

DYNAMICS OF YOUTH EUROSCEPTICISM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖNDER KÜÇÜKURAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
SOCIOLOGY

DECEMBER 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof.Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Dr. Mustafa Ően
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman (METU, ADM) _____

Dr. Mustafa Ően (METU, Sociology) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr Aykan Erdemir (METU, Sociology) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Önder Küçükural

Signature :

ABSTRACT

Dynamics of Youth Euroscepticism

Küçükural, Önder

M.Sc., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Dr. Mustafa Şen

December 2005, 138 pages

The aim of this thesis is to describe the dominant features of Euroscepticism in Turkish context and to understand its main dynamics with special reference to a particular group, the youth in Turkey. A field research was conducted in order to understand youth's EU support. The field research involved a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques in order to attain multi-layered perspectives on Euroscepticism. The research is representative at a country-scale and the participants were 4542 senior students of high schools in twelve cities of Turkey. One of the striking findings of the research was the high percentage of Euro-optimists when the survey was applied and the dominance of Eurosceptic discourse during one to one and group interviews.

According to the research results two strands appear to be dominant in youth's Euroscepticism. The first is moral degeneration discourse that is articulated by a threat perception to Turkey's culture and lifestyle. The second one is nationalist discourse that is expressed by threat perception to the unity and integrity of the nation and the state. Considering the main motivation of the youth in their appropriation of these two discourses I argued that the identity theories provide plausible explanations for the understanding of this phenomenon. The identity is

formed around the “we” concepts that are mainly derived from Turkish nationalism and culture. Besides, the Turkish state’s founding principles and the atmosphere created during the 80’s and onwards seems to contribute to this construction.

Keywords: Euroscepticism, youth, European Union, public opinion

ÖZ

Gençlerdeki Avrupa Birliği Karşıtlığının Dinamikleri

Küçükural, Önder

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Mustafa Şen

Aralık 2005, 138 sayfa

Bu tez çalışması, Türkiye'deki Avrupa Birliği (AB) karşıtı söylemin öne çıkan özelliklerini lise öğrencileri ile yapılan bir alan araştırması üzerinden anlamayı ve gençlerdeki AB karşıtı tutumların temel dinamiklerini ortaya koymayı hedeflemektedir. Bu bağlamda çalışma, gençlerin Türkiye'nin AB'ye tam üyelik süreci konusundaki tutumlarını anlamak amacıyla yapılan bir alan araştırmasının verilerine dayanmaktadır. Bu alan araştırmasında derinlemesine görüşme ve odak grup görüşmesi gibi niteliksel araştırma yöntemleri, anket uygulaması gibi niceliksel araştırma yöntemleri ile bir arada kullanılmıştır. Araştırma Türkiye'yi temsil eden bir örneklem üzerinde gerçekleştirilmiş olup 12 ilden 4542 lise son sınıf öğrencisini kapsamıştır. Araştırmanın ilginç bulgularından biri de anket sonuçlarının yüksek düzeyde AB desteğine işaret etmesi, buna karşın AB karşıtı duyguların daha çok odak grup ve yüz yüze görüşmelerde belirgin olarak ortaya çıkmasıdır.

Araştırma sonuçları gençlerin AB karşıtlığında iki eğilimin öne çıktığını göstermektedir. Bunlardan ilki, "AB'nin Türkiye'nin kültürüne ve yaşam tarzına bir tehdit oluşturduğu" algısı çerçevesinde ifade edilen *ahlaki yozlaşma söylemi*, ikincisi, "AB'nin, devletin ve milletin birlik ve bütünlüğüne yönelik tehdit oluşturduğu" algısı etrafında şekillenen *milliyetçi söylem*dir. Bu iki söylemin anlaşılmasında ve

açıklanmasında kimlik yaklaşımı daha etkin ve verimli bir kavramsal çerçeve sunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda gençlerin AB karşıtlığının özellikle geleneksel öğelerden beslenen, kültürelist, reaksiyoner, dışlayıcı ve biz-onlar ikiliğine dayanan bir Türk Milliyetçiliği çerçevesinde şekillendiği gözlemlenmiştir. AB karşıtı bu kimlik oluşumunda Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devleti'nin kurucu ilkelerinin ve 1980 Darbesi sonrasında ortaya çıkarılan ve Türk-İslam sentezi fikrine dayanan eğitim anlayışının büyük bir rolü olduğu anlaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Avrupa Birliği karşıtlığı, gençlik, Avrupa Birliği, kamuoyu.

Etrit'e

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Method of the Study.....	5
1.2. Organisation of the Thesis.....	8
2. PUBLIC OPINION AND EUROSCEPTICISM.....	11
2.1. Euroscepticism: Theories and Approaches.....	13
2.2. Dynamics and Determinants of EU Support and Euroscepticism.....	17
2.2.1. The Utilitarian Approach.....	18
2.2.2. Cognitive Mobilisation and Values Approach.....	20
2.2.3. Domestic Politics Approach.....	22
2.2.4. Identity Approach.....	28
2.3. Conclusion.....	33
3. TURKEY’S RELATIONSHIP WITH EUROPEAN INSTITUTIONS.....	34
3.1. Mid-1960s: the Initial Period.....	37
3.2. 1970s: The Additional Protocol.....	38
3.3. 1980s: Trials and Tribulations.....	41

3.4. 1990s: The Customs Union.....	43
3.5. 2000s: Fast Forward to Europe	52
3.6. Conclusion	57
4. UNDERSTANDING THE YOUTH EUROSCEPTICISM.....	59
4.1. EU Support and Euroscepticism	62
4.2. Dynamics of Euroscepticism.....	65
4.2.1. Moral Degeneration Discourse	67
4.2.1.1. Scrutinizing the Moral Degeneration Discourse	70
4.2.1.2. Grounds of the Moral Degeneration Discourse	79
4.2.2. National(ist) Discourse	82
4.2.2.1. Scrutinizing the National(ist) Discourse	86
4.2.2.2. Grounds of the National(ist) Discourse	102
4.3. Loyalties and Betrayal.....	110
4.4. Conclusion	113
5. CONCLUSION	115
6. APPENDICES	121
6.1. APPENDIX I (Distribution of Participants)	121
6.1. APPENDIX II (Public Opinion in Turkey).....	122
7. REFERENCES.....	133

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.1	Number of Schools and Students that are included in the Survey.....	7
TABLE 4.1	Demographical Features.....	60
TABLE 4.2	If there were a Referendum Tomorrow About Turkey's Full Membership to the EU, What Would You Vote For?.....	63
TABLE 4.3	Negative Stereotypes about Europeans.....	68
TABLE 4.4	EU Membership and Moral Degeneration.....	69
TABLE 4.5	In what direction do you think the following problems would be effected by the EU membership?.....	84
TABLE 4.6	National(ist) Charges on the EU Membership.....	85

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The public support for the European Union (EU) became a topic that attracted scholarly interest particularly with EU's political integration attempts which were emphasised in the Maastricht Treaty in 1993, where the name of the European Community was changed into the European Union, while the creation of political union aimed opening out as well as greater depth in terms of integration (Carey, 2002). The enlargement of the EU to include the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries increased the concerns among the European member states and candidate state citizens about the nature of the European integration.

The emphasis on political integration became more salient as it coincided with the rise of the Eurosceptic discourse all over Europe. Hooghe (2003) points out that EU is an elite led project, and there is huge discrepancy between public and elite opinion, which is perceived as a democratic deficit in the EU. According to him European integration is not the dream of the people but that of the elites. Consequently further integration, which beside economic issues aims at the deepening as well as the enlargement of the Union, bring about the clash between elite and public opinion. As legitimacy is the *sine qua non* of democracy and it is measured through the approval of elite's actions by the common citizens. This explains the eagerness of the researchers studying this issue to find out the determining factors of one's willingness of support for 'further integration' and

enlargement of the European Union. Or conversely, to find out the dynamics of one's discontent with further integration.

The stances of the people of member states about the European Union have been tested and the considerable part of the accumulated literature is reserved to the member state citizens' attitude towards the EU. Nevertheless, the research has not been confined to the societies of member state countries and the question of whether the candidate countries' citizens are willing to see their country as member of European Union or not has been at the centre of attention as well.

In the Helsinki summit of 1999 Turkey was officially accepted as a candidate country to join the European Union. As the prospect membership of the EU becomes a reality polarization towards either EU-support or Euroscepticism increases (Kazimierz and Shabad, 2003). Taking this into account, this thesis aims to describe the dominant features of Euroscepticism in Turkish context and to understand its main dynamics with special reference to a particular group, the youth in Turkey.

The data for this study was gathered by the research project "Turkish Youth Speaks Up: Youth's Opinion on Turkey's EU Accession and Membership Process", which was financed by the Horizons and Mosaic Program of European Commission Delegation to Turkey. The project was commissioned to the Turkish Social Science Association and was conducted by a team of researchers of which I am a part, working in 'Yaşama Dair Vakıf' (Lifeworld Foundation). In this study I focus particularly on Euroscepticism because the extra-ordinary prevalence of Eurosceptic discourse in in-depth interviews and focus groups seems to be in complete contradiction to the high percentages of EU approval in the survey results.

Some of the questions that I discuss in the thesis are: Why do some section of Turkish youth say 'no' to EU? What are the motivations behind their opposition?

What are the main characteristics of scepticism towards the European Union? What are the characteristics of the discourse of Euroscepticism that is articulated by the youth? How do they perceive the on going process of European integration and related adjustments on the way to the EU?

When we consider the scholarly attempts at determining the factors for the EU support and in understanding the motivations behind the Euroscepticism, we see that there have emerged several camps in the field. The first camp of scholars discerns the utilitarian calculations of individuals and discusses losers and winners of the changes caused by the EU (Gabel, 1998; Henderson, 2001). A second group of scholars propose the cognitive mobilisation approach arguing that individual's level of knowledge about the EU and interest in political issues are decisive factors in taking a side on the EU issue (Inglehart, 1970; Janssen, 1991). A third group of scholars (Kazimierz and Shabad, 2003; Ehin, 2001) lend particular attention to individual characteristics and they consider the EU as the community of values such as liberalism, free market economy and democracy. Consequently depending on how a person identifies with these values, one also supports the EU. Yet another approach has been to focus on the effect of national identity. Researchers argued that the stronger it is the more one assumes anti-EU stance (Carey, 2002; Christin and Trechsel, 2002; McLaren, 2002; Kritzinger, 2003). In addition, they found evidence that perceived threat to national institutions, identity or culture and religion brings about Euroscepticism. For example, anti-immigrant sentiments also strongly effects ones decision to support the EU (Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2005).

Europe is a huge geography and it bears great cultural, social, and economic diversity. And consequently, it is not possible to find an all-encompassing explanation for the diversity in opinions. Such an aim would be a mistake from the

start. However, I think that each approach tells part of the truth, and none of them can claim superiority over the others. All the variables that are intensively studied in these standpoints matter for understanding the EU support and Euroscepticism. But how they matter depends on both characteristics of the groups and individuals under study, historical, cultural and social predispositions of the nation-state where the study is conducted.

The cynic attitude towards the European Union can be interpreted as a position that has to do with once affiliation/liking or disliking the idea of Europe and Europeans. In the Turkish context, Çarkoğlu, one of the prominent researchers in the study of public support of the EU in Turkey, measured 'Euroscepticism' while defining it along the liking/disliking the Europeans line of thought. Consequently, in order to assess one's 'Eurosceptic' stance Çarkoğlu asked questions on EU's eligibility to solve the conflicts in the Aegean and Cyprus, whether one supports having Europeans work in Turkey, willingness of having one's daughter married to a European, and having European neighbours. And in compliance with the expectations, he found out that the 'Eurosceptics' are less likely to support Turkey's EU membership (Çarkoğlu, 2003:181). However, these questions show that Çarkoğlu's concept of Euroscepticism is different from the widely shared definition of Euroscepticism. In the studies conducted out in European context, Euroscepticism is simply defined as "the idea of contingent or qualified opposition" which incorporates also "outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration" (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2004:3). This definition emphasises one's negative attitude towards the EU or the ongoing project of European integration. Basically, questions like having one's daughter marry with European, or willingness to have a European neighbour tap into a different realm. They could assess one's

affiliation or interest in ‘Europe’ or ‘Europeans’ or one’s attitudes towards other cultures. However, we cannot directly utilise the answers of these questions to label someone as ‘Eurosceptic’. Besides, these questions implicitly bear the idea that Turkey is outside of Europe. To ask them in EU member or candidate countries would be ridiculous and incompatible in the European setting. However, as the research findings show that this questions taps into important realm, and they are proved to be meaningful in the Turkish context. Furthermore, I can argue that this constitutes one of the main dynamics of Turkish Euroscepticism. Nevertheless, the ambiguous feelings that revolve around the definition of Euroscepticism should not deceive the researchers. In order to achieve parsimony with the body of literature existing on the issue I will adopt the common definition of Euroscepticism in the literature. The variable identified by Çarkoğlu is not an independent variable in explaining Euroscepticism but rather an intervening variable¹ and as such I will take it in consideration in forth chapter while discussing the underlying peculiar motivations of youth Euroscepticism in Turkish context.

1.1 Method of the Study

In the field research, qualitative and quantitative techniques were utilized in combination. Qualitative techniques include the conduction of in-depth interviews and focus group discussions while the quantitative technique involves survey implementation. At the beginning 30 in-depth interviews were conducted in order to discover the peculiarities and characteristics of the subject matter of the targeted population. The questionnaire was prepared with the help of the data collected during

¹ An intervening variable is defined as one that links between the independent and the dependent variable. Intervening variables point out the causal sequences or chains, thus explaining the causal process of a phenomenon (Losh, 2001).

this initial phase. The questionnaire included questions regarding the youths demographical and socio-economical profiles, general problems of Turkey and the youth, identity and the perception of the “other”, Turkey’s place in the world and international affairs, attitude towards the EU accession and membership process, level of information on the EU and lastly needs, desires, preferences and expectations regarding Turkey’s foreign policy and the EU.

In the last phase of the field research that is after the implementation of the survey a combination of focus groups and in-depth interviews were also conducted in order to deepen and re-evaluate the research findings. The qualitative technique enabled the assessment of the issue and the exploration of unknown and colorful peculiarities that can not be captured through quantitative techniques.

The target group of this research was composed of the senior students in the high schools across Turkey. The rationale behind the specific decision to focus on the high-school senior population was the great diversity in the student and school profiles. The target group had all it takes to represent the larger sections of the society at a smaller scale. Retrospectively, carrying out a survey on youth and focusing high school rather than university population offers a better alternative to reach socially, culturally and economically different strata, as a larger section of the population attends secondary school. Moreover, working with high school participants has practical advantages such as the readiness to cooperate and ease of reach.

The seniors (third year) of high schools students were born between 1987 and 1988. The population of the senior high school students in Turkey is 749.989. Out of this population 320.529 (42, 73%) of the students are females, and 429.460 (57, 26%) are males (MEB, 2005). The students were selected equally from five different

types of high school. These types are: the regular public high schools; Anatolian high schools; private schools, occupational high schools and the schools for preachers and religious leaders (IHL).

The following table shows the distribution of these high schools types as well as the distribution according to their gender of students that attend these schools. In total 93.05 % of the people in this age group attend one of these secondary education schools. As Table I.1 shows students are not distributed equally in each school type, nevertheless the aim of the research was to explore the attitudes towards EU based on school types so equal numbered samples were picked from each school.

Table 1. 1. Number of Schools and Students that are included in the Survey

School Type	Number of Schools	Females	Males	Total Number of Students	% of the students in total
Public High Schools	1.663	642.664	725.118	1.367.782	45
Anatolian High Schools	443	89.978	101.953	191.931	6,31
Occupational High Schools	3.870	415,339	687.055	1.102.394	36,26
IHL Schools	452	44.492	52.359	96.851	3,18
Private Schools	630	31.499	38.664	70.163	2,30
Total of all secondary schools	6861	1.306.408	1.733.041	3.039.449	100

Ministry of National Education, Research and Coordination Board Presidency (2005)

The survey was conducted in 12 cities to ensure the representativeness of the results for Turkey by using the NUTS System (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics), known as the Turkish statistical classification system for territorial units. This is accepted as the official classification system following the 2002/4720 numbered decision of the Council of Ministers. The 12 cities corresponding to 12

regions were selected randomly. The selected cities are: İstanbul, Balıkesir, İzmir, Bursa, Ankara, Adana, Kayseri, Samsun, Trabzon, Erzurum, Malatya and Gaziantep.

From each city, five schools from the different types were selected. In the sample design the sole selection criterion for each high school was its population. The most crowded three high schools among its type were selected from each city. Then, one of the schools was defined randomly as the target and the other two schools remained as backup. The plan was to reach at least 70 students in each school; therefore the minimum number would be 4200 students in 60 schools all over Turkey.

The students in the classroom setting filled in the questionnaires with the direction of survey implementers. The questionnaire was distributed to all the class during each implementation. The classes were randomly selected to reach 70 students, and their number varied from 2 to 5 in each school. Because of the huge fluctuation in the population of each class, we end up with 4545 questionnaires at the end of the survey implementation. Impressively, only 3 questionnaires were discarded because they were not properly filled in. The distribution of the participants according to the cities and the school types is in Appendix I.

