and trained teachers of Turkish Language, Culture and History to the schools of some major receiving countries with the consent of the relevant authorities. Turkey also sends religious functionaries to help Turks living abroad to fulfill their needs in this area.

Political rights: Political integration involves the right to vote and to be elected in the elections at Local level Meanwhile the acquisition of the citizenship by the immigrants may enable them to benefit more widely from the political rights. Turkey wishes that Turks participate actively in the political life of the host countries.

Today the matter of giving the immigrants a fair share in decision making process and to enable them to participate actively in the social and economic life of the receiving countries is widely discussed at the international level. Granting political rights to the immigrants will surely encourage them to be fully integrated in their environments and to make more efforts for enhancing their socio-economic conditions (SCHMIDT, C.M. and ZIMMERMANN, K.F., 1992).

Turkey appreciates moves and initiatives aiming at ensuring active participation of immigrants in the social and political life of the receiving countries.

Improvement of the judicial and social status of Turks living abroad and particularly in Europe : Almost 40 years have elapsed since the first large scale emigration movement and today there are second and third generations of Turks who are permanently settled in the host countries.

Integration in the legal sense means the equal treatment of Turks, particularly of those who are permanently settled in the receiving countries, as other members of the society. Social integration aims at eliminating discriminatory policies or practices which prevent immigrants from becoming socially active members of the society.

As regards cultural integration the key word is education. Turkish children should be given the opportunity to benefit fully from the education opportunities in the country. The education of those children in their native language, culture and history is also of particular importance.

Turkey prefers to send qualified and trained teachers abroad for the education of the children in Turkish Language, Culture and History. Turkey cooperates in this matter with some countries and is ready to do the same with some others which prefer to benefit from the services of locally recruited teachers.

Finally, there is economic integration which requires being given equal opportunity to work as well as the choice to set up a business of one's own.

Turkey's Policy Towards Its Citizens Living Abroad

From the very beginning of the flow of Turkish migrant workers to abroad. Turkey has spared no effort to ensure that these people are provided the most favorable living and working conditions in those countries of destination. To realize this Turkey signed with the receiving countries agreements on social security.

Further, the Turkish Government actively participates in all international fora where the subject of the rights of migrants is discussed.

AN OVERVIEW OF REMITTANCES IN THE WORLD AND TURKEY

Remittances are the monies that migrants return to the country of origin. If labor is considered an export, than remittances are that part of the payment for exporting labor services that returns to the country of origin.

Total remittances--the sum of workers remittances, compensation of employees, and migrants transfers--increased from less than \$2 billion in 1970 to \$70 billion in 1995. Growth in total remittances was erratic from year to year. Remittances doubled between 1974 and 1975, and continued rising sharply in the mid-1970s, as workers poured into Middle Eastern oil exporting nations. Total remittances were flat in the early 1980s, resumed their growth in the late 1980s, and then stabilized in the 1990s at \$60 to \$70 billion; remittances sums for the listed countries total \$3.3 billion, with no remittances listed for India and Pakistan.

The country receiving the most worker remittances--from those abroad more than 12 months-- in 1995 was Portugal, with \$3.8 billion, followed by Mexico (\$3.7 billion), Turkey (\$3.3 billion), and Egypt (\$3.2 billion). Egypt received the largest single year amount of workers' remittances--\$6.1 billion in 1992.

Five countries paid 80 percent of workers remittances in 1995--Saudi Arabia \$16.6 billion, US \$12.2 billion, Germany \$5.3 billion, France \$3.1 billion, and UK \$2.7 billion. Kuwait paid \$1.8 billion, and Oman \$1.3 billion in workers were \$67 billion or more in 1990, 1994, and 1995.

Between 1970 and 1995, total remittances were almost \$1 trillion. Almost two-thirds of total remittances over the past 15 years were worker remittances, 25 percent were compensation of employees, and almost 10 percent were migrant transfers. The worker remittances share of total remittances peaked in the early 1980s at over 70 percent.

It should be emphasized that remittance data are generally under reported, and that the IMF estimates the remittances accruing to countries that report late or do not report, so that published world and regional remittances are larger than those reported for individual countries. For example, worker remittance credits for Asia in the 1995 Yearbook are reported to be \$11 billion, even though the remittances in 1995.

