

*A Discourse on the Foundation and Development of Turkish and European Identities
and their Manifestation within the Greater Context of
Turkey's Hopes to Join the European Union*

**By Joseph Rodriguez
University of Arizona
Department of Geography and Regional Development
Department of Political Science**

May, 2009

Approved by:

**Jeff McGovern
Advisor
University of Arizona
Department of Geography and Regional Development**

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

I hereby grant to the University of Arizona Library the nonexclusive worldwide right to reproduce and distribute my thesis and abstract (herein, the “licensed materials”), in whole or in part, in any and all media of distribution and in any format in existence now or developed in the future. I represent and warrant to the University of Arizona that the licensed materials are my original work, that I am the sole owner of all rights in and to the licensed materials, and that none of the licensed materials infringe or violate the rights of others. I further represent that I have obtained all necessary rights to permit the University of Arizona Library to reproduce and distribute any nonpublic third party software necessary to access, display, run, or print my thesis. I acknowledge that University of Arizona Library may elect not to distribute my thesis in digital format if, in its reasonable judgment, it believes all such rights have not been secured.

SIGNED: _____

Joseph Rodriguez

Abstract

This paper examines the history and formations of the identities of both Europe and Turkey, and how these identities have affected Turkey's bid to join the European Union. Utilizing discourse analysis, historical and current events are examined to evaluate Turkey's association within Europe. This is done through uncovering the foundations of a European identity through a historical context, and how that identity has evolved with European integration. Turkish identity is evaluated by analyzing the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey, and the importance placed upon changing the conception of Turkey both domestic and abroad. Turkey's application to the European Union is evaluated by analyzing the criteria set forth by the European Union, and addressing the primary concerns the European Union has with a possible Turkish accession. It is concluded that Turkey is a part of Europe as defined by the European Union, but Turkish accession is not likely imminent, nor should it be due to the strong anti-Turkic sentiments within the European Union.

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
	<u>What is Europe?</u>
<i>History of the Idea</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>History of European Integration</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>The European Union</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Applying to the European Union</i>	<i>9</i>
	<u>How has the Formation and Development of Turkey Affected its Identity?</u>
<i>Region's History</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Birth of a Republic</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Present Turkey</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Culture</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Politics and Government</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Foreign Relations</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Economy</i>	<i>22</i>
	<u>Is Turkey Part of Europe?</u>
<i>Foundations of Integrations</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Eastern European Enlargements of 2004 and 2007</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Contentions and Responses</i>	<i>28</i>
	<u>Should Turkey be admitted into the European Union?</u>
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Works Cited</i>	<i>34</i>

Introduction

Turkey is Eurasian. What that exactly means, is a bit unclear. In some ways Eurasia is a bridging of Europe and Asia, but what does this bridging imply? What happens to Europe? What happens to Asia? Is it both? Is it neither? Is this bridge simply referring to the geographic location of the region as an area of transition between two continents that are on the same landmass, or is it referring to a blending of the cultures and peoples of those two continents? There are answers to these questions, yet they would likely vary depending on who would be answering them. Herein lays the problem facing Turkey, especially as this state seeks to join the supranational organization, the European Union.

Should Turkey be admitted into the European Union? While the issue of Turkish accession is highly debated within the European Union, the various sides of the argument seem to view Turkey as either no more than a potential bridge, specifically to the Middle East, or as simply an outsider who should not be admitted. Each of these views takes both the formation of Turkish identity and the evolution of the idea of Europe for granted.

The issue at hand raises three questions to reconcile the current views of both Europe and Turkey and their historical development, and allows for a fourth question to be addressed, should Turkey be admitted into the European Union? These three questions are: What is Europe? How has the formation and development of Turkey influenced its identity? And is Turkey a part of Europe? All of these questions will be answered through a qualitative method of discourse analysis.

The first question of defining Europe will be determined through examining the history of the idea of Europe and its various forms in order to explain the creation of the European Union in 1993. The second question of how has the formation and development of Turkey

influenced its identity focuses primarily on the construction of a Turkish identity born out of the twentieth century transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey. The third question of Turkey inclusion as a part of Europe is encompassed by the fourth question that addresses Turkey's possible accession into the European Union.

What is Europe?

What is "Europe"? In a basic and elementary sense, it is a continent. A continent is understood to be a large, separate, but continuous landmass, separated by bodies of water from another large mass of land (Lewis p.21). Though, the continent of Europe does not seem to meet all of these criteria, seeing that the landmass that encompasses Europe continues from the British Isles in the west, all the way to Isles of Japan in the east. Does this mean that Europe is actually part of the larger continent of Eurasia? If so, how has a separate Europe come about?

History of the Idea

The region of Europe Geographically is extensive. Its boundaries are marked by large bodies of water to the north, the Arctic Ocean, west, the Atlantic Ocean, and south, the Mediterranean Sea. Europe's boundaries to the east are usually taken to be the Urals, the Ural River, and the Caspian Sea. To the southeast boundaries include the Caucasus Mountains, the Black Sea and the waterways connecting the Black Sea to the Mediterranean Sea(Encarta).

Europe is far more than simply one of the continents. Europe is a large region with numerous groups sharing cultural and historical ties, but it is the modern idea of Europe and a European identity, which make it so much more.

As defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, identity is “the quality or condition of being the same in substance, composition, nature, properties, or in particular qualities under consideration; absolute or essential sameness; oneness”(Handler p.28). Richard Handler names three primary uses of the term. The first is identity as it pertains to an individual; the second, as it pertains to groups of individuals, thus creating a collective identity; the third, the dynamic between the two, namely how individuals create their own identity, which is then grouped with others to create a collective identity that will come full circle by aiding individuals brought up in the group to individually identify with this collective identity (Handler p.28)

The foundations of the idea of a European identity can be documented to the fifth century BC. It was then that the Greek historian, Herodotus, mentioned his lack of knowledge concerning why the known world at the time was divided into three regions: Africa, Asia, and Europe (Wilson p.14). Even earlier the ancient Egyptians were thought to also share this view of three distinct parts to the world as well (Wilson p.15). This belief was held widely by scholars at this time, since spatially Africa was physically separated from Europe and Asia. The division between Europe and Asia was run along the lines of differing cultures between Europe and Asia. This contrast took on a more meaningful definition following the conflicts between the Greeks and the Persians during the fifth century BC(Wilson p.16).