1.2 Organization of the Thesis

The following chapter focuses on the discussion of public support and Euroscepticism in the literature. This is an attempt to pinpoint the main characteristics of public support as it is discussed in the literature in Europe. Four approaches, namely, utilitarian, approach, cognitive mobilisation and values approach, domestic politics approach and lastly identity approach are discussed at length to understand the basic building blocs of the EU support. As I noted above the

literature review showed that the issue is complex and it is not possible to come up with a prescription that would be valid for the entirety of Europe, including member states and the candidate states. The historical, social and cultural predisposition of the society and characteristics of individuals play crucial role in determination of public support.

The third chapter is reserved to the discussion of the background of EU-Turkey relations with special reference to the elite's opinion towards the EU throughout the history. The EU-Turkey relations are full of with ups and downs that can be characterised by integration and de-integration periods and they depend on national and international political and economical climate. The opinions of the elite with respect to the EU and characteristics of elite Euroscepticism shows that they are mainly motivated by the national interest discourse that can be characterised by soft type of Euroscepticism. The practice of the EU rather than the idea of it is mainly criticised, this is in line with Turkey's age old Westernisation policies. Besides this points signals a divergence with public opinion, that stress fear of moral degeneration of the society besides nationalist concerns.

In the fourth chapter I will present the results of the field research. The main emphasis is put on the exploration and discovery of the youth's Eurosceptic discourses and hence special focus is put on the revelations of the qualitative data. The results are presented in such a manner that quantitative and qualitative data blend together in order to reach a deeper understanding of the subject matter. Two pillars of Euroscepticism become manifested among the youth one is related to fear of threat to national unity and is expressed through nationalist discourse, while the other is fear of threat to Turkish culture and is expressed in moral degeneration discourse. The results showed that identity theory provides us with a stronger

explanatory tool to understand youth Euroscepticism in Turkey. In the discussion of the two discourses I tried to shed light on the peculiarities of Turkish context and the political sphere in explaining the youth Euroscepticism. Finally, I conclude the thesis by discussing the contributions that this thesis makes to the literature and the possible paths that can be followed by taking into consideration the findings of this thesis.

CHAPTER 2

PUBLIC OPINION AND EUROSCEPTICISM

Public opinion plays a significant role in measuring the legitimacy of a country's government's actions. In the case of countries that are actual members of the EU or that are about to join such a supranational organization, public opinion has a crucial role in shaping the scope and the pace of the integration. We can count several reasons as to why public opinion matters for EU member or candidate countries. Firstly, in the liberal democracies the governments should rely on the popular consent of their performance in order to acquire legitimacy and stay influential in the political arena. "Legitimacy builds upon principles of the authorisation of power-holders, responsiveness in the exercise of power and accountability" (Scharpf cited in Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2005:60). The lack of legitimacy is the signal of democratic deficit and this opposes the founding principles of the EU. Secondly, in line with the first consideration, the issue of EU membership is crucial in partisan debates and electoral appeals, therefore parties have to take the elections and the popular vote into account. Peculiar to the case of Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries is the fact that EU support signifies a mentality change. Support of EU integration means the approval of the systematic change towards democracy and an open market economy, therefore EU support goes hand in hand with legitimacy of drastic change in these countries, hence showing the level of the adoption to capitalism and democracy in the country (Kazimierz and Shabad, 2003: 504). The last but not the least, it should be noted that all the candidate countries hold a

referendum in order to decide about the accession and the final decision of joining the Union based on the result the referendum.

Although joining the Union requires a shift in the Turkish mentality and political culture as well, we see that this change is different from that of the CEE countries because in the case of Turkey, it does not show the adoption of values related to free market economy but rather it is related to affiliation to democracy and toleration of differences.

Despite the importance of the public opinion, it is interesting to note that most of the studies that were conducting after 90's on the CEE countries focus primarily on reporting aggregated survey results and almost none of them analyses the dynamics and determinants of public opinion in depth (Ehin, 2001: 32). After Ehin's article, some researchers' interest on this issue increased, yet the sole topic of interest was on the relationship between party preference and the public opinion, while other interacting variables have been attributed a secondary position. However, the newly emerging literature also shows a deepening of scholarly interests on the subject matter. Some of the concepts and focus points that have attracted the attention of the scholars are identity, perception of threats to national and cultural integrity, or the relation between anti-immigration sentiments on EU support (Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2005; Kritzinger, 2003; Carey, 2002; Cristin and Trechsel 2002; McLaren, 2002).

In this chapter I will focus on the dynamics of public support for and against the European Union, and a special attention will be paid to the factors that contribute to Euroscepticism. I begin by covering the literature on Euroscepticism and consider the categories through which this concept has been understood. Then I outline four approaches that have been adopted in the literature and explain citizens' support or

lack of it for the EU. In doing this I will focus on the determining factors of EU support that scholars have identified in their attempts of explaining Euroscepticism.

2.1. Euroscepticism: Theories and Approaches

The debate over Euroscepticism grew especially after the Maastricht Treaty, which entered into force in 1993 and changed the name of the European Economic Community into European Union. This change in name showed that the already supranational organization was not only an economic association but also a political one. In Maastricht Treaty, after the fall of Berlin Wall, newly independent states of Central and Eastern Europe were added to the list of candidate countries (Müftüler-Baç, 2001: 48). The referenda that were held in those years show that further integration attempts of EU were not welcome by the people of member states².

Taggart and Szczerbiak (2004:3) define *Euroscepticism* as “the idea of contingent or qualified opposition” which incorporates also “outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration.” One of the strengths of this definition is that it is valid not only for EU member countries but also for CEE countries and candidate countries in general. Taggart and Szczerbiak (2002:7-8) emphasize that, “if someone supports the EU as it currently exists and oppose any further integration, then they are effectively Eurosceptic because this is at odds with what is the dominant mode of integration that is going on.” The scepticism of the people emanates from the unforeseeable consequences of an ever-closer European integration process. The sceptic view mainly questions the risk taken by the attempt

² Danish rejection of Maastricht Treaty in 1992, Irish failure to ratify the Nice Treaty in 2001 can be seen popular rejection of further integration (Fidrmuc and Doyle, 2005). Liesbet Hooghe argue that there is a huge discrepancy between elite and public opinion, according to him European integration is an elite led project, public at large oppose the further integration (Hooghe, 2003:282).

of abandoning the already existing legitimised nation state in favour of the uncertain future advantages of integration (Beichelt, 2004:1).

The common question to measure the EU support is to ask the participants the following question: 'if a referendum took place tomorrow on joining the EU, how would you vote: in favour or against. Those who report negative answers to this question are classified as Eurosceptics. In addition, most of the researchers in this subject utilises the data obtained from the European Commission's Eurobarometer Surveys³.

Euroscepticism comes basically in two shapes, Taggart and Szczerbiak differentiate hard and soft version of Euroscepticism. *Hard Euroscepticism* implies outright rejection of the entire project of European political and economic integration and opposition to one's country's joining or remaining a member of the EU. The major argument of the hard Eurosceptics is that EU offends deeply held values or that it is the embodiment of negative values (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2004:3). The *soft Euroscepticism*, on the other hand, involves contingent or qualified opposition to European integration. It may be in two forms: *policy Euroscepticism* and *national interest Euroscepticism*. Policy Euroscepticism is the one that is directed against measures and policies of the EU. Opposition to Euro, as it was the case in Denmark, Britain and Sweden may be examples of this kind of Euroscepticism. National interest Euroscepticism involves one's discourse of defending or standing up for the national interest especially in the agenda of EU related debates (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2004:4).

³ Eurobarometer Surveys assess public opinion on the EU and monitors people perspective regularly. The surveys have been conducted every six months since 1973 in all member states. Some eurobarometer surveys are also conducted in candidate countries as well. The First survey conducted in Turkey is "Candidate Countries Eurobarometer" (CCEB) in October / November 2003 and second is "Eurobarometer 62" Autumn 2004.

The terminology coined by Taggart and Szczerbiak in 2001 was challenged by Kopecky and Mudde in 2002, as the latter came up with a different distinction other than “hard” and “soft” conceptualisation of Euroscepticism. They proposed ‘diffused’ and “specific” support for European integration. By *diffused support* they mean the support for general ideas of European integration, while by *specific support* they mean support for specific practice of European Union. The first conceptualisation differentiates the ‘Europhiles and Europhobes’. *Europhiles* like the idea of European integration and pooled sovereignty, whereas *Europhobes* totally rejects the idea of integration and are sceptic about the loss of national sovereignty. The second conceptualisation separates *EU-optimists* and *EU-pessimists*. It denotes optimism of the direction of the developing EU or pessimism of the way it develops. The euro-pessimists are not necessarily rejecting the EU integration but they propose different formula to further integration (Kopecky and Mudde, 2002:301-302).

Similarly, Beichelt opposes the Taggart and Szczerbiak’s distinction of hard and soft version of Euroscepticism, he argues that the magnitude of the Euroscepticism is not crucial but the quality of it matters. Instead of their distinction he proposes the distinction of *Euroscepticists* and *EU scepticists*. Euroscepticists are those who do not like the idea too much integration into a supranational structure, consequently they also oppose the integration practices. On the other hand EU scepticists are those who do not object the idea of integration but disfavour the way the integration is organised by the EU. He acknowledges that in both of the stances various degrees of scepticisms towards integration are possible, either soft or hard (Beichelt, 2004:4-5).

Lubbers and Scheepers come up with yet another distinction, for them *instrumental* versus *political Euroscepticism* can be differentiated. The first type of

Euroscepticism derives from the perceived gains or loss from EU integration, while the political Euroscepticism derives from the hesitancy that to what extent the policies should be decided on the European level. Political Eurosceptics believe in the strength of the national level decision-making (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2005:224).

When we think of ‘political Eurosceptics’/ ‘Euroscepticists’ / ‘hard Eurosceptics’ / ‘Europhobes’, they all assess the EU by way of their existing set of ideas. Hence, they oppose the EU because they see a close relationship between EU and their previously identified foe: as it is capitalism for communists, socialism for the right, bureaucracy for populists, supranationalism for nationalists or, neo-liberalism for socialists. For ‘soft’, ‘instrumental’, Euro-pessimists or ‘EU-sceptics’ the prospect of EU is doubtful especially when it disturbs interests, policies or issues that they support. However, for the Euro-enthusiasts / Europhiles / Euro-optimists, this is not the case and they support the EU by arguing for solidarity or international cooperation. While the Europhiles support the EU and its integration as a good in itself, Eurosceptics oppose it by referring the already existing and properly identified demons (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2002:8). It is possible to argue that these references to imagined realities that embody a language of threatened national interest, and are very remindful of conspiracy theories make the Eurosceptic arguments very appealing.

I will focus only on the terms that denote Euroscepticism rather Europhilia as in this thesis I am analysing the Eurosceptic discourses. Despite the great number of concepts that have been thrown in, give the impression that scholars are once again in a hair-splitting debate. By taking into consideration the way they have been formulated I don’t see much difference between Kopecky and Mudde’s Euro-

pessimists and Beichelt's EU scepticists as both concepts signify the group that doesn't like the present formula of integration, but is not against integration as such. The same is true for these scholars' respective concepts of Europhobes and Euroscepticists, as the reference is to the group that totally rejects the integration and its practice. I agree with Taggart and Szczerbiak's definition that the group criticizing the current formula of integration is soft Eurosceptic and the group that comes with an outright rejection is hard Eurosceptics. On the other hand, Lubbers and Scheepers' definition of instrumental and political Euroscepticism seems to add a new dimension to the debate as they go beyond the formula of present state of integration and national interests. While I utilise Taggart and Szczerbiak distinction to analyse the attitudes of political actors and intellectuals, Lubbers and Scheepers' concepts will come handy in analysing the youth discourses.

2.2. Dynamics and Determinants of EU Support and Euroscepticism

I will review the literature with regard to public opinion on the issue of EU membership by focusing on the factors that have been pointed out as influential in promoting either positive or negative opinions with regard to the association of one's country with the EU. Four approaches dominate theoretical and empirical explanations of citizens' support for European integration or Euroscepticism. Each approach tests the effect of different independent variables and their capability of explaining part of the EU support. In addition, these variables assess the effect of EU relations but they are not encompassing and sole predictors of EU support, nevertheless they are meaningful in their own context. The dynamics of EU support and Euroscepticism differs in EU member or CEE countries. Nevertheless the

promise of a common future in the EU makes space for a lot of commonalities as well.

2.2.1. The Utilitarian Approach

I will begin with the *utilitarian approach*. This approach gives priority to the calculation of expected economic gains and losses through EU membership. Individuals perceive the EU membership either as an opportunity or as an unfortunate circumstance. Through this approach the relative losers and the winners of EU membership are defined. The underlying assumption is that individuals are making utilitarian calculations of the costs and benefits of EU membership. Therefore, those who think that the EU membership is serving to their interest would support the EU, while those who perceive it as disadvantageous to their own benefit would disapprove of the EU membership (Gabel, 1998:36).

At the micro level analysis both socio-economic determinants and subjective economical conditions play important role in ones calculations of cost/benefit. Highly educated and higher socioeconomic status participants were more likely to support the EU, because in most of the cases they were the first to gain from the EU integration (Gabel, 1998:51-52). Similarly, Kazimierz and Shabad (2003) based on Polish data argued that social class is one of the determining factors of EU Support. According to them, those who had already found a way of gaining from market economy and were expecting further gains from integration were more supportive of the EU integration. Groups like managers and experts or professionals have already benefited in Poland as a result of transition from state socialism to free market economy; therefore they were strong supporters of EU. On the other hand, such social groups as farmers, white colour employees in the public sector and labours

were harmed during the economic transition and therefore, they tended to oppose EU integration. Likewise, Gabel (cited in Ehin, 2001: 35) differentiated the individuals according to their occupational status, and found that lower waged manual workers, that is unskilled workers tended to oppose EU integration, while skilled professionals with high income were more supportive of EU membership. In the same way, Henderson (2001) in her research in the Slovak Republic found that doubts about EU membership were “a reflection of general resistance to modernisation and post-communist economic reform”. She also argued that this attitude was more prevalent among demographic groups which suffered through the transition period such as the elderly, the less educated, the more rural and the more conservative (Henderson, 2001:4). Tucker, Pacek, and Berinsky (2002) made a similar argument in their paper on transitional “winners” and “losers”.

However, Ehin (2001) while analysing his own findings argued that this was mostly the case for Western Europe, and that this explanation was too narrow for CEE countries, since other factors come into play in their case. Besides, in the CEE countries the unemployed or the non-labours also supported the EU, although they did not have any competitive advantage in the market. Their support was based in the belief that the EU embodies the regulative and redistributive norms of European welfare state.

At the macro level analysis, according to Ehin (2001: 34) individuals’ calculate national returns from the EU budget or take into consideration their country’s level of trade while formulating opinion on EU membership. Fidrmuc and Doyle extended this finding to all the economic indicators of a country. According to them high growth rate, low inflation and low employment in the country may also predict the grater support for further EU integration (Fidrmuc and Doyle, 2004:6).

The new trend that Papagiannidis pointed out in Greece can be the example of public consideration of macro level determinants. He sustained that the Greek public opinion is under a downward shift with respect to EU support because of EU's agricultural policies, price-support mechanisms and its structural funds (Papagiannidis, 2005). This is because the EU decided to revise its policy with regard to the benefits of EU member states.

2.2.2 Cognitive Mobilisation and Values Approach

The utilitarian approach tacitly assumes that individuals are aware and knowledgeable about the possible gains or losses of EU integration. However, several scholars argue that this is not the case for most of the individuals. Their approach is called *cognitive mobilisation approach* and it pays explicit attention to the individual's knowledge about the European integration process. Inglehart in the 1970's argued that increased level of information predicts increased support for European integration. Regarding this approach it is assumed that as one's level of information on the EU increases they feel less threatened by the EU (Inglehart, 1970:47; Janssen, 1991:67). Another important basis for knowledge is one's interest to political issues and frequency of engaging in political discussions. In line with the knowledge hypothesis, researchers found that political interest is positively correlated with EU support (Kazimierz and Shabad, 2003).

However, some researchers object to this assumption and propose that the increased level of information may also lead in negative evaluations of EU integration. Fridrmuc and Doyle (2004:32) found an alternative pattern with respect to cognitive mobilisation. According to these researchers greater the knowledge of the EU, the more one can clearly define either positive or negative opinions on the

EU, whereas the respondents with less knowledge are more likely to possess a moderate positive or negative attitude towards the EU.

Some scholars in this approach argue that the *EU is a community of values*. Values related to free market/capitalism and democracy are the key values of differentiation between Central and Eastern, and Western Europe. The iron curtain dividing the two parts of Europe for almost fifty years was not only of military and economic significance, it was also a separation of political and social systems. On each side children were socialised and educated by the norms and standards of the respective part's political ideology (Maier and Rosenmayr, 2000:217). In Eastern and Central Europe, the EU integration has been equated with democratic transition and transition to market economy (Kazimierz and Shabad, 2003). The items prepared to measure the effect of one's affiliation to democracy were prepared by considering the crucial principles of liberal democracy such as protection of minority rights, necessity and legitimacy of political opposition, electoral accountability. Similarly, one's affiliation to capitalism is measured by assumed attitudes towards main characteristics of free market economy such as the existence of a substantial privatised sector in the economy and liberalised labour and consumer market (Kazimierz and Shabad, 2003:521).