Compensation of employees--what the IMF termed labor income until 1995--are funds transferred to countries of origin by nationals who have been abroad less than 12 months. Compensation of employees was \$25 billion in 1995, including \$4.9 billion sent to the Philippines, \$4.4 billion each to France and Germany, and \$1.7 billion each to Thailand and Italy. Migrants transfers were \$9.5 billion in 1995, with Russia receiving \$2.3 billion, New Zealand \$1.7 billion, Israel \$1.4 billion, and Australia \$1.3 billion--these four countries accounted for two-thirds of migrant transfers.

Since some labor-exporting countries report workers remittances, and others report compensation of employees, it may be better to examine total remittances. For example, Mexico reported \$3.7 billion in workers' remittances in 1994, and \$650 million in compensation of employees, while the Philippines reported \$440 million in workers' remittances, and \$3 billion in compensation of employees.

Total remittances show that France received more from residents abroad than any other country in 1994, largely because France received \$3.7 billion in compensation of employees. The top five countries in total remittances--France, Mexico, Portugal, Egypt, and the Philippines--accounted for about one-third of total remittances in 1994, and the top 10--these five plus Greece, Turkey, Italy, Brazil, and Pakistan--accounted for almost half of total remittances. The US and the UK are in the IMF data base, but the US had \$160 million in compensation of employees reported for 1995, the UK zero, and Germany \$4.4 billion.

Remittances are very important for many island economies, as well as for populous nations including Egypt, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. In 1994, total remittances were equivalent to more than 100 percent of merchandise exports for the Dominican Republic, over 75 percent of merchandise exports in Egypt, El Salvador, and Jordan, more than 50 percent of merchandise exports in Yemen and Greece, and 25 percent or more of merchandise exports in Bangladesh, the Philippines, and Pakistan. In Turkey and Mexico, total remittances were equivalent to 14 and 12 percent of merchandise exports in 1994.

Total remittances have not declined as migration streams "matured" in Turkey, Egypt, and many other labor-exporting nations. There are many reasons, including the fact that the willingness of migrants to remit depends on economic and savings policies in the host and home countries, exchange rate and risk factors, and the availability and efficiency of transfer facilities. In some emigration countries, changed economic policies encouraged migrants to send home more remittances; in other cases, simply making it easier or cheaper to send money home has increased and/or sustained remittances(IMF, 2001).

Turkey			
Year	Workers'	Compensation of	Total
	Remittances	Employees	
	(Millions US\$)	(Millions US\$)	(Millions US\$)
1974	1,426	0	1,426
1975	1,312	0	1,312
1976	982	0	982
1977	982	0	982
1978	983	0	983
1979	1,694	0	1,694
1980	2,071	0	2,071
1981	2,490	0	2,490
1982	2,140	0	2,140
1983	1,513	0	1,513
1984	1,807	0	1,807
1985	1,714	0	1,714
1986	1,634	0	1,634
1987	2,021	0	2,021
1988	1,776	0	1,776
1989	3,040	0	3,040
1990	3,246	0	3,246
1991	2,819	0	2,819
1992	3,008	0	3,008
1993	2,919	0	2,919
1994	2,627	0	2,627
1995	3,327	0	3,327
1996	3,542	0	3,542
1997	4,197	0	4,197
1998	5,356	0	5,356
1999	4,529	0	4,529
			63,155

Source: IMF Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook, 2001 Annual.

Statistics — Remittances

The money that migrants send home is very important not only to their families but also to their country's balance of payments.

For many countries remittances represent a significant proportion of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as well as of foreign exchange earnings. The following table is derived from (IMF) statistics.

Table 5. — Top 20 developing country receivers of remittances, 1999

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>\$</i> <i>millions</i>	<i>%</i> <i>of</i> <i>GDP</i>
1	India	11,097	2.6 t
2	Philippines	7,016	8.9
3	Mexico	6,649	1.7
4	Turkey	4,529	2.3
5	Egypt	3,196	4.0
6	Morocco	1,918	5.5
7	Bangladesh	1,803	4.1
8	Pakistan*	1,707	2.7
9	Dominican Rep	1,613	11
10	Thailand	1,460	1.1
11	Jordan	1,460	21.2
12	El Salvador	1,379	12.3
13	Nigeria	1,292	3.5
14	Yemen*	1,202	24.5
15	Brazil	1,192	0.2
16	Indonesia	1,109	0.8
17	Ecuador	1,084	5.8
18	Sri Lanka	1,056	6.9
19	Tunisia	761	4.0
20	Peru	712	1.2

Source: IMF Balance of Payments Statistics (2001) and World Bank World Development Report (2000).