This ancient separation does not directly account for the modern idea of Europe and European. These two social constructs were not realized until the early nineteenth century CE(Wilson p.13). The true catalyst was the French Revolution. In the midst of the Enlightenment, backlash against feudalism, monarch, and the old ways of traditional Europe were embodied by the French Revolution. Due to its central location and success, the French Revolution incited rebellions across Europe. While the supporters of revolution focused on the

negatives that were a part of Europe's past and sought to focus solely on creating new republics in their own countries, counter-revolutionaries began to long for the "ancient, civil, moral, and political order of Europe against a sect of fanatical and ambitious atheists"(Burke p.306). The conflict grew to greater heights with the rise of imperialist France under Napoleon. Continuing with the same spirit of the French Revolution, Napoleon sought to expand France and its revolutionary ideals across Europe. This aggressive step only strengthened the initial counter-revolutionary opposition by now including nationalist factions seeming to have to fight both revolutionary ideas and imperialism at the same time. Nostalgia for old Europe grew stronger, and after Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, European states although no longer fearful of becoming a single, large empire, were paradoxically closer than ever before. (Wilson p.68)

The majority of the people of Europe identified with three specific, earlier events, thus creating an idea of a unique European history in the nineteenth century (Wilson p.13). First they looked back to antiquity and the ancient Greeks as early representatives of European identity. Historians during the 1800's romanticized the Greeks defending their political freedom from Asians, in the form of the Persian Empire. Historians and the people of Europe also looked to the Middle Ages and Christendom. A mythos was created in figures such as Charlemagne, demonstrating how Christianity brought together the Latin peoples of the former Roman Empire and Germanic barbarians. Though historically inaccurate, historians, such as Denys Hay (Wilson p.34-36), claimed that the idea of Europe and a European identity were created at this time, indelibly uniting the idea of Europe with Christianity. The third piece of the shared history was the recent events of the French Revolution, and the defeat of Napoleon. The French Revolution was seen as a turning point due to the defeat of monarchy and feudalism, and the defeat of Napoleon ensured national sovereignty and political freedom. All three of these events were

neatly tied back to the first event in this timeline, the ancient Greeks and their defense of political freedom. In order to create a historical continuity, the ancient Greeks were written as the predecessors to the Roman Empire, which was founded as a democratic republic (Wilson p.69). With all of this history put into place, there was now a European identity to be seized upon, whether it was fabricated or not. There were now Europeans, who, according to tradition followed in the footsteps of the Romans and the Greeks.

So with this shared history in place, who qualified as “European.” Looking back to the Greeks and their democratic ideals, Europeans would clearly have to have a government based in democratic principles. Also, due to the importance placed upon Christendom’s “role” in creating a European mythos, “Europeans” would certainly have to be from a predominantly Christian nation and/or region. The final determination would come from the highly eventful period beginning with the revolutions across the region in the eighteenth century dating to the defeat of Napoleon. During the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the region was faced with the spread of revolutionary movements and the subsequent quest by Napoleon to conquer the region. Thus, the final qualification to be considered part of this fictional Europe would be being from a state involved or associated with the turmoil.

This early nineteenth century definition of Europe is no longer relevant or necessary, due to the emergence of the European Union. To speak of a European identity is confused, since there is now a functioning political unit that determines an entire state’s “European-ness.” Though many still look to the old, traditional ways of defining Europe, the new, seemingly official Europe (European Union) have outlined a new set of criteria. These criteria though, as I will demonstrate, are contradictory to the actions and statements of the European Union and/or its leaders within it, thus making their definition inadequate in practice. The traditional

conception of Europe, is the idea of Europe espoused particularly in the nineteenth century, still remains today. It is predicated on three criteria: foundations of political freedom from the Greeks, Christianity, and involvement within the conflicts of the late 1700s and early 1800s. “The European Union” is the supranational organization that presently is viewed as the official body of Europe, due to the capacity of deciding which states can be admitted, regardless of the criteria it has set forth.

History of European Integration

With the end of World War I came the first identifiable union amongst European states. In 1923 Austrian Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi created what is still known as the Pan-European Union (Wilson p.96). This union was created to serve as a force for political integration throughout Europe with the intent of establishing peace throughout what he considered to be continental Europe. Coudenhove-Kalergi was said to believe so much in the idea of Europe that he laid no framework for why Europe should even be integrated, and simply assumed all of the citizens of Europe to be cousins (Wilson p.96-97). This movement was the first and most significant within the context of creating a united Europe.

The consequences of World War II are significant in their lasting outcomes, the introduction of nuclear weapons, the commencement of the Cold War, the emergence of the United Nations that forever altered Europe and the world. .

After the war Europe was in shambles. Germany was occupied by French, British, U.S., and Soviet military forces. France and Great Britain had to be rebuilt, and countries such as Italy and Spain were forced to make amends after Nazi Germany’s defeat. The European everyday citizens noticed his/her standards of living dropping, and European leaders saw the growing

superpowers on each side of them (Kaelble p.23). Out of this fear started to overtake Europeans. Cooperation was no longer a lofty ideal, but instead became a necessity.

The first action taken was the creation of the Council of Europe in 1949 (Wilson p.165). This action had the intention of uniting Europe on a political scale, through the creation of a federalist system. The council was hampered though by the divisions between France and Britain, and the group's functionality faltered (Wilson p.165). The organization has survived though. Currently forty seven states are members of the Council of Europe, including both Turkey and Russia. While the council's definition of Europe and membership seems to be broad, much of this is due to the nature of the organization. Unlike the European Union, the Council of Europe's members do not surrender any sovereignty, and instead seek to harbor a sense of integration through conventions, which bring states together to discuss areas of interest, such as human rights (Bell p.233-234).

Taking steps to realize any remaining potential within their region, two French technocrats and the West German Chancellor agreed to create the European Coal and Steel Community. The Community was created by the Treaty of Paris in 1951, also signing on were Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium, and The Netherlands. Other than simply pooling resources together, the original six aimed to prevent nationalism from leading to conflict, and felt as though the traditional adversaries, France and West Germany, could create a stronger Europe if they were able to cooperate (McCormick p.57). The group further integrated in 1958 by creating the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. "There would be free movement of people, goods, money, and services"(McCormick p.58). In 1973 Ireland, Denmark, and Great Britain joined. In 1979 the first elections for a European Parliament took place. In 1981 Greece joined, soon followed by Spain and Portugal in 1986. The European

Community was taking shape. With the falling of the Berlin Wall in 1989, East Germany rejoined West Germany and former Eastern Bloc satellites began lining up waiting to join as well. Many were skeptical of allowing these fragile states to join, especially due to their weak economies. This fear gave way to the establishment of the Copenhagen Criteria, which would be put in place to detail the requirements of a country prior to accession.

The European Union

The Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1993, creating The European Union and its three pillars(McCormick p.91). In 1995 Austria, Finland, and Sweden were acceded into the union, and in 2004 the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Malta, and Cyprus. The most recent accessions were those of Romania and Bulgaria in 2007.