Kazimierz and Shabad (2003) came to two crucial conclusions on their analysis of pro-democratic and pro-capitalist values. Firstly, they found that they have statistically significant direct effect on EU support that is the results of logistic regression analysis displayed that effects of other variables, such as class, are washed out in the most of the cases. Secondly, Kazimierz and Shabad's longitudinal study showed that pro-democrats and pro-capitalists were also significantly more likely to maintain their Euro-enthusiasm through time. On the other hand, fluctuations were

more likely to be observed in anti-democrats and anti-capitalists attitudes (Kazimierz and Shabad, 2003: 531).

Ehin's research (2001) revealed contradictory results. He rejected the hypothesis that "the stronger the identification with democratic norms, the greater the likelihood of supporting EU membership" in Baltic countries. Yet interestingly enough, he found evidence for the opposite in the sub-sample of Lithuanians, where statistically significant positive relation were found between authoritarian values and support for EU membership

Some researchers (cf. Jansen, Anderson & Reichert, Gabel, Cited in Ehin, 2001:35) also looked for relationship between cosmopolitan and post-materialist political values that were created especially after Second World War in Europe and support for European integration. Assuming that youth, better educated and highly paid individuals hold more post-materialistic attitudes, researchers failed to find any relationship either for post-materialistic values relation to age and the support of European Union.

2.2.3. Domestic Politics Approach

According to this approach, it is domestic politics rather than individual's calculated behaviour that plays a crucial role in one's formulation of decision to support EU integration. When one assesses the domestic politics, some of the determining factors are party position, party preference, and being satisfied with the incumbent government. Kazimierz and Shabad (2003: 506-507) sustain that these factors play the most significant and direct role in the determination of attitudes towards the EU. If we take into consideration the limited knowledge that they have about European integration, it makes sense for citizens to formulate their views through

intermediaries in the national political realm, such as political parties or the incumbent government (Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2005:62).

Due to its importance in effecting the public opinion party position related to the Euroscepticism has been intensely studied in EU member countries as well as in CEE countries. However, before analysing the effect of party preference on EU support, it is worth here to talk about the features of parties' positions with respect to the EU.

According to Taggart and Szczerbiak Euroscepticism comes from the opposite ends of the left and right spectrum. It brings together unusual coalitions and convergences of ideological forces (Szczerbiak and Taggart, 2000:5). We see that this statement is true in the Turkish context as well; one such convergence is the similar attitudes towards EU among Labour Party and Nationalist Action Party supporters. These two parties were the great antagonists and their respectively opposing views dominated the political scene during the 1970s, and even escalated to street fights and death of their members. During those times one could hardly imagine that these groups would share the same ideological standpoint on any issue (Başkan, 2005: 53). I will talk in detail about the positions of the right and the left wing in Turkey with regard to the EU in the next chapter. The crucial lesson that Taggart and Szczerbiak draw from these "unusual" experiences is that thinking about Euroscepticism in term of its place in the political spectrum is fruitless because "...from communist parties on the far left, through Social Democratic, liberal, agrarian, Christian Democratic, conservative and nationalist and populist parties on the far right, Euroscepticism transcends the left-right spectrum" (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2004:14).

However, if we think of the position of a political party in terms of its location in the centre or periphery, then we notice that parties in the periphery of the spectrum be that either left or right are more likely to be Eurosceptic, while central parties are not. Central parties bear high cost if they assume Eurosceptic stance, because they will be the parties that will be directly involved in negotiations during the accession process, and in general there's consensus about the benefits of the EU (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2004:5). Given that this is the case a Eurosceptic stance would affect negatively a party's voting base. In order to justify the Eurosceptic position of the fringe parties Taggart and Szczerbiak (2004:5) argue that these parties hold a Eurosceptic stance because this contributes to emphasising the difference between themselves and central parties. Furthermore, this strategic and tactical manoeuvre is cost free for them compared to the central parties, and it increases their position of competitive advantage.

As far as party positions are concerned, there are differences in Euroscepticism between Western and Eastern countries and even among the Eastern European countries themselves. So in the Western Europe, among central governmental parties there is no expressed Euroscepticism. It is not the case for Central and Eastern Europe, where many central parties, both in opposition or in government, hold Eurosceptic stance, in the form of soft Euroscepticism. On the other hand all hard Eurosceptic parties are to be located in the periphery of their party systems in Central and Eastern European countries. Another difference is that in Central and Eastern European countries, Euroscepticism is mostly seen in more right wing parties (the nationalists or populist orientation) compared to Western Europe. As far as Eastern European countries are concerned, researchers found that the Baltic countries, Czech Republic, Slovenia and Poland are the countries where

high level of EU skepticism is seen, while Hungary, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania have lower levels of Euroscepticism (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2002).

The effect of party preference is one of the mostly and extensively studied issues in this area. The researchers have tried to establish whether there's a direct relationship between party preference and attitude towards EU? Is it possible to predict the results of EU related referenda from polling data by looking at voter base of Eurosceptic parties? Considering the fact that individuals have very limited information on the issue of EU they would tend to rely on their parties preference.

Party preference gives crucial clues on citizens' political and ideological standpoint. However if it were possible to predict people's attitudes on an issue based on party preference, if such a correlation was proved to be significant, the acquired data would shed light on the predispositions of Euro-enthusiasts and Eurosceptics. Its practicality would be another motivation behind the scholarly interest on party preference as in a democratic regime elections are held regularly. Furthermore, the existence of such a relationship would be functional in affecting parties' policy formulations and attract vote depending on their agenda.

In most of the cases researchers take party preferences through reported votes of the individuals. And parties are grouped according to their manifest attitudes towards EU. For instance Kazimierz and Shabad grouped the parties as "persistent staunch support", "cautious endorsement", and "outright opposition." These labels correspond to Taggart and Szczerbiak's not Eurosceptic at all, soft Eurosceptics and hard Eurosceptics respectively.

However, results of the researches on this issue are quite controversial. For instance, Kazimierz and Shabad (2003:509) reported that individuals are likely to rely on parties as agents to form their opinions about integration. Similarly, Leonard

Ray (2003:987) sustains that party positions do influence public opinion and he goes further to find the intermingling factors and strength of this effect. He says that parties' EU stance can act as a cue for supporters of that party; nevertheless the strength of this effect varies significantly according to the characteristics of the party, national context and of the individual party supporters. Consequently, Ray found that as party unity on the issue of EU increased, the effect of party is also increased; similarly he proved that as the relevance of the issue for the party increases, the persuasiveness of the party on the public opinion is also increases. In terms of the characteristics of the national context, he found that there's a positive correlation between the variation of the position with respect to EU issue and the party preference. The reason for this is the politicization of European issue is ensured through the emergence of different elite opinions or break in the elite consensus, and hence in this circumstance parties' stance matter. As far as for the individuals characteristics: he found that the closer individuals feel to the political party they support, the more they will be affected by the positions taken by that party (Ray: 2003, 987-988).

Contrary to the others, Taggart and Szczerbiak (2002:22) found that there is no simple link between public Euroscepticism and party-based Euroscepticism. That is parties are not simple ciphers of public opinion. They found that "high levels of public Euroscepticism do not necessarily translate into high levels of support for parties expressing Euroscepticism and high levels of support for such parties are not necessarily indicative of high levels of popular Euroscepticism." Bielasiak (2004) supports these findings by arguing that party placement and its perspectives are not consistent predictors of the success of Eurosceptic political entities in CEE.

Taggart and Szczerbiak contemplate on the reasons of misfit between average level of national popular Euroscepticism (11.56%) and the level of support for Eurosceptic parties (5,52%). They note a few reasons for this discrepancy. Firstly, EU being the second order issue in the domestic politics it hardly becomes the sole determinant of the elector decision. Secondly, low levels of support for hard Eurosceptic parties do not necessarily shed light on people attitude towards EU, as it is seen in the referendum results. People who support Europhilic parties may vote “no” in the referendums as it is seen in referendum on Maastricht, the Euro and Nice in Denmark, France and Ireland (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2002:25). Similarly, Midtbo & Hines deriving from the Norwegian referendum and electoral vote found that a causal link did not run necessarily from party to referendum. However, they also note that political parties both affect and are affected by referendum outcomes (Cited in Ehin, 2001:36).

Despite the controversial result it is possible to conclude that parties matter. However, it is hard to identify ‘How do they matter?’ They mediate between public opinion and elite actions but the mechanisms behind are complicated. At this stage we can only agree with Taggart and Szczerbiak who wisely noted that there is no simple link between party preference and attitude towards Europe (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2002:22).

Another important determinant of the EU support is *support of incumbent government*. Ehin (2001:49) found in his research that supporters of government tended to favour EU integration more than those who distrust the government. Similarly, Vreese and Boomgaarden (2005:72) found that positive evaluations of the incumbent government are related to higher support of European integration. However, Fidrmuc and Doyle found opposite results in their consideration of 28

countries including the candidates. They argue that the European citizens no longer obediently follow their governments (Fidrmuc and Doyle, 2005:11). Due to these contradictory findings a similar interpretation to that of the effect of party preference can also be made about the effect of the positive evaluation of incumbent government. It matters but the direction of the effect of the trust to incumbent government varies depending on the other combination factors peculiar to the context. For instance, Çarkoğlu (2003) found that for the Turkish case that AKP's voter base posits low levels of EU support compared to voter bases of parties like CHP or HADEP. I think that a better explanation to Çarkoğlu's finding be explained by the group identity of the individuals.

2.2.4. Identity Approach

This approach focuses on the resilience of the national, cultural or religious identity as an explanatory factor for the existence of the Eurosceptic stance in the public opinion. The argument of this approach is that Euroscepticism emerges from a reluctance to share political power with foreigners (Sanchez-Cuenca, 2000). People formulate the idea of distinction between domestic and foreign by depending on different sources. Some rely on shared cultural experience or common assessment of national performance, or from religious affiliations (Jones and Bijl, 2004:335). In what follows I will discuss each one of these factor in turn.

Carey considered the national identity as important predictor of EU support, and he defined the national identity as the “intensity of the feelings toward one's own country, level of attachment to the nation and other territorial entities” (Carey, 2002:387). By explaining the national identity as intensity he found out that strong national identity leads to a decrease in EU support (Carey, 2002:397). Sanchez-

Cuenca discussed another factor concerning the strength of the national identity on effecting the decision on EU support. It is the perception of one's own nation regarding its institutional capability and comparison of it with that of Europe. According to him individuals are simply assessing the functioning of national institutions; if they evaluate their own countries performance worse than that of Europe then they are more likely to support EU membership. For instance, due to the domestic problems Spaniards are more likely to support the EU than the Danes who are already living in highly developed welfare state (Sanchez-Cuenca, 2000:168). This line of argumentation is supported by the cases of high level of support for EU membership in Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey.

Besides this instrumental look to national identity, some researchers point out the effect of perceived threat that might emanate from EU integration is the main reason of opposition to further integration. Kritzinger indicates that people do not assess Europe and national level separately, but national factors play more crucial role in formulating attitudes towards the EU. She sustains that feelings of threat to the nation state inhibit the support for the EU (Kritzinger, 2003:237). Similarly, deriving from the Swiss data, Christin and Trechsel found out that perceived threat to national interest is an important predictor of support for integration with the EU. The threat is perceived both for national economy and institutional stability of the country and the image of the neighbouring country plays crucial role in the formation of perceived threat. "The more negative the image of neighbouring countries, the higher the perception of threat to national interest" (Christin and Trechsel, 2002:431).

A drastic example for the effect of national identity on the EU support comes from Croatia, who started accession negotiation in 3rd of October 2005 like Turkey. The poll carried out in 2004 September showed that EU support in Croatia fell below

50%, a drastic drop from 78 % recorded in September 2003. The percentage of the EU oppositionists rose from 15 to 41, in the last poll. Vujcic explained this drop by the General Gotovina's persecution by Europe. He is considered a national hero in Croatia, so those that oppose the integration argued that their nation should not support an organisation that treats Croatia in an intolerable way (Vujcic, 2004). Hence, the Croatians regard the EU's position as a threat to their own national values. This is a typical effect of sensitive national issues clashing with the EU demands. I will discuss this extensively in the chapter reserved to the field research, as we see similar reactions in the Turkish case as well.

McLaren, on the other hand, considers the cultural threat as a determining factor of Euroscepticism. Accordingly she argues that "people are hostile towards European project in great part because of their perception of threat posed by other cultures" (McLaren, 2002:551). The threat is felt against other ethnic or national groupings in such a way that the hosting people perceive other groups as exploiting the resources that actually belong to them. Or they feel concerned by the threat that is posed to their culture and way of life from the foreigners (McLaren, 2002:557-8). In-group identity is threatened by EU integration, just as in this case national identity. Vreese and Boomgaarden extend McLaren analysis to immigration discussions. The researchers points out that in the European political sphere anti-immigrant sentiments and the resulting support for populist parties has increased recent years. Immigration related attitudes play crucial role in political opinion formation. The support for the European integration is not an exception and it is deeply influenced by this process. The anti-immigrant sentiments trigger people's willingness to show out-group bias and therefore to oppose further European integration. The researchers found strong support for their hypothesis related to "people holding negative attitudes towards

immigrants are more likely to reject the idea of further European integration” (Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2005:64).

Ehin (2001) argues that cultural influences such as individual’s belief systems play crucial role in ones shaping attitude towards the EU. Religious belief systems may effect individual’s political decisions through effecting their interpretation of political affairs, as some individuals compare the argument for and against EU in the light of religious values (Hagevi, 760-761). In most of the studies, religiosity in the European countries is measured by considering the amount of times of “church attendance” (Hagevi, 2002:763; Szczerbiak, 2002: 34fn).

Hagevi (2002) focuses on the case of religiosity in Sweden, which he defines as a highly secularised society (only one tenth of Swedish society attends church). Yet, he argues that besides the economic factors religion plays significant role in shaping decision on the EU integration. For instance Evangelical Protestants in Sweden tends to perceive the EU integration as a way of “re-Catholicizing” the society. Interestingly enough this position is largely supported by atheists and non-believers who fear the idea of Catholic Europe. Evangelicals, deriving from the biblical interpretations believe that “EU’s founding document – the treaty of Rome- heralds the formation of the coming world empire: the new Rome that will oppress all the peoples of the earth until God takes action and saves the believers....After some time, its leader - the Beast (or Antichrist), whose number is 666- will initiate one of the most evil, destructive, and repressive regimes ever known to mankind” (Hagevi, 2002:760). Religious Eurosceptics in Sweden oppose the EU through finding support to their argument in the Bible to show that EU is Catholic: “A great wondrous sign appeared in heaven: a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet and a crown of twelve stars on her head” (Revelation 12:1 quoted in

Hagevi, 2002:767). Interestingly, the EU has acknowledge this meaning that twelve stars symbolise perfection, and the European Commission add a remark in their web page in Sweden that “the origin of the twelve stars is biblical” (Europeiska kommissionenes representation i Sverige 2001, quoted in Hagevi, 2002:768). Hagevi’s research showed that Evangelicals tend to oppose Sweden’s membership to EU, while mainline Protestant majority have positive attitude towards the EU. The effect of religion both for the supporters and oppositionists shows no relation to demographic variables. That is, demographic factors do not explain the opposition in Evangelicals and positive attitudes among immigrant religions (Hagevi, 2002: 767).

Szczerbiak (2002) came to a similar conclusion as far as religion is concerned when analysing the case of Poland. He sustains that the core religious right, composed of those who go to church several times a week, were more likely to be anti-EU. However, this group was relatively small and besides them it was not possible to make a clear connection between religiosity and attitude towards the EU (Szczerbiak, 2002: 34fn). On the other hand, the Ecumenical Council of Churches in the Slovak Republic promoted the Slovak citizens’ support for the integration in the European Union, arguing that “EU enlargement is a challenge for the internal integration of people and churches in Slovakia” (Ecumenical situation, 2005). In conclusion, the situation seems to be very mixed and the relation between religiosity and support for EU is not very clear, but much of it seems to depend on the national context. Religiosity comprises one of the crucial variables whose effect is intensively studied in the Turkish context. I have given related field researches in the appendix of the thesis.

2.3. Conclusion

In this chapter I outlined the main premises of Euroscepticism and considered the widely discussed approaches to EU support. In doing this I tried to show the contradictions within each approach as dictated by context sensitivity in studying the transnational issue of public opinion regarding the EU integration.

When we consider strength of different approaches to explain the EU support and Euroscepticism I should note that each approach explains the part of the phenomenon. The explanatory strength of each approach comes from either characteristics of national context or that of individual. Therefore, in order to understand the dynamics of the public opinion we should pay explicit attention to the contextual variables such as the country's historical, social and cultural predispositions. Furthermore we should also take the individual relative position in a given society into account, such as his or her socio-cultural background, position regarding the socioeconomic status or the ones' strength of national, religious or ethnic identity.