CONCLUSION

The international immigration which has a very important situation at the present, is because of the necessity of economical and social and political conditions, holds a very dominant place.

Turks who immigrants to Western European countries that demand labor in the 60's are now over 4 million and this constitutes the majority of the immigrants. Turks who live in these areas have a very important contribution to the economical and social life of both Turkey and Western European Countries.

Moreover the economical crisis, unemployment and social-politics problems which are seen in Turkey recently force the people to immigrate to the other countries and as a result of these the increase of the illegal immigration raised.

In this study, as a result, the results of the economical and social immigration that started in the 60's and continued up to the present have been analyzed. In the result of the analysis there has been an immigration to the foreign countries from Turkey and there is another reality which appeared, that is, there is also an immigration from the Middle East countries and Arabic and Balkanian countries to Turkey.

These immgrations have played a very important role in the economical and social lives both Turkey andr Western European countries.

References

APPLEYARD, R. (1991) *International Migration*: Challenge for the Nineties. Geneva: *International* Organization for *Migration*.

ATALIK, G. and BEELEY, B. (1993) What mass *migration* has meant for Turkey, in: R. KING (Ed.) Mass *Migrations* in Europe: The Legacy and the Future. London: Belhaven.

BOHNING, W.R. (1991) Integration and immigration pressures in Western Europe, *International* Labor Review, 130.

CASTLES, S. and MILLER M.J. (1993) The Age of *Migration*: *International* Population Movements in the Modern World. New York: Guilford Press.

CHAMPION, A.G. and KING, R. (1993) New trends in *international migration* in Europe, Geographical Viewpoint, 21.

CHESNAIS, J.C. (1992) By way of introduction, in: People on the Move: New *Migration* Flows in Europe. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Press.

COLEMAN, D.A. (1992) Does Europe need immigrants? Population and workforce projections, *International Migration* Review

COLINI, A., BONIFAZI, C. and RIGHI, A. (1993) A general framework for the European *migration* system in the 1990s, in: R. KING (Ed.) The New Geography of European *Migrations*. London: Belhaven.

HASKEY, J. (1992) The immigrant populations of the different countries of Europe: their size and origins, Population Trends. 37-47.

HAWKINS, F. (1987) The experience in the main geographical OECD areas: non-European receiving countries, in: The Future of *Migration*. Paris: OECD.

IMF (2001) **Balance of Payments Statistics (2001) and World Bank World Development Report (2000)**. USA: IMF.

ICDUYGU, A., **Transit Migrants and Turkey**, Boğaziçi journal C.10, No:1-2, 1996, Istanbul.

KORNER, H. (1987) The experience of the main geographical OECD areas: European sending countries, in: The Future of *Migration*. Paris: OECD.

KRITZ, M.M. and KEELY, C.B. (Eds) (1983) Global Trends in *Migration*: Theory and Research on *International* Population Movements. New York: Center for *Migration* Studies.

OECD (1992) Trends in *International Migration*. (SOPEMI Report 1992). Paris: OECD.

OGDEN, P. (1989) *International migration* in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in: P. E. OGDEN and P. E. WHITE (Eds) *Migrants in Modern France*. London: Unwin Hyman.

PRYOR, R.J. (1983) Integrating *international* and internal *migration* theories, in: M.M. KRITZ and C.B.

SCHMIDT, C.M. and ZIMMERMANN, K.F. (1992) *Migration* pressure in Germany: past and future, in: K.F.ZIMMERMANN (Ed.) *Migration* and Economic Development. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

STRAUBHAAR, T. (1992) The impact of *international* labour *migration* for Turkey, in: K.F.

UNECE (1993a) *International Migration* in the UN/ECE Region. Rapid Information System Bulletin 2, United Nations, New York.

UNECE (1993b) *International Migration* Bulletin, No. 3. Geneva: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

UNFPA (1993) *The State of World Population*. New York: United Nations Population Fund.