After the last round of accessions in 2007, there are currently twenty-seven member states of the European Union. Not all member states were forced to go through the same application process (including the six founding members), but the thirteen most recent and any future member states must undergo a long and grueling application process

Through the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1993, the European Union is made up of three pillars. The pillars are the European Community, which is made up of the institutions that continued to use the same name, a Common Foreign and Security Policy, and policies on Justice and Home Affairs(McCormick p.91). The primary institutions are the European Commission, the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union, and the European Council. The European Commission is the executive arm of the European Union, consisting of a minister from each member-state charged with legislative powers(McComick p.109). The European Parliament

consists of 785 elected MPs, proportionately representing the population of each member-state. This body has legislative and budget oversight authority, but cannot create legislation(McCormick p.155). The Council of the European Union also consists of a minister for each member-state, but the ministers change depending on the topic at hand(McCormick p.133). The final body is the European Council, which is another form of an executive branch(McCormick p.199). This council is the highest body within the EU, since it is composed of the heads of state along with the President of the European Union who is from the Commission.

Applying to the European Union

Becoming a member state within the European Union is much more involved than simply being considered “European.” The average accession process takes about a decade, but in reality the entire process may take much more time. Though both the European Commission and European Parliament give recommendations, the ultimate decision of whether accept a country’s application for membership and begin the process is made by the European Council, which is comprised of the member’s heads of state. This decision is made based on two standards of criteria. The country must be a “European State ” and “respect the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law” (European Commission “Conditions for Enlargement”). Whether a state is a “European State” is highly interpretive, and can be read as a geographical, cultural, or political term according to the determination of the European Union (European Parliament).

Prior to this happening though, a state will likely enter into an association agreement with the European Union (European Commission “Conditions for Enlargement”). This agreement is a

treaty that will further develop economic, cultural, and political links between a non-member state and the European Union. In order for these links to form or further develop, the non-member state must likely make reforms in one or multiple areas of their policies. These reforms are often aimed at preparing the state for entering into the rounds of accession negotiations if their application to join is accepted. This pre-process allows the state's government to begin making changes that may take years, yet must be in place for any further relationship to develop. Some of these more time-intensive tasks are administrative reforms that may not signal a change in ideology, but are aimed at increasing the efficiency and efficacy of a government, so that they may one day successfully implement EU law. A much more specific reform that association agreements require if the standards in place are not sufficient is a reform of human rights issues. To successfully achieve this kind of reform may be time-consuming, because it may involve changes that take place on a cultural level. All association agreements must be ratified by all EU member states.

If the country applying meets the two previously states criteria as decided by the Council, the Council can then choose to begin the accession process with an initial screening of the laws of the candidate state (European Commission "Conditions for Enlargement"). This screening is used to determine the differences between the state's laws and the laws of the European Union. The European Commission, the executive branch of the European Union, will then begin negotiations with the candidate. The opening rounds are based on "chapters" of the candidate's laws, which the Commission feels there is enough basis for beginning constructive negotiations. The negotiation involves the candidate state demonstrating that the laws in place are adequate for the implementation and enforcement of EU law. These negotiations often, if not always, involve timelines, thus allowing candidates an interim to meet the various requirements of the EU. These

requirements are outlined in the *acquis communautaire*, which are the policies and laws in place within the European Union (McCormick p.93). In order for a “chapter” to close, both sides must be satisfied with the implementation and enforcement of the laws, but the Commission reserves the right to reopen a chapter if it feels that the candidate state has not sufficiently complied.

Typically the number of chapters which must be closed are thirty one.

While these negotiations are going on, the Commission annually submits reports to the Council (European Commission “Conditions for Enlargement”). These reports are used by the Council to gauge the progress of a candidate, but to also make decision concerning the current negotiations and future rounds with other prospective members.

The intent and progression of the negotiations is to build towards satisfying the Copenhagen Criteria, established in 1993 by the European Council (McCormick p.93). The Copenhagen Criteria has three tenets that must be met in order for an applicant to be admitted into the European Union. The state must be democratic, respect human rights and the rule of law, have a functioning free market economy that has the capacity to cope with the competitive pressures of capitalist economy, and be able to take on the obligations of the *acquis communautaire*.

When the negotiations are finalized, a treaty of accession is signed by all concerned parties (European Commission “Conditions for Enlargement”), the institutions of the European Union, all of the member states of the European Union, and the candidate state itself must ratify the accession treaty.

How has the Formation and Development of Turkey

Affected its Identity?

The Region's History

Though the Republic of Turkey has been in existence for less than a century, the territory does have a rather rich and diverse tradition. Modern-day Istanbul was once Constantinople, and the center of the Christian Byzantine Empire (Philippides p.1). For over 1000 years, Europeans established themselves in the region known as Anatolia or Asia Minor (in Latin), and after Rome's fall, the region became an epicenter for Europe. The boundaries of the region are the Black Sea to the North, the Caucasus to the northeast, the Aegean Sea to the west, the Mediterranean Sea to the south, the former northern regions of Mesopotamia to the southeast, and the Iranian plateau to the East. The Turks began migrating Westward during the Early Middle Ages (6th century CE to 11th century CE); the Seljuk Turks began into Anatolia by establishing an independent sultanate there (Ahmad p.185). This sultanate was ultimately controlled by an aristocracy, which in 1301 was overthrown by an Uzbek, named Uthman (Osman I)(Ahmad p. 185). Uthman was a member of the Ottoman Clan, and upon his victory declared himself Sultan of Anatolia. It was Uthman who established the governing traditions of the empire, and set the Ottoman sight westward. His line of descendents would rule the empire he founded until its end in the early 20th century. Following Uthman's death, his son Orhan I took power and the Ottomans waged campaigns against Greeks, Serbs, and much of the Byzantine surrounding territory (Ahmad p.185). The Ottomans did not secure total stability within the region, which they had never before seen, until the fall of Constantinople on May 29, 1453. After 1453, maps created throughout Europe, which were often commissioned by the Church, demonstrated Europe's boundary to the east shifting considerably West, no longer

including Constantinople, which was now in the hands of the Ottoman Turks (Jung p.35). With the fall of Constantinople, The papacy came to be known as the head of Europe, and interchangeably used Europe with the term, 'Republica christiana,' always viewing the Ottoman Turks as a foreign, Asian threat seeking to control the Christian Europe, not be a part of it (Jung p.35).

With the Byzantines headed back towards western Europe, the Ottomans established rule over vast amounts of territory, stretching their borders from the Persian Gulf to much of Northern Africa. Cities such as Cairo, Mecca, Medina, and Baghdad were all under Ottoman control, thus creating a lasting tie through the Ottoman Empire between Turks and other people of the Middle East. At its peak the empire included territories of the modern day countries of Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Bulgaria, Romania, Macedonia, Hungary, Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and other portions of the North African Coast (BBC 2004-09-14).