The next chapter will overview the history of Turkey's relations with European institutions. I will be referring to them as institutions because just as Turkey changed in the past five decades so did the institutions that represented Europe. The historical background aims to set the context for further analysis, while the main focus will be on the actions and attitudes of the political actors, parties and intellectuals that have had an influence in the shaping of the public opinion.

CHAPTER 3

TURKEY'S RELATIONSHIP WITH EUROPEAN INSTITUTIONS

In this chapter I will focus on the history of European institutions - Turkey relations in order to contextualize the discussion that will take place through out the theses. The literature on public opinion in Turkey is quite limited, however based on the assumption that political elites' attitudes contribute to the shaping to some extent of public opinion perspectives on the issue, I will present a brief history of Turkey's relations with the European institutions starting from the time of the first application in 1959. The focus will be on the positions that political personalities and political parties have espoused ever since the beginning of the relationship. I believe that this overview will be helpful in the later discussions in order to understand the diversity of youth opinions.

First of all, in order to avoid confusions I should briefly mention the names of the subsequent institutions that are established during the integration attempts of Europe, as I will make use of the name that is accepted in the corresponding period. During the period between 1957 and 1967, the European adventure was known by the name of European Economic Community (EEC), between the years 1967 until 1993, the year when the Maastricht Treaty was signed, the common term was "European Community" (EC) and from 1993 onwards the name has been the European Union (EU). This differentiation is crucial for analytical purpose, as this differentiation points out to the evolution of the established organisations during

European integration and it is also a differentiation accepted in the literature to avoid confusions, as legally speaking, the three institutions are still existing (Çayhan, 2003: 492).

I will start my discussion with Turkey's membership application to EEC in 1959. Müftüler-Baç summarises the reasons of this application by the following: 1- To obtain concrete results of Turkish westernisation attempts, 2- To provide free entrance of Turkish export products into European market, 3- To find a trigger for the economical growth. The last but also most effective reason was the Greek's application to EEC. Turkey was concerned that the Greeks acquired an advantage that would be utilised against Turkey. Turkey applied for membership just 16 days after the Greek's application (Müftüler-Baç, 2001: 25-26). The EEC offered Turkey an "association status" instead of full membership at that time until its circumstances permits accession because Turkey was assessed to be unfit to join to EEC (Glyptis, 2005: 403). As a result of this application Turkey was accepted a European country that has the prospect of full membership.

At this time period in Turkey, the stand with regard to the EEC was not a united front, as the reasons named by Müftüler-Baç may lead one to suppose. The state departments were divided in their attitude towards the EEC. There was a serious clash between the State Planning Organisation (SPO) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As Birand pointed out The SPO accused the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of selling the country to the European powers and SPO claimed that any partnership with Europe would harm Turkish economical growth. On the other hand the Ministry of Foreign Affairs accused the other party to be religious fanatics. The result of these political skirmishes was that Turkey was not able to formulate a coherent policy toward Europe on the way towards Ankara Treaty (Birand, 1990 cited in Müftüler-

Baç, 2001: 26). Aybey (2004: 23) points out that, besides the religiously oriented, the leftists were also among the groups that dominated the State Planning Organisation. Despite their political divergence, both groups joined forces against the integration with Europe and this is an important factor in explaining the State Planning Organisation's attitude towards EEC.

The Ankara Treaty was signed on the 12th of September 1963 and it entered into force on 1st of January 1964. It aimed at securing economic adaptation and political integration with Europe. It was seen as an instrument for eventual integration of Turkey and EEC, therefore according to this treaty the relationship was envisaged in three stages: preparatory period, transitional period and final period.

Since Turkey was not eligible for membership, it was decided that a preparatory stage was needed, yet this first stage brought no obligation to Turkey, and it was more of preparatory stage for the EEC so that it would organize the financial aids to be given to Turkey. The second stage was the transition stage in which both sides were to eliminate all barriers to trade, the final period was the last stage that would bring about the customs union (Aybey, 2004: 22). The period that will end with the customs union were planned to last at least 12 years to 22 years at most (Müftüler-Baç, 2001: 29). According to Çayhan (2003: 478-479), while EEC wanted to establish a trade treaty between European countries, Turkey emphasised the formation of Customs Union, in that time. Çayhan (2003:479) concludes that the entrance of Turkey to the Customs Union in 1996 is just the achievement of the procedures that were started in 1964.

3.1. Mid-1960s: the Initial Period

In the initial period, more precisely in the second half of 1960's, in Turkey-EU relations almost all the parties were pro EU, except for Turkish Labour Party (TİP). Justice Party (AP), Republican People's Party (CHP), Republican Peasants Nationalist Party (CKMP) and the New Turkish Party (YTP) assumed pro-EU attitude because they thought that the economic integration would lead to political integration in the near future (Çayhan, 2003: 481). CHP, whose main ideological position was in favour of democracy, Westernisation and secularisation, considered support for EEC to be in concurrence with its own political standpoint. CKMP, similarly to the other nationalist parties, was a supporter of Kemalism and it saw Westernisation as an ideal. CKMP was also enthusiastic about Turkey's membership in NATO, as this contributed to the strengthening of the above mentioned ideal, in other words being an ally to the West through membership in the most prominent Western organisations was a supplement to the fight against the threat of Communism. Thinking along these lines, CKMP supported the Ankara agreement (Güneş-Ayata, 2003: 208).

On the other hand, TİP while outside of the parliament, strictly criticised the formation of partnership with EEC by a "No to Common Market" declaration on 14.09.1963. TİP emphasized that EEC was aiming at the continuation of exploitation with new methods (Çayhan, 2003: 481). What follows is a part of this declaration:

We are completely against the signing of the Common Market Agreement which is being treated as if it were a great feast. Even if the hopes for monetary help, little benefits now and there, and loans could come true,- that in fact even these will be repaid sooner or later with due interests by our proletarian people – as a long run enterprise, the Common Market will produce result against our independence and the proletariat. The Common Market is a customs union, (a cartel) agreement that aims to penetrate and dominate and it is organised by the French, German, Italian, Belgian, Dutch, and Luxembourgian

financial monopolists. The aim of the Common Market is to continue colonialism in a new shape. For a country that is underdeveloped, like Turkey, to participate in such a partnership and to expect to benefit from it, is no different than for a lamb to expect to live in the mouth of the wolf (TİP'in "Ortak Pazara Hayır!", cited in Çayhan, 2003: 481).

3.2. 1970s: The Additional Protocol

As I have noted earlier, Turkey's relation with EEC/ EC was divided into stages with the Ankara Treaty, the additional protocol signified the end of the preparatory stage and the beginning of transitional period. The protocol was signed in 1970 and entered in force at the beginning of 1973. The period that started with the additional protocol is significant because both Turkey and EEC were supposed to harmonise the economic policies and to mutually and cumulatively reduce the tariffs as well as reduce the commodities within 12 to 22 years, as two separate lists (Aybey, 2004: 23). However, as Müftüler-Baç points out, the signing of this protocol became the symbol of the worsening of the relations between Europe and Turkey. Both Europe and Turkey failed to adhere to protocol's articles on mutual balance in economical relations. She points out three more external reasons that enhance the worsening of relations: 1-The increase of the number of the member state from 6 to 9 in 1972; 2 - The Oil Crisis in 1973; and 3- Cyprus crisis in 1974.

The admission of the new member states affected Turkey's candidacy because they believed that Turkey's membership was not crucial for the EC. The Oil Crisis resulted in the EC giving priority to petrol producing countries. Lastly and most importantly, the Cyprus crisis brought about the beginning of serious problems between Turkey and the EC. The inability of the EC to solve the Cyprus crises within the principle of equal distance to Greece and Turkey aroused suspicions in the Turkish government; the EC was implementing Christian - European discriminatory

policies against Muslims – Turks, very much remindful of the last days of the Ottoman Empire. The government begin to think that EC were acting like the instrument of Greek and English governments (Müftüler-Baç, 2001: 35).

In 1978, Bülent Ecevit's government froze the relations and the terms of the Association Agreement one-sidedly. While the Demirel government was trying to find ways to re-establish the relations, Turkey experienced yet another military coup on 12th September 1980. With this development, in addition to the Greek veto, the EC also froze the relations and delayed the forth financial protocol and direct economic aid to Turkey (Aybey, 2004: 25).

As far as party positions towards EC are concerned, the 1970s brought in new developments. At the very beginning of the relation with Europe, TİP was the only party expressing negative attitudes. 1970 and onwards, other parties who were also criticising the process emerged, however these parties did not reject the unification process totally but mainly express their anxieties especially in terms of economical adaptation in the integration with Europe. According to Çayhan (2003: 482), the reasons behind AP, CHP, and National Trust Party's (MGP) hesitation was not due to their rejection of EU but rather, due to scepticism about the timing of the transition period, they were suspicious about Turkey's readiness to assume responsibilities in the period of relations with the EC. Güneş-Ayata (2003: 213) argues that 1970's economic difficulties made CHP even more sceptical towards Europe. Because of these reasons Ecevit's government questioned Turkey's place in European Community and among Western alliance, and decided to cool down the relations with EC. At that time, besides the government, labour unions, leftist parties and business organisations were also sceptic toward Europe.

One of the parties that actively criticised Turkey's relations with Europe was the National Order Party (MNP), which was established in 1970 by Necmettin Erbakan. Çayhan (2003: 483) argues that this party's standpoint expressed by Erbakan in 1970 did not change in the successive years and parties that followed the National Outlook tradition, namely National Salvation Party (MSP), Welfare Party (RP), and Virtue Party (FP). We see that the Anti-European institutions discourse is systematically constructed throughout the 30 years of the National View tradition. In Erbakan's words:

Turkey's social structure, worldview, historical consciousness and experiences are inconsistent with Turkey's membership of a political entity of Western states. There is a disproportion in material possibilities and population numbers. Such unification will result in Turkey being subsumed by the community of western states... A common market between Turkey and Western states would result in Turkey's colonisation and would make Turks labourers of the west (Doğan, 2005: 424).

Or

The Common Market is a three stories house. On the top floor sit the Zionist capitalists. In the middle floor the Europeans, today they are the civil servants of the [Zionist] capitalists. And when it comes to the first floor, they need servitors and workers, that's why they are trying to attract Turkey to this ground floor (cited in Çayhan, 483).

The extreme nationalist wing, which is represented by Nationalist Action Party (MHP) differs from the religious wing as in the former we cannot trace a continuation in their approach to Europe. Unlike the National Outlook tradition, MHP's opinion evolved from negative to positive attitude towards European Community (Çayhan, 2003: 483). During the 70's MHP assumed a position similar to that of MNP towards EC. In Alpaslan Türkeş's words:

Our enterprise with the Common Market will be a serious obstacle on our path to industrialisation. It is impossible for our country to compete with the industrialised countries that make up the Common Market, when we take into account such factors as the costs of the

establishment and the time required to gain experience. We are absolutely against a common market that will allow foreigners to acquire land in whatever location and of whatever size that they wish, hence permitting the implementation of the Sevres Treaty, a common market that will lead to cultural and social deformations, and one that will prevent our cultural development (cited in Çayhan, 2003:484-5).

The 70s were tumultuous years for Turkey and the problems in local and foreign politics and economy took precedence over the implementation of the agreements with the European Community. Therefore, the relationships with European Community were in crisis and the situation wasn't altered much during the 80s.

3.3. 1980s: Trials and Tribulations

After the 12th September 1980 coup, political issues such as the lack of democratic regime and human rights violations were added to Turkey's economical problems. The political situation was harshly criticised by EC, who proceeded to freezing the relations with Turkey. The irony of the circumstances was that as Glyptis (2005:404) notices, during the rule of the generals Turkey moved a step closer to satisfy EEC economic criteria, but now this was not enough. EC froze all aid and negotiations until civilian rule had been restored.

In the early 80s Turkey executed radical economical reform by overtly abandoning etatist models in economy. Hence the Turkish economy shifted from the autarchic import-substitution model to an economy open to operation of market forces. Therefore, when civilian government come to power in 1983, the road was paved for the adaptation of the European economic demands.

After the elections in 1983, and during the Özal period, European Community - Turkey relations were restarted. In 1986, Özal gave a central place to the issue of EC membership in his political agenda (Müftüler-Baç, 1997: 83). He submitted a

formal application for full membership on April 14, 1987. Aybey (2004: 26) points out that, for the first time there was a wide consensus in the domestic sphere over membership to EC among different political and economical elite groups. For instance, the Social Democratic People's Party (SHP) for the sake of counterbalancing the military power, became a strong Euro-supporter to defend human rights, democracy and multiculturalism in Turkey (Güneş-Ayata, 2003:213). The nationalist MHP's attitude towards European Commission changed as well. During the 80s they defined their enemy as communism and the Communist Block and decided to be ally against communism with Western Europe and began to assume positive attitudes towards Europe (Çayhan, 2003:486). During this period, the only party that still persisted in its anti-EC attitude is the Welfare Party of Erbakan. In this period Erbakan declared again that government's attempts to gain entry to the Common Market for Turkey would eventually make Turkey a province of the EC hence resulting in its isolation from the Muslim world and in Turkey's political unification with the West (Doğan, 2005: 425).

Despite the efforts of the Turkish politicians, in the December of 1989 the EC refused Turkey's application, on the grounds that the Community needed deepening rather than enlarging. Considering the fact that Portugal, Spain recently became member country in 1986, this diplomatic explanation sounded reasonable. However, Müftüler-Baç (2001:39) cites David Barchelard speech in 1985, and argues that economic, cultural, demographical and geographical disparities were the underlying reasons for this refusal.

3.4. 1990s: The Customs Union

Beginning with the 90's EC-Turkey relations became closer. The first half of the 90's is marked by the efforts on the establishment of Customs Union on the both sides. Finally, Turkey-EU Association Council in its 36th meeting on March 6, 1995 took the decision of establishing the Customs Union. And this decision was entered into force on December 31, 1995. Turkey became the first country to enter into Customs Union without being the full member of EC. This meant that Turkey would not be able to effect the decision making process of EC with regard to trade policy. Furthermore, agriculture, free movement of labour, services and the capital were not included into the Customs Union. The next year's economic indicators of trade between Turkey and Europe, after the signing of Customs Union showed that, Turkey's import rose by 34,7 % and export rose by 3.6 %. Being Turkey's biggest trading partner, the EC's share became 52.9% in imports, and 49.5% in exports (Aybey, 2004:27). Besides the economic implications Çayhan (2003: 479) points out that the entrance of Turkey to Customs Union in 1996, can also be interpreted as important step forward in political integration.

During the 90s most of the political parties share the view that Turkey should actively pursue full membership in the EC. It is only the Islamists that persist in their definition of Turkish national identity with reference to Islamic civilization, while constructing the European identity as an opposition to the domestic one. The RP, "considered Turkey's membership of European community to be the last stage of the imitative Westernisation movement that began with the Tanzimat" (Duran, 2004:128)

Among the other political parties there was a great discord on the policy that should be followed with regard to the Customs Union. The government was a result

of the coalition between True Path Party (DYP) and Republican People's Party (CHP), who were in favour of Customs Union because they see it as crucial step towards full membership. The opposition parties in the parliament namely, Motherland Party (ANAP), Democratic Left Party (DSP), Nationalist Action Party (MHP), Welfare Party (RP), Great Union Party (BBP), criticised the governments position, because they insisted that being a part of the Customs Union but not a full member in the Community would mean that Turkey would be allocated less funds than a full member. In addition, they were sceptic about the problems that would arise because of the exclusion from the decision making process. They also argued that the responsibility of obeying the decisions of EU would create problems with the third countries (Çayhan, 2003:487).

Particularly MHP sustained that Customs Union would put Turkey into a disadvantageous position in economic relations with Central Asian Republics (Çayhan, cited in Güneş-Ayata, 2003:211). In the beginning of 90's MHP changed its positive attitude towards the EC and took a more Eurosceptic stance, which became more pronounced in the issues of sovereignty, security and national identity. Scholars, (cf. Güneş-Ayata 2003:211) argue that these developments were caused by the changes in international and national arena. Firstly, the fall of Communist Block made it unnecessary to worry about Communism; therefore the alliance with Western Europe against communism became redundant. The independence of Turkic states gave rise the possibilities of new political and economic alliances where Turkey plays a leading role with its experience of democracy and market economy. Alliance with the states in Central Asia seems to have been particularly appealing for MHP as this means putting a stronger emphasis on the origins of Turkish people in the Central Asia.

Even though it was celebrated in some circles, Customs Union gave rise to a lot of criticism from some Kemalist intellectuals. For instance, Manisalı argues that the Additional Protocol of 1970's was successful in establishing balance in the relation between Turkey and EC, however Customs Union shifted it on behalf of EC's interest one-sidedly. In Additional Protocol, 22 years of transitional period were reserved for full membership; Customs Union was the indispensable part of the full membership. However, EU and the government did not even talk about the full membership of Turkey in the Association Council. Manisalı sustained that government made Turkey dependent on EU one-sidedly. The government, the bureaucracy, business circles and the media were hiding this reality by releasing false news as Turkey is becoming a full member state, and getting into the Customs Union was shown to be one step forward to the membership (Manisalı, 2002: 128-129). The debates about the Custom Unions are still alive today and they come on and off the agenda, and they are a favourite topic especially for the nationalist Left.