Though Islam was part the foundation of Ottoman culture, the empire was extremely tolerant. Dating back to Uthman's rise to power, the Sultans understood that they could be most successful by utilizing alliances (BBC 2004-09-14). Thus, the Ottomans encouraged other faith groups to be loyal to the empire, all the while maintaining religious freedom. This tolerance extended past places of worship as well though. Almost as soon as the Ottomans controlled Constantinople, they established a community of Orthodox Christians, which was the first millet. The millet system allowed minorities to congregate into communities and gave them access to a limited amount of power in order to control their own affairs. These millets would in turn be responsible to pay a tax to the state, known as *dhimmis*. If a millet was seen to be performing a service to the state, they would be exempted from such a tax. All of this was held together by a very strong central government. Over the course of seven centuries, the Ottoman Empire was

ruled by the same dynasty(Ahmad p.186). Though bouts of strife would break out, the leadership eventually found ways to stabilize succession. Fratricide was practiced, thus removing any competition for the position of Sultan, and in order to hold sway over their diverse communities, the Ottomans used the practice known as *devshirme*(BBC 2004-09-14) This was the practice of 1/5 of the males within a non-Muslim family being handed over as a tax to the state. These males would be forced into slavery, and made to convert to Islam. This slavery though could include advancing in the military and government, and possibly even holding the position of Grand Vizier, the Sultan's top advisor. This meritocracy served as a foundation for the pragmatism that came to typify the empire.

The Ottomans did meet failure though. They attempted in 1529 and 1683 to capture Vienna in order to gain access to Central Europe (Ahmad p. 186-188). This was a devastating blow to the empire, since they did not develop their lands as an investment. Instead, they would exhaust the land's resources quickly, and move to the next parcel. This practice required the empire to constantly expand, and with the failed access into Central Europe, helped the empire begin to fall into stagnation.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, the Ottomans started to have additional setbacks due to the emergence of other powerful countries (Kili p.89). The United States' growing role in international trade damaged the Ottoman economy, while the other European powers were looking to expand their influence throughout the globe in the form of colonialism. With their share in the global economy lessening and a lack of available land to expand, leadership came to be ineffective. Facing decline, the Ottomans attempted to modernize in order to survive. With a sense that the powers to the west had defeated the empire's hopes of enlargement, which were necessary to their way of life, Mahmud II set into motion the *Tanzimat* (Kili p.105). This was

seen as a modernization of sorts, but was truly an artificial aim and desperate attempt to maintain the existence of the empire (Kili p.105). Desperate to maintain their position in the modernizing world, the Ottomans aligned with the Germans prior to World War I, which ultimately brought on the collapse of the Empire, and by 1922 the great Ottoman Empire had been dismembered (Ahmad p.192).

Out of the remnants of the Ottoman Empire, the Republic of Turkey was formed soon after in 1923. In 1922, the new Turkish Republican Assembly officially overthrew the last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, Mehmet VI, but Turkish nationalists met the true resistance to their goal of statehood in the form of the Turkish War of Independence (Macfie p. 113). Greece, Armenia, Great Britain, France, and Georgia all had interests within the former Ottoman territory the Turkish nationalists were hoping to form into a state. Due to strong leadership and their effective military, the nationalists under Mustafa Kemal Ataturk were able to defeat the forces, and under the Treaty of Lausanne the boundaries of most of modern Turkey were formed (Macfie p.129). Soon after, the new nation state of Turkey was recognized by the international community. The ruling group did not have any intentions of restoring the past systems though, and instead looked to Westernize. The first President of the Republic and founder of Turkey was Mustafa Kemal Ataturk.

The Birth of a Republic

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk was born in the Ottoman city of Salonika, now Thessaloniki, Greece (Macfie p.11). As a boy his mother encouraged him to attend a religious school, but after much resistance Ataturk would eventually be given a more modern education at Semsî Efendi. He then would go on, at first secretly, to attend military institutions. After his graduation

Ataturk served as an officer in the army, and became well known for his efforts as a commander in the Battle of Gallipoli (Macfie p.40). Even with his service to the state though, Ataturk was a revolutionary. He was a member of various secret groups, which sought to overthrow the Sultan, and with the decline of the empire due to the war, he saw his opportunity. As a defeated state, the Ottomans were at the whims of the Entente Powers, Great Britain and France. Ataturk was the voice for Turkish independence, and followed it with leading the nationalist movement(Macfie p.66).

Upon Turkey's recognition he was the obvious choice to lead the newly formed state. From 1923 until 1938, he served as president. In those fifteen years, he took what was left to him by a theocratic monarchy, and transformed it into a functioning secular democracy. He realized that in order to modernize in the changing world, Turkey would need to separate from Islam. Taking much of his ideology from the Enlightenment, Ataturk looked to establish Turkey's national identity through six aims, known as the "Six Arrows"(Jung p. 75)

Ataturk's Six Arrows were republicanism, populism, secularism, revolutionism, nationalism, and etatism. He defined republicanism as the rule of law, popular sovereignty, and civic virtues, with an overall emphasis on the ideals of liberty, which was all to replace the absolutism of monarchy. Populism was a social revolution with specific goals, such as the advancement of women within society. Another focus of populism was to endear the people to their country, thus giving them a sense of pride in citizenship. Secularism to Ataturk was the generic removal of religious interference from state affairs, especially with regards to education and cultural initiatives. Revolutionism was the replacement of traditional institutions and ideas with modern counterparts. According to Ataturk though, this would be the most difficult aim in that it was a generational movement, which would need to be active well after he was gone.

Nationalism to Ataturk was necessary among the citizenry. In order to push forward the people of Turkey had to have a sense of pride within themselves and their state. The final arrow, etatism, was aimed at state involvement in the modernization and advancement of society. This meant that the state would aid technological and economic development when necessary. This did not discount private enterprise, but Ataturk felt there were sectors that capitalism could not cure, and the state was responsible for maintaining those.