The 1990s marked a change in the relationship between the European Community and Turkey because the economy became secondary to political issues. The political demands of Copenhagen Criteria of 1993, and the Association Participation Document stressed multiculturalism and minority rights at a time when the Turkish state was trying to deal with ethnic and religious minority issues, specifically the Kurdish question, Alevi identity politics and Armenian religious schools. The nationalists and especially MHP accused Europe of underestimating Turkey's security problems. They argued that EU was favouring ethnic nationalism that tried to promote a 'federalisation of Turkey' (Güneş-Ayata, 211-212). But even under these circumstances MHP did not argue for a complete abandonment of the European path. They came up with the typical Eurosceptic argument: "Turkey

should enter as an honourable and respected member and not as a crippled one” (Güneş-Ayata, 2003:212). Devlet Bahçeli said the following words during the time he was in government as part of the coalition, yet they nicely depict MHP’s concern that persisted during the 90s:

The European countries talk about citizenship and political equality, but for many years our country has dealt with the separatist-destructive activities, hence when they request “minority rights” this is impossible to make sense of. It is impossible to uphold that the European Commission is working in good faith. It is impossible for Turkey to be enthusiastic about “cultural” or “ethnic” rights that will fuel the ethnic struggle and separation (cited in Çayhan, 2003:488).

Similarly, the Welfare Party was also against the signing of the Turkey-EU Association Council’s Customs Union decision of in 1995. They held the government responsible for paving the way to “economic destruction and loss of political independence in taking Turkey into the Customs Union on the basis of one sided concession” (Doğan, 2005: 426). Nevertheless, when Ciller invited Erbakan to join her government as the minor partner of the coalition, he did not turn her down.

In the July of 1997, Commission communicated the report “Agenda 2000: For a Stronger and Wider Union”, which was followed by the Luxembourg Summit in December 1997. Succeeding the proposals of the mentioned report Turkey was not included in the list of candidate countries (Müftüler-Baç, 2001: 49). According to the decision taken in this summit Hungary, the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovenia, Estonia, Cyprus (the Greek side) would start accession negotiation in the spring of 1998, Romania, Bulgaria, Slovakia, Latvia and Lithuania would start the negotiation after a related decision was taken by the Commission (Aydoğan, 2002:150).

The Luxembourg summit signified the beginning of yet another period of stagnation in EU - Turkey relations because, in contrast to Turkey’s expectations,

Turkey was not mentioned among the Eastern European countries to start accession negotiations. In Luxembourg summit it was declared that even if Turkey was eligible for EU membership, but this did not guaranty the EU commitment with respect to Turkey's accession. Furthermore, according to the paragraph 35 of the Luxembourg declaration, Turkey membership was conditional upon establishment of stable and satisfactory relationship with Greece (Uğur, 2003:167-8).

McLaren and Müftüler- Baç argue that many Turks, including the elites began to believe that religious and cultural reasons were the main obstacles in front of Turkey's candidacy rather than the problems in economy and the political system (McLaren and Müftüler- Baç, 2003:202, McLaren, 2000:127). This belief was derived particularly from the fact that the EU accepted Romania's candidacy more easily than Turkey's candidacy, despite the fact that Romania's GDP/capita was approximately half that of Turkey, and Turkey and Romania were standing almost in equal terms with respect to developments in democracy.

Survey of press archives, and McLaren's survey results shows that the result of Luxemburg Summit produced a lot of discontent among the elites in Turkey. They condemned EU for being discriminatory and unjust in the exclusion of Turkey from the list of candidate countries (Wood, cited in Aybey, 2004: 30, McLaren, 2000:127). Subsequently Mesut Yılmaz, the leader of ANAP, and member of the coalition government at that time gave a speech to New York Times and said that "the reasons that EU put forward in order to exclude Turkey from the enlargement are false" while "the true reason is religious discrimination" (Milliyet, cited in Aydoğan, 2002:151).

In 1999, during the Helsinki Summit Turkey's candidacy for membership was acknowledged by the EU leaders. Aybey (2004:31) counts four reasons that

account for this positive outcome. Firstly, EU wanted to repair its relationship and degraded image with Turkey that was created after Luxembourg Summit. Secondly, the coalition government in Germany worked hard for Turkey's candidacy. Thirdly, the Greek attitude altered towards Turkey, especially due to the earthquake; and lastly, the pressure exerted by the US for Turkey's candidacy.

According to Mehmet Uğur (2003:166-7), the Helsinki Summit addressed the incomplete nature of the contract between EU and Turkey. Until Helsinki the relationship with Europe was full of with uncertainty, but after the Helsinki decisions the uncertainties on Turkey's obligations were reduced. As a consequence of the Helsinki Summit and its clear messages, "societal input" was included into the debate. The increased involvement of the public into the debate reduced government's top-down attitudes and unaccountable reflexes on the issues of EU. The results of the Helsinki Summit gave the impression that the EU prospect was real in the eyes of the Turkish public and elite opinion. Furthermore, the Helsinki Summit affected the expectations in Turkey; its outcomes showed both anti and pro EU groups in Turkey that the country needed to undergo radical change in its foreign policy and make a lot of democratic reforms in order to be an EU member. Kazimiers and Shabad (2003: 503) support this view by arguing that the debates over costs and benefits of membership became more intense, as the EU entry becomes closer. Therefore, Helsinki Summit can be seen as the turning point with respect to public interest into the issue of EU in Turkey.

As noted earlier in this chapter Islamists were the main Eurosceptics from the beginning of EU-Turkey Relations. The parties that belonged to the National Outlook tradition followed their anti-EU stand until 1999. Despite the fact that it was

a continuation of this tradition, Virtue Party abandoned its negative attitude toward EU and western democracy after the Helsinki Summit.

According to Güneş-Ayata (2003: 216-7), two successive events lead into this change. The first was the '28 February Process' that denotes the fall of the coalition of Welfare Party and the True Path Party, because of the memorandum of National Security Council. The second was the closure of the Welfare Party by the constitutional court and consequent loss of vote in the following election. This dramatic failure made them question their identity and search for new alliances. The liberal rules of the EU that about the personal freedom such as the abolishment of the ban on the headscarf made the EU support more appealing for them. In addition, EU's criticism of the anti-democratic political sphere, i.e., more concretely seen in terms of the influence of military in the politics in Turkey may form the more important reason of this shift about the perspective on EU.

After the 28th February 1997 the Virtue Party (FP), the new name for the shut down Welfare Party, began to overtly declare their support for the EU. They deliberately emphasise the issues of democratisation, human rights, and personal liberties. From that point on, FP began to criticise the ban on headscarf as matter of human rights violation, rather than legitimising their demand in Islamic terms. Islamists began to criticise the Kemalist project for its shortages in the functioning of democracy and the rule of law. According to the Islamists, democracy must be consolidated constitutionally, that secures liberties and rights, especially the ones regarding religious practices and freedom of thought and expression. They also emphasised other pillars of liberal democracy such as superiority of civilians over army, supremacy of law and the depiction of the state as the servant of the people

(Duran, 2004:128). Head of Virtue Party, Recai Kutan's words nicely illustrates this shift:

The general inclination in Turkey is to have Turkey join the EU as soon as possible. We as the Virtue Party, think that this particular accession is very important. And we believe that as long as Turkey joins the EU, the implementation of some perspectives will also be easily practiced in Turkey as it is in Europe. That is the implementation of democracy, human rights and freedoms at their highest stage...(Kutan, cited in Çayhan, 2003:487)

Kutan explained the radical shift in the following way: they had rejected the European Economic Community and European Community on the grounds that at that time it was a Christian Club, with a monist and Euro-centric culture. But at the present, the EU emphasised multiculturalism, equality and a political approach with stress on individualism (Duran, 2004: 133). Yet among many important personalities, especially from the Kemalist-Republican tradition, these changes in the Virtue Party discourse were only rhetorical, they were still sceptical about the close relations with the EU (Doğan, 2005: 427).

On the other hand, the Islamist intellectuals showed diversity in terms of their position with regard to the EU in the period following '28 February Process'. Three stances became particularly visible: support, denial and hesitation (Duran, 2004). Some of them supported the EU, because they considered "Turks' movement to the west" as unfinished project. "Turks have always looked to Europe, not to Asia, and the Ottoman State failed in Paris, London and Berlin. The revival of the Ottoman mission will manifest itself in Brussels, Vienna and Rome... The history of Europe is the history of Ottomans" (Gürdoğan, Cited in Duran, 2004: 136). The argument was that Turkey cannot stay out side of the globalising tendencies, therefore has to integrate with Europe.

The Islamist that adopt a rejectionist stance, conversely believed that EU membership would not bring about democratisation and human rights, the central powers of the world capitalism would not allow any extension of privileges such as human right and freedoms to the peripheral countries. Turkey was singled out by the EU because of the hegemony rivalry between Europe and US. Turkey would serve to the EU with its army to defend European borders in this rivalry of hegemony. Others Islamic intellectuals rejected the EU integration, because they believe that Turkey was under deep colonisation. Turkey searched for its salvation through Europe, because of the taste of false happiness that was felt under this colonisation. Furthermore, Islamists argue that unlike the other great civilisations such as, Mesopotamia, Egypt, China, India, the Aztec and Inca, the European civilisation acquired its strength by challenging spirituality, nature and the idea of creation. Therefore, integration to the EU would mean the departure of Turkey from the spirituality, nature and the creator (Duran, 2004:136-139). Furthermore, some of the Islamist considers some points of Copenhagen criteria such that emphasising minority rights as a revival of Serves Treaty. In addition, the stances of some European politicians on Kurdish nationalism, Turkish genocide of the Armenians and the Cyprus question makes some Islamists equate the EU's role with the European Crusade mentality.

Providing examples of the hesitation line of thinking, Fokas (2004:157) cites a Muslim intellectual who said that the EU membership does not present a threat to Islamic identity, but it may negatively affect Turkish family values. Making a similar argument an Islamist journalist said: "there will be problems: I am concerned about our souls, because the European way of life, sex, drugs, etc. will definitely come here. These problems are contagious, and I am not sure that they will be controlled if

they come to a society like Turkey” (cited in Fokas, 2004:157). Typical of this approach to the European Union is the focus on the morality issue: “A self-confident Muslim is not afraid of interaction with Europe. But a two ways relationship must be established. Such a relationship can not exist when Turkey feels itself to be a passive follower of Euro-centric development; the important thing is our dignity. We can’t sacrifice our own values, and culture, in our relations. We would prefer dignity rather than wealth” (cited in Fokas, 2004:158). Those who are hesitant towards the EU, say yes to the EU integration with half-heartedly. They approach the EU issue more pragmatically because of the authoritarian atmosphere of 28 February process and related gains with respect to empowerment of civil society and democratisation. However, they also feel the fear of assimilation of Muslim Turkey into the European secular culture. According to them, the marginality of the religion in the secular culture can not be accepted in Islam (Duran, 2004:136-139).

3.5. 2000s: Fast Forward to Europe

Following the 1999 general election Democratic Left Party (DSP), Nationalist Action Party (MHP) and Mother Land Party (ANAP) formed a coalition government. Several scholars (cf. Heper and Baskan, 2001; Başkan, 2005) note that this coalition government had the longest lifetime and despite the fact that they are coming from different (better to say opposite) ideological backgrounds they were quite successful in cooperation and working in harmony. The MHP, DSP and ANAP coalition prepared the national program for the adaptation of the EU *acquis communitare*, and they formulate sound economic policies and take crucial steps to deal with Turkey’s neglected structural problems (Başkan, 2005: 64). Indeed, it is acknowledged that the promising performance of Turkey in the way to EU

membership, during AKP government owes a lot to MHP, DSP and ANAP coalition government.

This coalition government amended 34 articles in the Constitution, nearly one fifth of the total constitution. These articles were related to improving the human rights, strengthening the rule of law and restructuring the democratic institutions. Furthermore, a new civil code came into force in 2002, improving freedom of association and assembly; in addition to that gender equality and child protection were ensured, at least on the paper. Other legislative packages were introduced on enhancing freedom of the press, thought and expression. During this period, despite the quarrels, among amended articles we can count the ban on death penalty, the reinforcing measures to prevent torture and ill treatment and the lifting of legal restrictions on individual cultural rights (Glyptis, 2005: 405). Başkan (2005: 66) says that these parties came together for the promotion of the long term interest of the country, and they made important steps forward in Turkey's EU relations. The deeds of this coalition gain particular importance especially if one keeps in mind the slow work of the past coalition governments.

MHP's attitude towards EU while it was an incumbent requires special attention. MHP did not oppose the principle of EU membership but strongly criticised the integration process even when they were part of the coalition government. MHP claims that "it has never been against Turkey's membership of the EU but has questioned whether Turkey should accept every condition of the Union", such as lifting of the death penalty and allowing broadcasting and education in mother tongues other than Turkish (Başkan, 2005:62). In other words, the MHP supports Turkey's membership of the EU provided that this membership does not pose a threat to the unitary structure of the Turkish state. The approach of MHP to

the EU poses a dilemma, or can be interpreted as ‘terms in contradiction’ when we consider the founding principles of EU. As Öniş (2003:11) pointed out EU is a trans-national organisation and it poses serious threat to any nation state and its sovereignty, it tries to transcend the borders of nation state and it tries to abolish its power by supporting decentralisation attempts.

In February 2002, European Commission Representative, Karen Fogg’s e-mail account was hacked into and her private exchanges were published in newspapers. Çarkoğlu (2004:24) comments that this event created a nationalist reaction in the public opinion at that time, as according the wide spread belief Fogg and her colleagues were working against the national interest of Turkey. This event affected the public opinion negatively and gave a basis to Eurosceptic attitudes. In general the last semi-decade we have witnessed harsh criticisms of EU especially motivated by nationalist stance both on the left and on the right of the political spectrum, but I will dwell more deeply on the dynamics of this opposition as one of the main pillars of Turkish Euroscepticism in the discussion chapter.

The result of November 3, 2002 general elections brought to power the Justice and Development Party (AKP) as a single party. The AKP was a relatively new party, whose program included many references to the EU accession process and they followed the path of reform that was started by the previous government. The government’s program stated that full membership into the EU was their most important objective, in order to carry out the economic and democratic progress (58th Government’s Program cited in Doğan, 2005:429).

Erdoğan, while promoting his government’s EU stance with respect to its foreign policy, maintained that the EU was not a geography but a model that has no

political alternative in promoting democratisation (Duran, 2004:135). In line with this thinking, he said:

I appreciate the importance of pluralism, variety and tolerance. As a requirement of my beliefs, I have set my political ideals as democracy, freedoms, tolerance, basic human rights, secularism and political participation and I know that we have to go hand in hand with other countries of the world in furthering both technological advance and democratic values (Duran, 2004:134).

Doğan (2005:429) also notes that AKP was insistent in its stance that the aim of economic and democratic progress will be maintained even if the objective of EU membership failed. Consequently, European Commission's 2002 Progress Report declared that Turkey accomplished a lot of political and economical reforms to meet EU criteria, however the report concluded that the political criteria were not fully met and the implementations of the amended legalisations were lacking (Glyptis, 2005: 406).

Copenhagen Summit held on December 13, 2002 was yet another turning point in the EU Turkey relations. Erdoğan, the head of AKP, insisted on getting a date for the beginning of accession negotiations, while the EU hesitated to do so. The decision that came out was that "if the European Council in December 2004, on the basis of a report and a recommendation from the Commission, decides that Turkey fulfils the Copenhagen political criteria, the European Union will open accession negotiations with Turkey without a delay" (Aybey, 2004:35). This declaration was met with great disappointment in Turkey, Erdoğan expressed his discontent by saying that "Turkey has been at the doors of the EU for forty-one years, can no longer be kept waiting". He also added that all this was happening because Turkey belonged to a different civilisation (Glyptis, 2005:406). Hughes (2004:6) noted that many Turks expect rejection no matter what they do, and the European Union is

perceived as standing out of reach, despite the claims that negotiations were to be started in the very near future.

On the 6th of October 2004 the report of the Commission was the most positive that has ever released and it recommended the EU summit to start the accession negotiation with Turkey. In December 2004 leaders' summit set the date of October 3, 2005 as the start day of accession negotiations. These developments had a positive effect on the Turkish public opinion as far as the EU integration process is concerned. The Turkish media greeted these events by using headlines like "The Second Great Turkish Revolution"⁴ (Hurriyet, 2004) and "Let it be Auspicious, More Power to Your Elbow"⁵ (Radikal, 2004).

However, refusal of EU constitution in the French referendum on 29th of May 2005, and the same result for the Dutch referendum on June 1, 2005 raised questions marks with respect to the political developments in the Union. According to the report provided by the Post-Referendum Survey (2005:18) in France only six percent of the negative vote can be explained by the opposition to Turkey's admission in the EU. Nevertheless Turkey's membership was questioned more harshly by the political elite in Europe, particularly France and Austria claimed that they will hold referendums on whether to endorse Turkey's accession treaty (BBC News, 2005).

In September 2005 Germany's election took widespread coverage in the press, due to its close relation to Turkey's membership into the EU. Christian Democrats party leader Angela Merkel in her election campaign emphasised her party's policy towards Turkey, focusing on the proposal of giving Turkey a privileged partnership rather than full membership to EU. On the other hand, the Chancellor Schroeder insisted on the importance of having Turkey as a full member,

⁴ İkinci Büyük Türk Devrimi

and Turkey just before the date of decision of the accession talks was once again at the centre of the European politics. On the 3rd of October 2005 Turkey officially started the long awaited accession negotiation, despite the last minute quest of Austria against this accession.

3.6. Conclusion

In this chapter I focused on the Turkey – European institutions relations starting from the Turkey’s membership application in 1959. From that time on these relations were characterised by ups and downs, in correspondence with both country’s domestic political climate and European institutions’ evaluations of Turkey. In the over all analysis, regarding the political elite opinion we see a positive attitude towards EU integration throughout the history. The opinions towards the European institutions were mainly formulated according to the countries internal dynamics and domestic politics.

The scepticism towards EU appears in the form of national interest and the discourses of Euroscepticism tend to focus on the practice of the EU integration. Some political actors’ discontent regarding the EU membership can be seen as soft version of Euroscepticism as it is discussed in the literature. Hard versions of Euroscepticism are almost non-existent among political elites, including the elites of the religious parties. However, some Muslim intellectuals express their sceptic visions with respect to the idea of Europe and cultural threat that would possibly emanate from western culture. While in the popular discourse cultural concerns take up a lot of space, the political actors prefer to stick at critiques of practices of integration in terms of economic effects and national interest. The next chapter, I will

⁵ Hayırlı Olsun, Kolay Gelsin

discuss the main threads that make up youth's Eurosceptic discourse and will also explore the dynamics of youth Euroscepticism as articulated in this discourse.

CHAPTER 4

UNDERSTANDING THE YOUTH EUROSCEPTICISM

The discussions in the previous chapter situate the historical milieu in which the Eurosceptic discourses have been growing. The focus was on the political actors, political parties and intellectuals that contributed to the articulation of these discourses. Even though there is no clear proof in the literature that elite opinion shapes the opinion of the rest of the society, I think that still elite interpretation of the political, social and historical context influences the way the debates are shaped in the society at large. Therefore, despite the divergences, there are parallels between youth's interpretation of the relationship of Turkey and the European Union and that positions held by the actors of the public sphere.

In this chapter I will illustrate the main dynamics of youth Euroscepticism by discussing research results in detail. I will begin by briefly describing the sample of the survey so that we can locate the main characteristics of the population that we are contemplating on. Subsequently, I will proceed to the discussion of survey results, in order for us to see the place of Euroscepticism among the youth in general. This part mainly considers the 'yes' and 'no' answers to the possible membership of Turkey to the EU. However, the in-depth analysis of youth's motivations through qualitative techniques showed that the phenomenon is more complex one. Therefore in the last part, I will consider the dynamics of Euroscepticism under two major headings: one is moral degeneration discourse, the other is national(ist) discourse. This part focuses mainly to the exploration and description of the central features of youth

Euroscepticism. I will present the qualitative and quantitative data interchangeably while searching for the main dynamics. I will make use of the qualitative data to show the multi-faced phenomenon of Euroscepticism. The quantitative data will be used to locate the place of the findings that are discovered through qualitative techniques. I believe that the interchangeable presentation of the data coming from qualitative and quantitative techniques will elucidate the extent to which Eurosceptic discourses are spread and the dynamics of Euroscepticism among the youth.

Before the analysis of the Euroscepticism I will give a brief description of the respondents' socio-demographic and socio-economic features. The Table 4.1. shows the mean median, mode and standard deviations of the respondents' ages, the family sizes and household incomes.

Table 4.1. Demographical Features

	Mean	Mode & Median	Std. Deviation
Age	16,82	17	0,96
Family Size	4,46	4	1,59
Household Income	1717,96	1000	2813,87

Looking into the distribution of each variable along its levels in percentages would provide us with more detailed picture about the distribution. Considering the respondents ages we see that 32,5% of the respondents were 16 years old; 46,5% of the respondents were 17 years-old; and 12,3% of the total respondents are 18 years-old. Distribution of the respondents' the family sizes shows that 20,2% of the respondents come from families composed of 1 to 3 persons, 33,1% from the families of 4; 24,5% from the families of 5 and 22,2% come from the families composed of 6 members or above. Considering the household incomes per month

those with incomes less than 499YTL comprise 16,3% of total households. The biggest group is the households whose income are between 500 and 999 YTL (33,2 %). 15,7% of the households income is in between 1000-1499 YTL and 11,0% households' incomes are in between 1500-1999 YTL, and lastly households whose incomes are 2000 YTL and above comprise the 23,8% of total households.

When we look at their birth places we see that most of the respondents were born in the cities (64,1%), while 24,8% were born in towns and 8,6% were born in villages. Lastly, 2,5% of the respondents were born abroad. Considering the education levels of the parents we see a huge gap between the education of the mother and that of the father. The percentage of university graduates among the fathers is 32,5% while this figure falls down to 15,5 % for the mothers. Besides, the percentage of the mothers who do not read and write is 8,4% compared to 1,1% among the fathers. The graduates of the primary school comprise the biggest group among the mothers (35,9%) while among the fathers the biggest group is composed of university graduates.

For the father's jobs, we see that most of them were waged labourers (41,9%), the percentage of self-employers was 31,1%, the retired were 16,2% and farmers amount to 5,8%. The unemployed and the occasional workers comprise 5% of the total number. Concerning the mothers we see that 75,5% of them were housewives and had no history of work. Among the mothers who work 57,2% were waged labourers, 24,2% were retired and lastly 13,9% self-employers.⁶

⁶ For more details about the youths socio-cultural, economical and demographical backgrounds see Şen, M., Kucukural, Ö., Arslan, B. Arun, Ö. (2005) Gençlik, AB ve Zıt Hisler: Bedenini İsterim ama Ruhunu Asla, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara.

4.1. EU support and Euroscepticism

In this section I will present the survey results with respect to EU support and Euroscepticism. At this point my aim is to show the extent to which hard Euroscepticism is popular among the participants. Table 4.5 displays the distribution of Euroscepticism with respect to gender, school type, birth place and social economic status.

Initially, we asked three typical Eurobarometer questions to assess the EU support among the youth. Assessment of the EU support through three questions enabled us to control the confusions and acquire more detailed data about the EU support. The first question asked participants to evaluate EU membership for Turkey. The results showed that 66.9% of the respondents think that EU membership is a good thing for the country, while 18, 6 said it is bad, and 9, 2% said that it is neither good nor bad, 5, 3% declared that they have “no idea” about the subject matter. Secondly, we asked “If there were to be a referendum tomorrow about Turkey’s full membership to the EU, What would you vote for?” 70, 3% of votes were “yes”, 21, 8% votes were “no” and 7, 9% votes were “empty”. Thirdly, we asked the respondents “Is Turkey’s EU membership for the benefit of the country?” 69, 0% of the respondents declared that it is for the benefit of the country, 22% though that it is not for the benefit of the country, while 9% of the respondents had no idea about the subject matter. The result revealed similar patterns of support for three questions. Consequently, I preferred to conduct more detailed analysis on the answers of the second question which was also mostly preferred in the literature of EU support. The following table depicts the distribution of the EU support along some crucial variables of the study.

Table 4.2. If there were a Referendum Tomorrow About Turkey's Full Membership to the EU, What Would You Vote For?

IV⁷	Levels of IV	"Yes"	"No"	Empty vote
Gender	Male	73,7	19,9	6,4
	Female	65,4	24,5	10,1
School Type	Public High School	69,6	23	7,3
	Anatolian High School	66,4	26,9	6,7
	Occupational High School	76,8	15,4	7,7
	IHL Schools	63,8	26,1	10
	Private Schools	75,1	17,1	7,8
Birth Place	City	70,1	22	7,8
	Town	70,4	21,9	7,7
	Willage	71,8	18,7	9,6
	Abroad	69,9	23,9	6,2
SES⁸	Lower	68,9	20,7	10,4
	Lower-middle	72,1	20,1	7,8
	Middle	72,5	16,6	7,9
	Upper-middle	66	27	6,9
Cities	İstanbul	64,1	26,6	9,3
	Ankara	59,5	28,8	11,6
	İzmir	72,8	18,5	8,6
	Balıkesir	67,1	27	5,9
	Bursa	75,4	17,3	7,3
	Adana	72,6	20,4	7
	Kayseri	68,2	22,1	9,7
	Malatya	74,9	18,4	6,7
	Gaziantep	67,7	23,3	9
	Erzurum	76,4	15,5	8
	Trabzon	69,3	24,9	5,8
Samsun	78,3	16,6	5,1	
Total		70,3	21,8	7,9

The results of the analysis show that female participants, those who were born abroad, living in Ankara, İstanbul and Balıkesir, those coming from upper-middle class families and the students who are enrolled in either Anatolian high schools or religious high schools tend to be more Eurosceptic. The combined analysis of the school type variable and the socio-economic status variable reveals two important

⁷ Independent Variable

⁸ The variable of socio-economic status (SES) is an aggregate of parent's education level and occupational status. When we consider the distribution of the respondents along the SES, we see that 12, 1% is from the lower, 39, 5% from the lower-middle, 23, 4% from the middle and lastly 25, 0% of the respondents come from the upper-middle SES.

patterns. First of all the most of the students of Anatolian and private high schools come from either middle or upper-middle SES families. However, their opinions diverge on the issue of support for EU membership. The number of hard Eurosceptics enrolled in Anatolian high schools is higher. The same trend can also be observed when we consider the students of IHL and occupational high schools. In both cases the families of these students come either from lower or lower-middle SES, however they differ on the question of EU support. Students of occupational high schools show Europhilic tendencies while IHL population rates high on hard Euroscepticism.

Lastly, it is surprising to see that those born in the villages comprise the smallest group in terms of hard Eurosceptics. These findings are contrasting with Çarkoğlu's (2003) findings⁹ who argued that the prevalence of Euroscepticism increased among people of low SES and/or who lived in villages and/or were less educated. However, according to our research the children of the most educated group are enrolled in Anatolian high schools and they are harder Eurosceptics than participants whose parents belong to other SES groups. There can be two explanations for this difference. One reason could be the fact that we are dealing with two different samples even though they are both representative. A second plausible explanation is the fact that new trends of EU support might be emerging and it may be signaling a shift in the EU attitude. That is, more prosperous sections of society might be beginning to assume Eurosceptic stance which in turn would alter its support base in the near future.

⁹ In the appendix of the thesis the results of the field researches that have been conducting since 90's have been analysed. The details of the Çarkoğlu's research can also be found in this appendix.

4.2. Dynamics of Euroscepticism

I have conducted 30 semi-structured in-depth interviews before the implementation of the survey and 4 focus group discussions and 10 more in-depth interviews after the survey implementation in order to better understand the youth's attitudes towards the EU. Based on this data and together with the survey results I will explore the internal dynamics of Euroscepticism.

Some clarifications are in order. First of all, while considering the qualitative data "who said what" is not important, rather "what is said" entail the foremost point of my discussion. I do not aim at reaching representative results with this qualitative data but rather I am trying to figure out and discover the dynamics and motivations of youth's Euroscepticism. Besides, it would be methodologically wrong to make generalisations out of qualitative data, since the size of the group is too small to do it. Moreover, the data collection technique would not enable the researcher to perform sound comparisons. However, I will attempt to illustrate "who said what" by presenting the survey results in spontaneously with qualitative data. I believe the qualitative data will give ideas for the interpretation of numbers.

Secondly, although during the interviews I tried to differentiate Europe and European Union; it was very hard to separate the two concepts. Most of the youth considered the EU and Europe as a monolithic entity. Furthermore, some of them believed that the EU included USA and Russia and gave examples accordingly. In the overall beforehand analysis I can say that the youth consider a monolithic West and saw Turkey outside it, while talking about the EU. I believe there is some form of Occidentalism in youth's discourse that can mainly be attributed to their limited knowledge on the subject matter, i.e. the West.

Thirdly, in line with the first consideration, it should be noted that the subtitles that I addressed are mainly the discursive roots of the Euroscepticism, most of the individuals cannot be characterised with one particular discourse, and rather these threads are blended together in one's discourse. In the most of the interviews I saw a big confusion and indecision on the EU issue. That is, they changed minds easily and talked inconsistently and even contradictorily. The strong EU support that was expressed in the beginning of the discussion, could shift into strong opposition during the interview and focus group discussions, or although rarely, the opposite was also possible. Yılmaz, who extensively studied the issue of the EU membership and the public opinion, gives a valuable insight with regard to this observation:

... throughout the various research projects that we have undertaken on the issue of the Turkish perceptions of Europe, what we have found out has been that, apart from few people who express more or less neat and clear opinions on the issue, the attitudes of the majority can at best be characterised by ambiguity, ambivalence, confusion, double-mindedness, uncertainty, cynicism (Yılmaz, 2004:3).

If we keep in mind that Yılmaz was referring to a sample that is representative of all the age groups in Turkey, the problem becomes even more severe in this research given that the sample consists of 17-18 years-olds. Despite the “ambiguity, ambivalence, confusion, double-mindedness, uncertainty, cynicism”, it is still possible to trace some discursive roots of Euroscepticism. It should be borne in mind that they are socialised in this society and most of the free floating discourses, either hegemonic or not impinge on their minds. In what follows expose their discourses on Euroscepticism.

The survey results, in-depth interviews and focus group discussions showed that two strands are dominant in youth Euroscepticism, the first is articulated through national(ist) concerns, the second is through the discourse of fear of moral

degeneration of the society with EU membership. The following part discusses these two approaches in detail.

4.2.1 Moral Degeneration Discourse

This is a society-based discourse articulated with the fear of moral degeneration of the societal relationships in such realms as men-women relationships, relationships among neighbours and relatives and family relations. This discourse revolves around considerations of the threat that the European membership would entail for the customs and traditions in general. This is the most popular discourse among the youth. It questions the traditional and religious content of the values of people in society. In this vein of discourse the youth mainly objects the Turkey's membership to the EU because they think that the European culture is a 'rotten', Turkey's membership would result in an influx of this 'rotten culture' into the Turkish way of life. In this part firstly I will consider the survey results and will focus on the adoption of this discourse by the youth in our sample. Consequently, I will proceed to the discussion of the survey results with the help of the qualitative data in order to improve our understanding of the statistical analysis and youth's motivation in adopting this discourse. Lastly, I will explain the existence of moral degeneration discourse with the help of the literature.

The adoption of the moral degeneration discourse was assessed in the questionnaire by two distinct approaches. Firstly, we measured some of the common negative stereotypes that the Turkish youth has about Europe and the Europeans. Secondly, the effect of these negative stereotypes is measured regarding the Turkey's membership to the EU.

Table 4.3. Negative Stereotypes about Europeans

Statements	Youth in General			Euroseptics Only		
	Agree	No idea	Dis-agree	Agree	No idea	Dis-agree
The Europeans do not give necessary importance to moral values as it deserves	66,1 %	17,3 %	16,6 %	73,0 %	12,9 %	14,2%
The relationships in the family and among the relatives are weak in Europe	70,2 %	18,8 %	11,8 %	77,2 %	13,1 %	9,8 %
The youth in Europe are in total moral degeneration	71,8 %	16,7 %	11,6 %	80,6 %	11,0 %	8,4 %

Table 4.3. shows the responses to our first approach, as it can be followed from the table the great majority of the respondents were agreed on the totality of the statements. Therefore, we can say that most of the youth bears the moral degeneration stereotype regarding the Europeans. I will discuss the motivations behind this negative attitude at length in the following part while I am focusing on the in-depth interviews.

The second approach analyses the translation of these stereotypes into Eurosepticism through certain questions in the survey. We asked the respondents to indicate the direction of change that EU membership would cause on several of Turkey's problems. The results showed that 60,4% of the respondents believed that EU membership would entail increase in "moral degeneration of the society". And 65,5 % declared that the EU membership would give rise to an increase in drug abuse in the Turkish society.

In addition, through the survey we assessed the perception of the youths about the effect of EU membership on the morality of the Turkish society. We present statements to the respondents in a Likert type five-point scale. In order to

make it more clear and easy to follow, the following table shows the results in three levels for both totality of the sample and Eurosceptics only.