Many of these aims were accomplished through large sweeping changes to society, while others were more intricate and detailed changes within society. For instance women and their role within society was to be embraced, going so far as creating the first Miss Turkey contest in 1929 (Jung p.61). Also, the day of rest would no longer be Friday, as is typical in Islamic culture, but instead would be Sunday as was typical of the modern world (Jung p.60). The minor details that Kemalism focused on were not focused upon for their own sake, but rather to symbolically demonstrate change and modernization. An example of this can be seen in a speech given by Ataturk in 1927 when he introduced the prohibition of the fez, the traditional hat worn by men in the Ottoman Empire:

“Gentlemen, it was necessary to abolish the fez, which sat on our heads as a sign of ignorance, of fanaticism, of hatred to progress and civilization, and to adopt in its place the hat, the customary headdress of the whole civilized world, thus showing, among other things, that no difference existed in the manner of thought between the Turkish nation and the whole family of civilized mankind”

- Ataturk, 1927

The Present Turkey

Modern-day Turkey is not the Ottoman Empire. Under the direction of Ataturk and his Kemalist principles, the Republic of Turkey has indeed come along way in less than a century. Absolute monarchy has been replaced by a democratic, secular, constitutional republic. The state is viewed as a developed country and regional power by government agencies and political

scientists alike, but for some reason there is still a stigma surrounding Turkish the state, especially within the concept of traditional Europe. Historically, the region has continually been linked with Europe. The Greeks that resided in Anatolia during antiquity were considered the foundation of traditional Europe's democratic ideals. The Byzantine's were the Christian heirs to the Romans, and even after Constantinople's fall, the Ottomans were a force within the geopolitics of Traditional Europe. So why is the European Union so hesitant to accept Turkey? Before answering that question, the present state of Turkey must be taken into account. The areas that are pertinent to the issue are Turkey's culture, politics, foreign relations, and economy.

Culture

All four of these areas have been shaped by Kemalist ideals, but quite possibly the least changed of the four is the culture of Turkey. Though the Ottoman culture is unique from Turkey, the Ottoman Empire immediately prior to its fall was composed of the same citizens who would become citizens of the Republic of Turkey. These people, for the most part, were still ethnically Turkish, practiced Islam, and spoke Turkish. These basic elements of their culture remained, but much was changed. Histories were written to endear people to their Turkish roots, yet to modernize was to westernize in the eyes of Ataturk, and the only way to be successful was to accomplish it completely (Jung p.61). This modernizing did not seem to fall in line with Islam, which very much permeated all aspects of society. Kemalists long pushed religion to the backseat. While the Republic of Turkey was young and fresh, the citizenry did not seem to mind the changes taking place. Thus, the impacts and difficulties of these changes seemed to lay dormant for some time. The roots of capitalism took hold and Turkey slowly began to become a consumer society. It was in these urban landscapes that the Turkisness that Ataturk espoused was

being realized, seemingly no different than the cities of traditional Europe. As Turkey grew though, economic and social strains were put on Turkey's demographics resulting in groups who had long been relegated to the countryside were now moving into the city, or perhaps more accurately, the city was moving into them. These people on the periphery were the "have nots" of society, but what they did have was their faith. (Mango p.64). This change in demographics started to reveal itself within the Turkish political spectrum.

Over the past few decades, a more traditionalist approach has taken hold embracing religion and its role within not only the culture of the country, but within politics as well (Khalilzad p.14).

Politics and Government

This sentiment to bring Islam back into politics was embodied by the Turkish Welfare Party, known as Refah. Refah was heir to the National Order Party and the National Salvation Party, which were each banned in the 1970s due to breaking the Turkish constitution's principle of secularism. The two predecessors did not have much success, but with the change in demographics and a growing pool of voters, Refah began experiencing some success. In 1996 Refah saw one of its own, Necmettin Erbakan, become the Prime Minister of Turkey, and was also the largest party within Turkish politics (Khalilzad p. 14). In an effort to protect the secular nature of the state, democracy was put on hold. A military coup forced out Erbakan, and in 1998 Refah was banned from Turkish politics. This halt of democracy is not a random occurrence within Turkey though, the military has also removed governments in 1960, 1971, and 1980. Ataturk specifically insisted on separating the military from politics, but that did not mean they would not have a role within the political realm. The armed forces were and have been seen as

the defenders of Kemalist ideology (Momayezi p.3). This raises a question to one of the European Union's standards, "is Turkey truly democratic?"

The formal structure does match the European Union's standards in that Turkey's government is that of a parliamentary, representative, democratic republic, with a president serving as head of state. The government is separated into three branches, executive, legislative, and judicial. The executive branch is composed of the president, who is elected to serve a five year term by the Grand National Assembly, and the Prime Minister who truly holds the executive power. The prime minister is from the ruling party or coalition and elected by the parliament via a vote of confidence. The legislative branch is unicameral with the sole body being the Grand National Assembly. This house has 550 members and numerous political parties. The current party in power is the Justice and Development Party (AKP), which is considered a conservative party with Islamist roots. The People's Party (CHP), founded by Ataturk, was in power until 1950. Since then conservatives have dominated the landscape. CHP is still in existence though, currently seen as a leftist party, and second in size to the AKP. Ironically, as many conservative parties have roots as Islamists, like the AKP, they maintain that they are Kemalists. This is due to these parties claiming to be descendents of the Democratic Party, which was the first to unseat CHP, and whose founders were longstanding members of Ataturk's CHP (Ahmad p. 104).

Foreign Relations

Aside from Turkey's domestic scene are their foreign relations. Turkey's foreign priorities and relationships have remained consistent for the most part, but have been most clear during significant international events. The first was during their period of formation. Naturally, Ataturk sought to repair relationships that had been harmed when the region was formerly the

Ottoman Empire (Macfie p. 150). He made concessions to the British, and began forewarning others, like the United States, about the issue Germany would pose to the European continent, all while being sure to keep a careful eye on the Bolsheviks looking west, even though he vowed Turkey and Moscow should never be enemies. The next stage came after World War II.

Turkey had been hesitant to join the war, but finally did in 1945 on the side of the Allies. Taking advantage of a war torn European landscape and the growing sentiments of integration, Turkey was quick to become a member of the Council of Europe. It was apparent though that the Soviet Union clearly had its eye on expansion, and with the United States no longer staying out of geopolitics, as per the Truman Doctrine, Turkey knew it would be an area of interest throughout the Cold War. The United States saw Turkey as a bridge to the Middle East, and quickly wanted to recruit the state into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Turkey initially balked since the U.S. would give no guarantee of aid if the Soviets were to invade. The fairly young state did happily accept funds from the superpower though, and in 1952 finally decided to join NATO. This was not without issue though. Many Kemalists were outraged at the concessions made due to the union. Though Ataturk's dream of never seeing Russia as an enemy would die, it was agreed that there was simply too much at stake.

What they did take issue with was their regrouping with the Middle East. The Kemalists had for so long attempted to rid Turkey of any semblance of the region to the east, but with the urging of the U.S. and Britain, Turkey joined the Middle East Defense Organization, later to be known as the Baghdad Pact (Ahmad p.107). This move also put Turkey at odds with Arab Nationalists though, like Nasser, who opposed the West. The foreign relations of Turkey have not much changed since the 1950s, except with respect to Middle Eastern Relations, which have fluctuated. Initially being the only state with a majority of Muslims to recognize Israel infuriated

Arab States. Turkey's desire to be associated with the west was also a point of contention. Another long standing issue is with Syria. In the 1930s, France ceded the Hatay province to Turkey, which France had recognized as a longstanding Ottoman province. Syria's claim to the land is their occupation of the region from 1920-1946 when they attained their independence, but were forced to resign it to Turkey (Liel p.193). These relations have remained stable though, primarily due to their Islamic ties.

Economy

The final sector of Turkey that must be examined is that of its economy. Turkey's economy is still very much in line with Ataturk's socialist aim of statism. The industries that are controlled by the government are manufacturing, banking, transportation, and communication. The largest manufacturing industries in Turkey include textiles and clothing, food processing, oil refineries, and automotives. The state's agricultural sector is also very much alive with over 35% of employment coming from it (CIA 2009). The unemployment rate for 2008 is 7.9% with an additional 4% being underemployed. The GDP based on purchasing power parity for the state is \$906 billion in 2008, with a GDP per capita of \$12,000. Currently, Turkey is facing some hardships with declines in the textiles and clothing and oil refining industries, but is seeing growth in its automotive and electronics industries (CIA 2009).

Is Turkey a Part of Europe?

“Turkey’s application for full membership in the (European Union) poses one of the most dramatic challenges facing the (European Union)...Much of what Turkey must overcome has its roots in history, which continues to, in effect, “condition” contemporary elements.”(Kili, p.428-429)

Foundations of Integration

Dating back to its foundations under Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the state of Turkey has sought to be “Europeanized”(Jung p.61). Following a similar trajectory as Turkey’s own development has been the development of an integrated Europe. Thus, Turkey has constantly sought to be included in an integrated Europe, and has found ample success. This process of “europeanization” required Turkey to first step away from its Ottoman past (Bell p. 39-40), and define itself as a part of Europe.

Ataturk recognized how the Ottomans were seen as despotic and somewhat backwards by traditional European powers (Jung p.60) despite that the Ottomans had long made cultural and economic in-roads to Central Europe, and were always noted as key geo-political partners of Europe. This connection that the Ottomans had within Europe never could truly be inclusive (Wilson p.35). Thus, when shaping the Republic of Turkey, Ataturk had no intentions of retaining the region’s past.

Ataturk’s aim to make Turkey a part of Europe quickly showed signs of success. By 1934 Ataturk and Turkey had been so fervent with not only their desire, but also their actions to be a part of Europe, Coudenhove-Kalergi, who was considered the Honorary President of the Pan-European Union until his death in 1973, included Turkey as a part of Europe not only politically as far as the union was concerned, but culturally as well (Nelson p.101). With this being one of

the benchmarks of European integration, Turkey from this point could be considered to be a part of Europe. After World War II, the first international, functioning body espousing European Integration was the Council of Europe. Its foundations, like the Pan-European Union, were political in nature. Though Turkey was not one of the ten initial signers of the Treaty of London, which founded the council, it became a member later that year (Bell p.233).

From a military standpoint, Turkey integrated with much of the Western world including the United States through their joining of NATO in 1952. This invitation clearly differentiated Turkey from many Muslim countries to its eastern border that were relegated to being members of the Baghdad Pact (Ahmad p.107). The European Union, which has been the most successful model of integration, took a bit longer to recognize Turkey's relationship to Europe. This union, though related, was a contrast to the two previous associations in that it was aimed at economic integration. Even so, Turkey was recognized in 1963 as an associate member of the European Economic Community, the earlier incarnation of the European Union, after applying for membership in 1959 (McCormick p.353). This agreement was not nominal though, as the agreement specifically stated that goal/end of this association was to be complete membership within the community. The next stage was economic in nature with a protocol being signed in 1970, which set a timetable for all quotas and tariffs between Turkey and the community to be abolished. The first pitfall Turkey faced with regard to the European Community, which was a combination of the European Economic Community, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the European Atomic Energy Community (Bell p.229) was in 1980, when the European Community halted relations with Turkey due to the military coup (Ahmad p.201). This freeze was lifted in 1983 when elections were once again held.

By the time Turkey had applied for full membership into the community, it had come to be known as the European Community. In 1989 the European Commission denied Turkey to begin accession processes, based on their political and economic situations (Ahmad p.202). Though they maintained the goal was still to grant Turkey full membership, part of the issue that Turkey faced was due to the now member-state, Greece (p.141). Admitted in 1981, Greece was highly opposed to Turkish membership due to the Turkish invasion of the island of Cyprus in 1974 (Ahmad p.202). Though Turkey intervened only to thwart a Greek supported coup of Cyprus' ruling democracy with the intent of annexing Cyprus, this military intervention along with the coup of 1980 made the European Community weary of Turkey's use of force.

After the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the states north of Turkey, which had been under Soviet control were left to their own survival, Turkey was forced to take a backseat in their quest to join the European Union (Bell p.221). Finally at the Helsinki Conference in 1999, the European Commission reopened Turkey's application granting them candidate status (Ahmad p.205). This would not be easy though, since the commission had created in the meantime the Copenhagen Criteria in 1993, which is used to determine the qualifications for any candidate. This reopening was somewhat of a bittersweet victory, seeing as Turkey had applied long before these standards were created, thus was going to delay the negotiations for Turkish accession until 2004.

On December 17, 2004, negotiations opened between Turkey and the European Union (BBC 2004-12-17). Again this opening was bittersweet. For Turkey there was no time-table was set, and there was no guarantee of accession. Particularly troublesome was two heads of member-states, French President Jacques Chirac and Austrian Chancellor Wolfgang Schuessel, all but guaranteed a public referendum within their state (BBC 2004-12-17). If the citizens of

either of these states simply voted against Turkish accession in a referendum, Turkey would be denied. Either of these referendums would be the first in the history of the European Union. Also, Turkey was faced with opening and closing thirty five *acquis* chapters, four more than the original thirty one as outlined by European Union Commission (McCormick p.93). This was not the end of trouble for Turkey though. The successor to French President Jacques Chirac, Nicolas Sarkozy, blocked one of Turkey's chapters from opening just days before negotiations were set to take place (Bilefsky 2007-06-25). The blockage of any chapter is a difficulty since all must be completed before accession is possible. President Sarkozy had blocked the most significant the chapter, Economic and Monetary policy, which is one of the subjects at the heart of the debate of Turkey's accession into the European Union. Sarkozy's block interrupted any progress Turkey could make with regards to this very large chapter. Currently this chapter is still blocked, and the only chapter closed (completed) is that of Science and Research (Cagaptay 2009-02-03).

Eastern European Enlargements of 2004 and 2007

To say Turkey is the first candidate under such a microscope is inaccurate. The European Union has experienced controversial enlargements as recently as 2007 with the accessions of Romania and Bulgaria (DeBardeleben p.19). Before that even, there were the cases of other Eastern European and Baltic states such as The Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Malta, and Cyprus. Comparing these past countries to Turkey can provide an evaluation of the issues that Turkey is currently facing.