Table 4.4. EU Membership and Moral Degeneration

Statements	Youth in General			Eurosceptics Only		
	Agree	No idea	Dis-agree	Agree	No idea	Dis-agree
EU membership would harm the Turkish family values	41,9 %	20,9 %	37,3 %	65,3 %	14,1 %	20,7 %
EU membership will negatively effect the relationships among neighbourhood and relatives	33,8 %	18,7 %	47,5 %	49,4 %	17,5 %	33,1 %
EU membership will weaken the customs and values	62,1 %	13,3 %	24,6 %	80,3 %	7,9 %	11,8 %
EU membership will result in moral degeneration	27,9 %	21,6 %	40,6 %	60,3 %	15,7 %	24,0 %
EU membership will result in degeneration of men-women relations	26,9 %	28,0 %	45,1 %	40,5 %	27,8 %	31,7 %

Following the findings that are depicted in Table 4.4., we can infer that except for the issues related to the values and the customs in general, the negative stereotypes of Europeans do not directly translate into youth Euroscepticism. Considering the results that only 21,8% of respondents would vote “no” in the referendum of Turkey’s EU membership, the most of the figures are still quite high regarding the fear of moral degeneration of the society. We can say that among the ones who approved EU membership there are crucial numbers of EU-pessimists. When we consider only the answers of those who reject Turkey’s membership of the EU, we see clear increase in the percentage of the approvals. In this group agreements increased up to 65,3% for the first statement, 49,4% for the second, 80,3% for the third, 60,3% for the forth and 40,5% for the last statement. Deriving

from survey results, we can say that fear of moral degeneration of the society with the EU membership comprises one of the important pillars of youth Euroscepticism in Turkey.

4.2.1.1. Scrutinizing the Moral Degeneration Discourse

The considerations revealed by the survey results address the perceived threat to the culture of the society; The deeper exploration of this phenomenon through in-depth interviews and focus groups reveals youth's discontent with the idea that EU membership would entail an invasion of Turkey by the so called 'rotten' European culture into the Turkish way of life. In the following part I will discuss the moral degeneration discourse by giving reference to youth's words on societal relationships mainly in the realm of men-women relations, relationship among neighbourhood and relatives, respect for family values and basically the father figure. The common point in all these concerns is the preservation of customs and traditions of the society during the transition period of EU integration. The main concern is the threat of losing one's dignity and pride in this rapid transition.

With their words:

First of all, I don't believe that we will enter the EU, that's one. OK, suppose that we entered, the culture would die. What I mean by culture is our customs and rituals, and all this stuff. That is if this country has become as we see it now just by the influence of television and the limited tourism, the ups and downs, I can't imagine even what EU's effect would be on us. (Cemal, Public High School)¹⁰.

One of the respondents, who considered religiosity as her primary identity, argued that approaching to the East is a better alternative for Turkey compared to the West.

¹⁰ Bir kere ben gireceğimize inanmıyorum bir. Hadi girdiğimizi var sayalım, kültür bitecek. Kültür dediğim şey o işte bizim örfümüz adetimiz şuymuş buymuş, ya şu ülke televizyonla bile, şu sınırlı turizmle bile şu hale gelebiliyorsa, inişler çıkışlar falan, AB bizi ne hale getirir ben tahmin bile edemiyorum (Cemal, Düz lise).

She derives from the lexicology of the two words: East and West¹¹. The following long speech quotation nicely depicts the moral reasoning of the youth rejection of the Westernisation and the EU:

-Westernisation, its name is not nice, East can also be a good thing. It is useless to differentiate between the East and the West. That is when one says 'contemporary', Atatürk told us that 'we are to reach to contemporary levels', but we still call it 'Westernisation'. When I think of this word, to me 'Westernisation' means a swamp. While the East, if we think of the word it means 'to be born'. Instead of rising like a sun, what is the point of sinking or westernizing? Indeed, the wording is wrong, but we still prefer to use it; and the words correspond to their meaning in the real life.

- What do you mean?

- We are sinking as the time passes, you do not need to observe it, and you can see it from the word itself. One did everything for honour in the old days, but now everything is obvious, every thing is wide-open. How can I put it, it is not only the values, they exclude us; they discriminate against us because of the headscarf. They are organising competitions to degenerate our country's customs, they are spoiling the family ambience with such [TV reality shows] as 'Will you be my bride?' and similar programs. Besides, they come up with Erosion [she is referring to Eurovision] Competitions, I think all such things are inventions of Europe.

In the Ottoman Period, when the Erosion Competition first started, they said Turkey was the winner even though it did not get the first prize. Then the Europeans began [to have fun], with wines and all. When [the Turks] asked, "Why are you so happy?" they respond by saying "Is there anything more splendid then seeing your collapse?" They demolished the Ottomans, now it's the turn of the Turkish Republic. No matter how hard we try to stand up, they will make us fall. But we still go on, with our eyes shut (Hayriye, public high school)¹².

¹¹ In Turkish 'west' (batı) and 'east' (doğu) has double meaning, firstly they denotes geographical directions, the second meaning is 'to sink' (batmak) and 'to be born' (doğmak) respectively. Indeed, the meanings are closely related with geographical directions, "the west" signifies the direction of the sunset, "the east" signifies the sunrise.

¹² Batılılaşmak, ismi güzel değil, batılılaşmanın, doğu da iyi bir şey olabilir, doğu batı diye ayırmaya gerek yok, yani çağdaş dediğin zaman, Atatürk bize bunu söylemiş, çağdaş düzeye çıkmak demiş, ve biz hala batılılaşma diye isimlendiriyoruz. Batılılaşmak bataklık gibi geliyor bana, isim olarak değerlendirirsek. Doğu yani isim olarak değerlendirirsek doğmak anlamında. Yani bir güneş olarak doğmak varken niçin yani batmak, batılılaşmak? Kelime olarak bir kere yanlış ve biz hala onu kullanıyoruz ve kelimeler de birbirine uyuyor yaşamda yani.

- Nasıl yani?

- Ya gittikçe batıyoruz. Hiç gözlem yapmana gerek yok, kelimeye bakarak da görebilirsin bunu. Irz için, eskiden öyle derlerdi, her şey yapılırken şimdi nedense herşey ortada, yani tüm şeyler ortada yani nasıl anlatıyım, sadece değerler olarak değil, bizi yani dışlamaları, kapalı [baş örtülü] olarak yani dışlamaları. Ülkemizin geleneğini bozmak için yarışmalar düzenliyorlar, aile ortamını bozuyorlar, işte "gelinim olur musun" falan böyle şeyler. Daha sonra erozyon [eurovizyon] yarışmaları çıkartıyorlar, hep bunlar bence zaten Avrupa'nın şeyleri, icatları.

It must be underlined that the decadence of men-women relationship is one of the main points of objection in moral degeneration discourse. While they are questioning the values of the society, they overtly emphasise the moral values of the society with particular reference to sexual affairs. With the youth's words:

If we enter the EU all our customs and rituals will dissolve. If we have at least one gram of Islam in our souls, that will also go away; because, as far as I can see we have already become even worse than Europe. There are that awful people among us. Some don't know their religion, some don't know their mores, and some don't know what to do for Turkey. If we join them [Europe], we will be like Russia in 15 years time. The grapes ripen by looking at each other. For instance, our girls will go and do what a Russian does. Once evil enters the soul, the rest follows. Turkish people are already selling their bodies, if now this is one it will be five [in the future]. They will see the life [out there] and will say that if they are doing it we can do it too. (Emin, public high school).¹³

In the interview the topic of decadent opposite sex relationship usually came up with no deliberate attempt. Discussing the EU membership, as soon as the question of how society in general will be affected by this membership, one of the first issues that the participants mention is the decadence of relationships.

For example, I feel uncomfortable if a woman and a man display inappropriate behaviour in the street. I feel offended by that because I have a sister and a mother. Such things make me feel uncomfortable. (Burhan, İHL)¹⁴.

Osmanlı döneminde bu erozyon yarışması ilk çıktığında birinci olmasa bile Türkiye'yi seçmişler. Avrupalılar başlamışlar şaraplar falan. "Siz niye seviyorsunuz?" dediklerinde: "ee sizin yıkıldığınızı görmekten daha iyi birşey olabilir mi?", demişler. Osmanlıyı yıkmışlar sıra Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ne gelmiş. Biz ne kadar ayakta durmaya çalışırsak çalışalım. Bizim ayağımızı kaydıracaklar, ama biz gözümüz kapalı devam ediyoruz. (Hayriye, düz lise)

¹³ Avrupa Birliği'ne girersek eğer gelenek ve göreneklerimizin hepsi gidecek. İçimizde olan bir gram Müslümanlık varsa eğer o da gidecek. Çünkü bakıyorum Türkiye'de artık Avrupa'dan bile daha beter olmuşuz. O kadar berbat insanlar var aramızda. Bazıları dinini bilmiyor, bazıları töresini bilmiyor. Bazıları Türkiye için ne yapacağını bilmiyor. Eğer oralara geçerse 15 yıl sonra biz de bir Rusya gibi olacak. İnsan insana baka baka kararır. Atıyorum bir kızımı gidecek bir Rus ne yapıyorsa bizimki de onu yapacak. Kötülük bir kere içine girdiği zaman ondan sonra artık devamı gelir. Şu anda bile Türk insanları bedenlerini para karşılığı satıyorlar bu şu anda birse beş olacak. Hayatı görecekler onlar yapıyorsa biz de yapacağız diyecekler (Emin, düz lise).

¹⁴ Mesela bir sokak ortasında bir kızla bir erkek uygunsuz bir vaziyetteyse ben bundan rahatsız oluyorum. Gocunuyorum ben bundan ya çünkü benim de ablam var kardeşim var annem var, ben rahatsız oluyorum bu tarz şeylerden (Burhan, İHL).

Other respondent depicted the Europeans and their way of life with particular reference to opposite sex relations as follows:

They [the Europeans] do not have anything like morality. They do not take responsibility for their women. Even a [foreign] woman at the age of fifty comes and sleeps with you. People sit on the beach and they even have sex there. They kiss in the public. They walk around while stark naked. There [in Europe] they think this is natural, they don't stare at each other. But this is not natural (Ferhat, public high school).¹⁵

It is worth it to note here that in order for us to have an idea about the place of this thought, in the nation wide survey we presented the respondents with the statement “I believe that the youth kissing in the public space should be warned”. We required them to express their approval of this statement in 5 point Likert type scale. The results showed that 59.9% of the respondents agreed, while 28.5% of them disagreed. If we keep these figures in mind, it is not surprising anymore to hear of municipality workers warning the youth kissing at the seaside of Samsun.

Another point of objection is related to the *degeneration of* family values due to Turkey's EU membership. Particularly, respect for the father is identified as main feature of a typical Turkish family life. A participant while complaining about the possible outcomes of the EU membership said: “Europeans don't even say ‘dad’, they call their fathers by name, they lack family values and respect” (Seyhan, public high school).¹⁶

Similarly, another respondent compared Turkish way of life with that of the Europeans, and sustained that EU membership will entail the adoption of European way of life:

¹⁵ Onlarda [Avrupalılarda] ahlak denilen bir şey yok. Kadınlarına sahip çıkmıyorlar. 50 yaşında bir bayan bile yani sizinle yatabiliyor. Sahilin ortasında insanlar var. Direkt orada ilişkiye girebiliyorlar. Ortalıkta öpüşüyorlar. Çırıl çıplak sahilde dolaşabiliyorlar. Ama orada doğal gibi görünüyor. Orada kimse kimseye bakmıyor. Ama aslında bu doğal değil. (Ferhat, düz lise).

¹⁶ Avrupalılar baba bile demiyorlar ismiyle sesleniyorlar. Onlarda ailevi değerler yok. Saygı yok

Family is fundamental for us; if the family structure is spoilt, this is not acceptable. For example, if my father comes home, while I am lying, I have to get up. I have to be sitting properly, but this is not the case for the Europeans. A kid calls her/his father by [their first] name. If I say "Ömer dear", my father's name is Ömer, "I want to tell you ..." I would feel ashamed. No, for me this is impossible. My cultural disposition is incompatible with this. This could be acceptable though for some people living in Bahçeli, Tunalı. Some families among these strata [of the society] would accept this (Ali, Anatolian high school)¹⁷.

Similarly,

- Turkish values include respect for the elders, respectful behaviour, but I don't suppose such things exists in Europe. They can be so laid-back with their fathers, they freely talk and sit, their family discipline is very loose.

- How are their manners or morality, do you think?

- They are more permissive, for instance, we can not be that easy-going, but they are slacker. For one thing, they do not care to differentiate [in terms of respect] between the elder and the younger. I haven't seen this happening (Hayriye, public high school).¹⁸

Besides appraising the family values in Turkey, the youth tend to see the close relationship in the neighbourhood and with relatives as the peculiar characteristics of Turkish society, nevertheless a feature that is prone to degeneration in the EU membership process. For them, the people in Europe are too individualised and lonely. They have weak societal relations especially among relatives and in the neighbourhood community. The EU membership bears the risk for Turkish society of losing its basic characteristics. In addition, when they consider the European way of

¹⁷ Aile, bizim temelimiz aile, aile yapısı bozulduğu zaman olmuyor, mesela şu anda eve babam geldiği zaman yatıyorsam mecbur kalkmak zorundayım. Düzgün oturmak zorundayım ama işte Avrupa ülkelerinde böyle bir şey yok. Bir çocuk babasına ismiyle sesleniyor. Ben babama, babamın ismi Ömer, Ömercim bak şöyle böyle diyecem, göçerim ben, yok ben mümkün değil yapamam [gülüşmeler], benim kültür yapım kolay kolay kaldırmaz. Böyle Bahçeli, Tunalı böyle kısımlarda kaldırılabilir. O kesimdeki bazı aileler kaldırabilir (Ali, Anadolu lisesi).

¹⁸ - Türklerin değerleri büyüklerine saygılı olunması, oturup kalkması, daha bir saygılı olunması, ama ben sanmıyorum Avrupa'da da böyle şeylerin olduğunu, onlar babasının yanında böyle rahat, gayet rahat bir şekilde konuşuyor, oturuyor, aile terbiyesi olsun başka şeyler olsun çok rahat yani.

- Nasıl ordakilerin aile terbiyesi, ahlakı?

- Biraz daha serbestler, biz mesela o kadar serbest olamıyoruz ama ordakiler biraz daha serbestler. Büyük, küçük demiyor bi kere ordakiler yani hiç görmedim. (Hayriye, düz lise)

life in this respect they also criticised the “cosmopolitan” life of the Western Anatolia where the old customs and traditions were lost to a great extent.

The common ground of the above-mentioned themes is the emphasis on the *degeneration of* customs and traditions that Turkish society has. They are indispensable at all costs:

EU says something like if you deny your own values and accept ours we accept you [Turkey]. I think this is absolutely wrong; our values are our own. As their name suggests, they are valuable things. They are our mores, rituals, traditions and custom; they are indispensable, how can we give them up? If this is the case, we don't want the EU. If they want us and accept us, they would win, not us. We fought for our freedom for years and we won our flag, the flag of independence. If we enter the EU and give up those values, then it means that we renounced that freedom. Entering there [the EU] means entering oppression. Then, this is not acceptable (Ayşegül, occupational high school).¹⁹

Another participant considered the importance of customs and traditions in Turkish life in comparison to Europe:

They [the Europeans] think [of their children] as birds flying away from home once they have reached the age of 18, they set them free. This is wrong; we do not have any thing like this. This is not the case, the values are different her; we have traditions and rituals such as coming and asking for a girls hand, that is our traditions and rituals are different. For example, my father is 45 years old, and he still doesn't smoke [when sitting] next to his own father. This means respect, and we also are always respectful to him [her own father]. Adult milieu and youth milieu are different for us; the differentiation is done for the sake of respect. When the elders come in, the rest stands up. But, they [the Europeans] lack all this. We have set our minds on the EU, all our values already dissolving, even before entering the EU. Although there are some who are trying to keep them alive, morality, religion, traditions and rituals are all disappearing (Hayriye, public high school).²⁰

¹⁹ AB kendi değerlerinden vaz geçersen bizim değerlerimize sahip çıkarsan kabul ederiz gibisinden birşey söylüyor. Bence çok yanlış, bizim değerlerimiz de bize göre yani. Adı üstünde değerli olan şeydir yani. Bizim töremiz, adetimiz, geleneğimiz, göreneğimiz yani bunlar bizim için vazgeçilmeyen şeyler bunları bırakıp nasıl...? Eğer öyleyse biz AB'yi istemiyoruz. Eğer, onlar bizi isterlerse, bizi kabul ederlerse onlar kazanmış olur biz değil. Özgürlüğümüz için biz yıllarca savaşmışız bir bayrağa sahip olmuşuz, istiklal bayrağına sahip olmuşuz, eğer biz AB'ye gireceksek ve o değerlerden vaz geçeceksek biz o zaman bu özgürlüğü kabul etmemiş oluyoruz. Oraya girerken bir baskı altına girmiş oluyoruz. O zaman olmaz (Ayşegül, meslek lisesi)

²⁰ Şey gibi düşünüyorlar 18 yaşından sonra yuvadan uçan kuş gibi serbest bırakmak, olmaz yani bizde böyle bir şey yok. Öyle değil yani, değerler farklı bizde. Gelenek görenek gibi, bizim kız isteme olayımız vardır, değişik yani geleneklerimiz göreneklerimiz vardır, Mesela babam 45 yaşında ve hala babasının yanında

Interestingly the cultural degeneration discourse focuses mainly on the family life and sexual affairs. On the other hand, while evaluating other aspects of European culture besides family life, for example work ethics, good manner in the societal relations even the Eurosceptic youth tended to be more positive. These aspects of the European way of life were appealing to them and they thought of these elements as superior to those existing in Turkey.