Just a general look into the history of all of these countries is telling. For instance three states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, were all ex-Soviet republic with relatively new

democracies. Turkey on the other hand has practiced democracy since its inception in 1923. The practice of democracy is not what is at question though.

In 2004 the states of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Malta, and Cyprus joined the European Union. This was the largest single expansion of the European Union, both in terms of population and territory. Conversely, it was at the same time the smallest in terms of gross domestic product (CIA 2003). The status of these countries was very much determined by the Cold War. To the West, these states were the traditional European powers, while some of these states had even been republics within the former USSR (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania). The issue of location was very significant in this case, since all of these countries were within proximity to the Soviet empire. Once the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, these countries looked to make reforms to their own systems to fall more in line with the then European Economic Community(Bell p.209). In 2004 the European Union even went so far as to create a program in order to help the various states remedy different obstacles that were a hindrance to accession (Europa). The PHARE Program was initially created to assist Poland and Hungary. The main objectives of the program were to aid the countries' economies through bettering administrative practices. This did require an introduction of new language and policies, but these changes proved to be a success in the eyes of the European Union. The major tool of the program was the Regional Quality Assurance Program, which allowed the countries to address one of the Union's most important, economic objectives, product consistency, through implementing a system that the states could follow.

Even with the regulations in place, the new member states were considered to be a likely drain on the European Union's strong economy. In 2003 prior to accession, not a single state had

a Gross Domestic Product per capita above \$20,000, the highest being the country of Slovenia with \$18,300 (CIA 2003). Of the existing EU members in 2003, the lowest GDP per capita belonged to Greece at \$19,000, which was still higher than all of the ten newly admitted countries.

In 2007 the states of Romania and Bulgaria were admitted into the European Union, but their accession is thought by many to simply be a carryover from the accession of 2004 (McCormick p.100). This is believed because throughout the processes undergone by the ten countries admitted in 2004, these two states had also been undergoing the same changes, but were always lagging behind. That lag is what led to the additional three years required before their accession. The economies of Bulgaria and Romania could be said to be in even more disarray though. In 2006, a year before their admission, Romania's and Bulgaria's GDP per capita was \$8,400 and \$9,000 respectively (CIA 2006). Even though in 2004, the European Union had opened its doors to about 73 million people, in 2007 they welcomed an additional 30 million more (McCormick p.101).

Contentions and Responses

The completion of *acquis* chapters are not where the debate between Turkish advocates and opponents take place though, since they are simply the reforms that a candidate must complete. Multiple contentions arise regarding the question of Turkey being European, the status of Turkey's economy, and the state's ability to protect democracy and human rights. Each of these points of contention can objectively be viewed and appropriately responded to, but Turkey's ultimate hindrance is likely due to public opinion to which there is no response

Is Turkey “European”? In some ways, the answer is simple: yes. For even being considered for admission and granted the ability to negotiate with the European Union, Turkey has to be considered European. Through the Maastricht Treaty’s stipulation that only a “European” state can join, the European Union has been given the task of determining what states are “European” and what states are not (European Parliament). In this age of integration, traditional definitions and ideas of Europe are seemingly irrelevant. Since Turkey was granted associate membership in 1963, the European Parliament, Council, and Commission all ruled that Turkey was part of the “European Concert,” and thus a European state (European Parliament).

The next issue is that of Turkey’s economy. Many argue that the problem facing Turkey with respect to its economy is the fear that Turkey will be an anchor to the European Union (Gower p.139)(Khalilzad p.39). Though its economy is clearly not at the level of the European Union as a whole, the best case can be made when comparing it to those of the twelve Eastern European member-states admitted in 2004 and 2007. The ten states accepted into the European Union in 2004 were immediately the ten poorest member-states (CIA 2003). The same could be said upon the accession of both Bulgaria and Romania in 2007, thus calling into question the fear of bringing poor states into the union. Though Turkey is on the lower end of economic indicators, such as GDP per capita, they do compare favorably with bottom feeders such as Bulgaria and Romania. The GDP per capita in 2008 of Bulgaria was \$12,900, while Romania’s \$12,200 (CIA 2009). Though Turkey’s is lower at \$12,000, the difference would likely at least be eliminated if Turkey were to be a member of the European Union with similar economic advantages.

Not all of the contentions against Turkey are unsubstantiated or unfair though. With the requirement that candidates protect democracy and human rights, an interesting battle between

democracy and secularism is brought to the forefront. As stated earlier, Turkey has been subject to four military coups during its rather short history, the most recent in 1998. Each were enacted due to the military's role as the protector of Kemalist ideals, especially secularism (Kili p.360). If the intervention of the military threatened democracy, then the strengthening of Islamist parties threatened secularism, which Ataturk believe to be a threat to human rights (Kili p. 352).

Religion freedom was highly sacred to Ataturk, and was seen as a great achievement by those outside of Turkey, especially since it would be so easy to allow Islam to permeate Turkish society (Kili p.365). The ease with which Islam can permeate Turkish society is often exploited by political parties who use it to gain success and power, thus forcing the military's hand to intervene when a party or worse, a government, goes too far. With either outcome, the European Union has cause for concern. Demographics within Turkey have not changed with regard to proportion of Muslims within the state. Due to this, the use of religion to garner political success will always be a fear. The military's existence and commitment to keep the political system in check also will not likely be going anywhere, since the choice to hand over power is the military's alone, as evidenced by the military's four coups (Momayezi p.3). Therefore, this objection to admittance into the European Union may be most justified.

Though Turkey has seemingly moved beyond these contentions by being accepted as a candidate and entering into rounds of negotiations, each of these contentions still can be played out by an individual member-state or in the arena of public opinion. A single member-state may reject the accession of a candidate, since each has to ratify all accession treaty (European Commission). It would be highly unlikely for a state's national government to single itself out within the European Union and reject such a state, but some would simply leave it up to their citizens in the form of a referendum (McCormick p.237). If a member-state were to have a

referendum on the accession of another and the citizens voted in a majority against the accession, the candidate would be denied without reason other than the majority opposition, regardless of the time spent going through the application process. This possibility is very realistic as a total of 59% of EU citizens are opposed to Turkish accession, while only 28% are in favor, according to EuroBarometer 66 (European Commission EB 66), and has been threatened by opponents to Turkish accession, most notably by Sarkozy.

The reality remains though that the largest contention to Turkey joining the European Union is likely its religious make-up. Turkey is 99.8% Muslim (CIA 2009), and would be the only majority Muslim state in the European Union. Though many, such as former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, have supported Turkish accession, citing as a benefit the possible amicable relations between Christians and Muslims (BBC 2004-12-17), the European Union has not officially referenced any opposition due to religious differences. The issue was slightly addressed further though in a EuroBarometer Poll conducted in 2003, which included all twenty seven current member-states and Turkey (at the time Bulgaria, Romania, and Turkey were the three candidate countries)(European Commission EB 2003.5). The poll asked citizens throughout the European Union and its candidate countries what they felt were the three most representative values of the Arab World. The citizens of the European Union overwhelmingly responded that religion was one of the representative values with 53% including it in their list (European Commission EB2003.5). The next closest values according to citizens were solidarity and the rule of law with 9% each. Though this clearly does not demonstrate a negative connotation towards Islam, which is the primary religion amongst the Arab World, it does demonstrate the citizens of the European Union recognizing Islam as a unifying factor, if not *the* unifying factor, among that region, which is highly similar to the Middle East. It is not a stretch by any means to

assume a connection between the opposition to Turkish accession and the value assigned to religion within the Arab World by citizens of the European Union.

Should Turkey be a Part of Europe?

Conclusion

Though Turkey cannot say its economy is much stronger than those of the twelve recently admitted states, there are noteworthy comparisons to be made that are not economic in nature to support Turkey's bid for accession. First, a historical perspective is in order. Not only has Turkey been an independent, democratic state since 1923, they also have been very stable throughout much of The Cold War. The primary arm to combat the Soviet Union in the east was that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Turkey has been a member since their first round of enlargements in 1952. Also, Turkey's recognition as a part of Europe, specifically with an eye towards European integration can be said to date back to 1949 when they were admitted as members of the Council of Europe, or even farther back to 1934 when they were deemed member of the Pan-European Union. Their quest to be admitted into the European Union began with the admission for associate membership to the European Economic Community in 1959, and was admitted in 1963. Finally, Turkey applied for full membership to the European Union in 1987. All of these events precluded any of the Eastern European counterparts, especially since they had all been a part of the Soviet Union. To try to make the case that any of these former Communist countries were on a better footing economically or democratically would be contested at best.

Instead of judging Turkey as a potential intermediary between the East and West, Turkey should be evaluated as a legitimate candidate through its own merits and flaws set forth by the European Union's Copenhagen Criteria. In no way does this mean Turkey will likely be admitted

into the European Union, since there are abundant issues. A change in perspective by the European Union would signal an immense change, even if it was only in mindset. No longer would states solely be tools for the use of those more powerful, the divide between Christianity and Islam would lessen, and Turkey's identity as a European state could finally be celebrated.

Before a final answer is given, the preceding three must be addressed. The vague traditional notions of Europe remain. This contradiction has come to typify Europe, and its primary integrated body, the European Union. The only answer waiting to be determined is by the European Union (European Parliament). Turkey's formation was in response to a dissatisfaction with the Ottoman Empire and a desire to align with the more modern West. Out of this was a unique Turkish identity that was inherently European in nature (Jung p.61). Even so it seems its Islamic ties still are a point of contention, alienating them from some of the European Union's citizens. The combination of Europe's inconsistent definition and Turkey's desire to be European gives way to an answer that is just as double-sided. Is Turkey a part of Europe? Yes, depending on who's answering. Should Turkey be a part of the European Union? Not yet. The climate within member-states of the European Union is still too hostile. Of course accepting Turkey would signal a nominal olive branch between Muslims and Christians, but it appears improbably with 59% of citizens within the European Union do not support the accession of Turkey. Presently, it appears that currents of progress, change, and understanding must take hold within the European Union. Turkey should remain patient, seeing as there true identity long ago embraced the three. In keeping with contradictions, they must now wait for Europe to catch up.

Works Cited

Ahmad, Feroz. *Turkey: The Quest for Identity*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2003.

Bell, P.M.H. *Twentieth-Century Europe Unity and Division*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Bilefsky, Dan. "Turkish Entry into Europe Slowed by Sarkozy Move." New York Times 25 June 2007. 10 Feb 2008

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/25/world/europe/25cnd-turkey.html?_r=1&oref=slogin>

Cagaptay, Soner. "Can Obama Break Turkey's EU Impasse?" Washington Institute for Near East Policy. 3 Feb 2009 <<http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=3003>>

Central Intelligence Agency. *The World Factbook*.

<<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>>

"Deal Struck over EU Turkey Talks." BBC. 17 Dec 2004.

<<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4103931.stm>>

DeBardeleben, Joan. *The Boundaries of EU Enlargement*. New York: Palgrave, 2008.

Encarta. "Europe." Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia.

<http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761570768/Europe.html>

Europa. "Activities of the European Union: Phare Programme". European Union. 2 Dec 2007

<<http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/e50004.htm>>

European Commission. "Conditions for Enlargement." European Union. 11 Oct 2008

<<http://ec.europa.eu/cgi-bin/etal.pl>>

European Commission. "EuroBarometer 66: Public Opinion in the European Union." Sep 2007

<http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb66/eb66_en.pdf>

European Commission. "EuroBarometer 2003.5: Public Opinion in the Candidate Countries."

Mar 2004

<http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/cceb/2003/cceb_2003.5_identity.pdf>

European Parliament. "Briefing No 23: Legal Questions of Enlargement." European Union. 19

May 1998 <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/enlargement/briefings/23a2_en.htm>

Gower, Jackie and John Redmond. *Enlarging the European Union*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2000.

Handler, Richard. "Is 'Identity' a Useful Cross-Cultural Concept?" *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Ed. John Gillis. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

27-40.

Jung, Dietrich and Wolfango Piccoli. *Turkey at the Crossroads*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Khalilzad, Zalmay, Ian Lesser and F. Stephen Larrabee. *The Future of Turkish-Western Relations*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 2000.

Kili, Suna. *The Ataturk Revolution*. Istanbul: Sefik Matbaasi, 2003.

Kinzer, Stephen. *Crescent and Star*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001.

Lewis, Martin and Karen Wigen. *The Myth of Continents*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.

Liel, Alon. *Turkey in the Middle East*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2001.

Macfie, A.L. *Ataturk*. New York: Longman Publishing, 1994.

Marston, Sallie, Paul Knox and Diana Liverman. *World Regions in a Global Context*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2005.

McCormick, John. *The European Union*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2008.

Momayezi, Nasser. "Civil-military relations in Turkey." International Journal on World Peace 15.3(1998): 3.

Nugent, Neil. *The Government and Politics of the European Union*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Philippides, Marios. *Byzantium, Europe, and the Early Ottoman Sultans 1373-1513*. New York: Jan Press, 1990.

"Religion and Ethics: Islam-The Ottoman Empire." BBC. 14 Sept 2008.
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/islam/history/ottomanempire_1.shtml>

Wilson, Kevin and Jan van der Dussen. *The History of the Idea of Europe*. New York: Routledge, 1995.