They can serve us as examples with their culture, speaking manners and so on. I am referring to the Germans, but by culture I don't mean morality but their speaking, eating and dressing manners. For instance, there's something in the way they raise their children, I really like that. The child is just 1,5 or 2 years old, he is just learning how to walk, his mother puts the food with the knife and fork in front, if the child eats he does not than he goes hungry. But this is not the case with us, the boy is 10 years old, begins the primary school, we give him a meal box, begging him eat. The child is 3 or 4, walks, his mother chases him begging her son eat. The child refuses to eat and then comes back in three minutes asking for food. Turks are all like this (Egemen, occupational high school)²¹.

Similarly, another example concerning the superior ethics of the Europeans:

It is better for us to resemble the Germans with regard to ethical issue. Of course they are much better in education, the Europeans. In Turkey, girls are not sent to school after finishing the primary school. Why don't they send them? The Germans send [their daughters] to school, they do better. Germans are better in ethical issue, the education issue is better among them (Emin, public high school)²².

sigara içmiyor. Yani bu saygıdır. Biz de saygılıyızdır ona her zaman. Biz de büyük oratamı farklıdır, küçük oratamı farklıdır, saygıdır bunlar hep. Büyükler gelince ayağa kalkılır. Ama şimdi onlarda yok, AB'diye tutturmuşuz bi Avrupa Birliği, ne değerlerimiz hiç biri kalmadı zaten. Şimdiden daha girmediğimiz halde değerlerimizi zaten yok oluyor hepsi, işte din desen ahlak desen, gelenekler görenekler bile yok, yaşatmaya çalışanlar var ama. (Hayriye, düz lise)

²¹ Kültürlerini, konuşmalarını şununu bununu örnek alabiliriz. Almanlar için diyorum, kültür derken ahlak bakımından demiyorum. Konuşmasını, yemesini, giyim olsun. Mesela diyorum ya çocuklarda birşey var. En çok hoşma giden tarafı buydu. Çocuk daha 1,5-2 yaşında, daha yeni yürümeyi öğreniyor. Annesi yemeğini önüne koyuyordu, çatalı bıçağı koyuyordu, yiyorsa yiyor yemiyorsa aç kalıyor. Bizde öyle birşey yok. Çocuk 10 yaşına geliyor, ilkokula başlıyor. Eline beslenme çantası veriyosun oğlum ye oğlum ye diye. Çocuk 3-4 yaşında yürüyor annesi oğlum ye oğlum ye diye peşinde dolanıyor, yemiyor, çocuk 3 dakika sonra yine geliyor yemek diye. Bizdeki tüm Türkler böyleydi. (Egemen, meslek Lisesi)

²² Ahlak bakımında Almanlar benzememiz daha iyi. Tabii yani eğitim konusunda daha iyiler, Avrupalılar. Türkiye'de ortaokulu bitirince kızı göndermiyorlar. Neden niye göndermiyorlar. Almanlar okutuyorlar.

In the survey this perception was measured also. The figures confirm what I have said so far. In a five point Likert type scale we gave respondents some statements in order to assess their perceptions of Europeans. One of the statements said “The Europeans are hard working and attentive in their works”, 67, 4% of the respondents agreed and 15, 6 % didn't. Similarly 55, 2 % of the respondents thought that European institutions were more trustable compared to their Turkish counterparts, while only 15, 8 thought the opposite. Furthermore, the Turkish youth also believed that “human rights and democracy is better implemented in Europe” and “European cities are in better condition” compared to the Turkish counterparts (76,5% and 83,6% respectively).

This opposing feelings and perceptions about other cultures reminds me the concept of ethnocentrism that is widely discussed in the literature. Faris' considers negative ethnocentrism and defined it as “the emotional attitude which places high value on one's own customs and traditions and belittles all others, putting as least valuable those that differ most” (Faris,1925 :21). Besides the negative version, the youths' boosted perceptions of Europe and Europeans also reminds me ‘grass is greener on the other side’ type ethnocentrism. While they look down on Europeans in terms of moral issues, they perceive them superior when considering ethics in the societal relations such as work. They perceive the Europeans as more educated and appraise them because they achieved to establish well functioning systems with “well-planned cities”.

On the other hand, as it would be expected, while talking in favour of Europe, some of the participants criticised Turkey too. They were pessimistic about EU

Daha iyi şeyler yapıyorlar. Ahlak konusunda Almanlar daha iyi, eğitim konusu daha güzel onlarda. (Emin, düz lise)

membership possibly causing change in Turkey's old and bad habits. The following conversation sheds light on the opinion of the participant on this issue:

- *If we enter the EU, how would this effect Turkey?*
- *Everything would go on the same as before, in my opinion. I am speaking for myself; I don't believe that anything would improve. Some will continue to fill their pockets, and we pay the costs (Onat, Anatolian high school)²³.*

Conversely, some of the participants acknowledged European superiority and also believed that EU membership has the possibility of enhancing Turkey on the issue related to work ethic, education, corruption, respect for human right and all other related issues. But, they argued this would not come without a price.

In the interviews and especially during the discussions in the focus groups at this point the two positions emerged and they framed these positions in such a way that each person could only choose one of the options. On the one side there is civilisation, technology, consolidated and well functioning democracy, respect for human rights, and consolidation of rule of law, most of which are equated with Europe and the European Union. On the other side there is human dignity and pride, morality, respect for one another especially for the elderly and the father figure, relatives or the family members, one's honour in front of the community, the respect for the tradition. They perceive these categories as mutually exclusive categories. To say "yes" to EU means, abandoning the values and all the humane sides of tradition in favour of technology and civilisation, human rights. Whenever this dichotomy appeared (and most of the time, especially in the focus group discussions it did come up) most of the students preferred the morality and the dignity of the society. To give an example:

²³ - AB'ye girersek sence Türkiye bundan nasıl etkilenir?

I completely agree with my friend regarding the culture, cultural issue. They say that income level will increase, I don't believe such things. They say that traveling will be facilitated. In fact these are none of my business. The only thing that matters to me is what will happen in the cultural sphere. I don't care about justice, law or such things. Okey, when you entered the EU thing like human rights courts and so on will be much better and easier. But now, by way of comparison culture is more important for me than these things. Let me I have no money, if I have my culture, I can be happy; it is enough for me (Erol, public high school)²⁴.

Other respondent added: "Let us be men [have human dignity] and than do it. Well what is this European Union? Having world's money, not having one's culture, one's dignity, what is the point? (Oğuz, public high school).²⁵"

4.2.1.2. Grounds of the Moral Degeneration Discourse

The most appealing explanation for the moral degeneration discourse comes from identity theories. McLaren considers the threat that is perceived towards the national culture as the most important determining factor of formulating opinion towards European integration. According to McLaren (2002:564), the general opinion formation toward the EU "tends to be based in great part on a general hostility towards other cultures". She sustains that the general feeling of being threatened by other cultures can be linked to the underlying feelings of xenophobia (McLaren, 2002:558). She mostly discusses the effect of cultural threat in the western European countries and is concerned with attitudes towards ethnic and religious minority groups in these countries. She also considers the related feelings that are emanated

- Her şey aynısı gibi gider. Yani ben hiç inanmıyorum birşeylerin düzeleceğine. Ben şahsen kendi adıma söyleyeyim hiç inanmıyorum; yani, herşey aynısı gibi gidecek yani. Birileri yine cebini dolduracak, olan yani bizlere oluyo yani (Onat, Anadolu lisei).

²⁴ Arkadaşa tamamen katılıyorum kültürel olarak ,kültür açısından. Gelir seviyesi artar diyorlar hiç birine inanmıyorum. Yok girişler çıkışlar kolaylaşacak. Bunların hiçbiri benim umurumda değil açıkçası. Tek umurumda olan kültürel olarak ne olacağı, adalet, hukuk falan hiçbirini ben umursamıyorum. Tamam Avrupa Birliği'ne girdiğin zaman bazı insan hakları mahkemeleri falan herşey çok daha güzel olacak, kolaylaşacak. Ama ben şimdi kıyaslama olarak söylüyorum, kültür benim için daha önemli bunlardan. Param olmasın kültürüme sahip olayım mutlu olurum, yeter bana (Erol, düz lise).

from the sharing of social benefits with outsiders. However, when we consider the youth's scepticism on the European culture in Turkey, anxiety that emerges because of the share of the benefits is not valid. But we can draw parallelisms with the fact that both threat perceptions are built on stereotypes that are formulated regarding the groups that are constructed as outsiders.

The youth's skepticism of integration with Europe because of the fear of cultural degeneration of the society represents once again the typical Turkish dilemma ever-present in Turkish modernisation and Westernisation history. This irony becomes even more visible in the national anthem of a country that "aims to reach the highest levels of contemporary civilisation":

*Recognize your innate strength! And think: how can this fiery faith ever
be killed,
By that battered, single-fanged monster you call "civilization"?²⁶.*

The scepticism towards EU that is articulated through the moral degeneration discourse can not only be confined to the European integration but it is also closely related with scepticism towards westernisation and modernisation. In the Turkish political sphere the right wing conservative nationalism and Islamism and their attitude regarding the westernisation and modernisation corresponds very strongly to the youth moralistic discourse.

We should note particularly the importance of Islamism in the formation of moral degeneration discourse. As Duran pointed out, in the traditional Islamic way of thinking not only EU membership is rejected but also entirety of the idea of Westernisation and modernisation in the cultural sphere is denied. According to him,

²⁵ "Adam olalım da yapalım onu biz. Ya Avrupa Birliği de neymiş. Dünya kadar paran olsun, kültürün olmasın, insanlık olmasın neye yarar ki bu? (Oğuz, düz lise)"

²⁶ "Ulusun, korkma! Nasıl böyle bir imanı boğar, Medeniyet!" dediğin tek dişi kalmış canavar?" The translation is taken from a web site: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Istikl%C3%A2l_Marsi . Retrieved on 20/11/2005

hard core Islamists are discontent with the European way of life. The Islamists considers Europe as morally decayed, and no technological advancement can compensate the moral deterioration. According to this discourse Europeans look down on the institutions of religion and family, and they consider them as an encumbrance. Nonetheless, these are most respected foundation of society in Islam. The morality crisis in the West has its roots in the defeat of Christianity by secularism. In the Western context, according to Islamists atheism has become widespread also bringing about spiritual crises (Duran, 2004:126-127). The intense reference in the youth discourse a European culture that is rotten can be interpreted as the appropriation of the Islamist discourse by the youth.

The adoption of the moral degeneration discourse by the youth also reminds me the age-old culture/civilisation dilemma. From the beginning of the Turkish modernisation attempts, scholars, and the intellectuals paid explicit attention to the possibilities of retaining Islam while, adopting Western technology and its civilisation. The dilemma became even more crucial at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Ziya Gökalp was one of the intellectuals of the time. He phrased the dilemma in terms of “culture” and “civilisation” and also devised a solution. For him religion belongs to individual sphere and cannot interfere with the political issues or be interfered by them. However, he gave utmost importance to the place and significance of religion under the changing conditions of modern life. He realised the incompatibility of the two, he thought of the possibilities of retaining religion in the context of secularisation. As a result he developed his distinction between civilisation and culture, for him civilisation and the culture must be conceptualised separately (Davison, 1995:190-1) The youths’ enthusiasm to bring the discussion to

the comparison of civilisation versus culture signifies the fact that the age old dilemma is not resolved in the eyes of the public, and it seems that will not be resolved for the next few decades a head of us on the way to the EU integration.

The extent to which the moral degeneration discourse is widespread in the high schools of Ankara is quite impressive. Interestingly it is hardly possible to hear spontaneously the effect of moral degeneration discourse among the students of Bornova Anatolian High School in Izmir, one of the most prestigious Anatolian high schools in Turkey. The young people from this school who participated in the research perceived the liberalised aspects of daily life and social relations as one of the great victories of the Turkish modernisation project. However, the youth that subscribed to this view frame their Eurosceptic position by referring to the other mainstream discourse, namely the ‘national(ist) discourse’.

4.3.2. National(ist) Discourse

I will begin the discussion of this discourse by setting the historical context in order to explain why the brackets should be employed when using the concept ‘national(ist)’.

Since the conception of the Turkish Republic, nationalism has been defined as one of its building blocks. However, with the beginning of the multi-party period and the emergence of political parties along the political spectrum, nationalism was appropriated by MHP, the ultra-nationalist party. During the 60s and the 70s their sworn enemies were the leftists. In the 90s the Eurosceptic discourse in Turkey shifted focus from economic arguments to political ones, accordingly the republicans and the leftist parties that did not favor Turkey’s joining the EU, took up a nationalist discourse shaped under arguments of national integrity. The republicans and the

leftist agree in many points with the nationalist discourse of the MPH concerning national integrity, they still prefer not to share the same name with their old political enemies. In the Turkish language the nominal distinction is easier as one calls itself *ulusal* the other uses *milliyetçi*. In the literature written in English they have been referred to as national and nationalist respectively. The youth discourse owes a lot to these stances in their articulation of Euroscepticism. However, considering the youth discourse, we see that it is not possible to make a distinction between the two. Therefore I will refer to this particular thread in the youth discourse as national(ist).

The great variety of opinions vocalised through the national(ist) discourse in the in-depth interviews is impressive: some point out national interests, others express desire for the past, especially the Ottoman period. Some consider the losing of sovereignty, others express their discontent because of the humiliation of the country in front of the other nations, and some talk about the superiority of the “Turks” and “Turkish nation” over the others. Besides, it is unusual to find someone talking from only one of these perspectives, as a result more often we find articulation of these themes in one’s national(ist) speech.

In this section I will firstly discuss the survey results in order to see the prevalence of national(ist) discourse among the youth, secondly I will proceed to analysis of qualitative data so as to provide an explanation for the statistics and to comprehend youth’s nationalist reasoning in their articulation of Euroscepticism. Lastly, I will try to explain national(ist) discourse by addressing the literature and its appearances in the Turkish political sphere.

The survey results give us an idea about the prevalence of the national(ist) discourses among the youth. We asked questions in the survey to assess widely articulated national(ist) discourse that highlights ‘separatist ideals’ of western states.

First of all we asked the respondents “In what direction do you think the following problems such as Kurdish/South-Eastern issue (i), terror (ii) and discrimination among religious sects (iii) would be affected by the EU membership. We required the participants to respond to each problem by choosing one of the following: either it would “decrease” or “increase” or “no change”.

Table 4.5. In what direction do you think the following problems would be effected by the EU membership?

Problems	Youth in General			Euroceptics Only		
	increase	no change	decrease	increase	no change	decrease
Kurdish/South-Eastern issue	34,1 %	45,0 %	20,9 %	60,5 %	30,5 %	9,1 %
Terror	26,6 %	41,9 %	31,5 %	47,9 %	39,3 %	12,9 %
Discrimination among religious sects	28,1 %	53,9 %	17,9 %	49,1 %	42,8 %	8,2 %

The results showed that almost one out of three believed that the EU membership would result in worsening of these problems. This conveys the fact that these people are sceptic about the influence of the EU in the internal affairs of Turkey, and they may even consider an active involvement of the EU regarding the ‘separatist’ tendencies in Turkey. The ones who expect “no change” in these problems would either saw no relationship between the EU and these problems or they did not believe the effectiveness of the EU to solve these perpetual problems of Turkey. I should note that the others who point out the decrease are true enthusiasts of the EU. When we evaluate the responses of the hard Euroceptics we see a drastic increase in the percentage of the ones who stress the worsening of the problems. This shows that beliefs in ‘separatist ideals’ of the western states is even more widespread among hard Euroceptics. This comprises one of the important motivations behind

youth Euroscepticism I will analyse these figures more deeply in the next section with the help of the qualitative data.

Besides, the following table shows the presented statements in the questionnaire to locate the existence of the nationalist discourse in line with what I depicted above. This time the participants responded the statement in the five points Likert-type scale as whether they are agreed or not. But the table shows the results in three levels for the sake of clarity and ease to follow.

Table 4.6. National(ist) Charges on the EU Membership

Statements	Youth in General			Eurosceptics Only		
	Agree	No idea	Dis-agree	Agree	No idea	Dis-agree
EU membership would harm Turkey's national unity and totality	34,6 %	26,7 %	38,7 %	69,6 %	16,8 %	13,6 %
EU membership would harm Turkey's independence	37,6 %	23,5 %	38,9 %	73,7 %	12,6 %	13,8 %
EU membership would result in Turkey becoming a mandate of European countries.	37,8 %	27,9 %	34,2 %	72,9 %	15,2 %	11,9 %
EU's dealing with Turkey's problems gives rise to harm of Turkish national unity and totality	36,7 %	34,3 %	29,0 %	68,8 %	20,9 %	10,9 %
EU accession process is humiliating our country	48,4 %	21,5 %	30,1 %	73,0 %	15,7 %	11,3 %

Considering the first three statements figures show that more than every one person out of three assess the EU membership as a threat to Turkey's independence and national unity, considering the responses of those who are against Turkey's membership the figures almost doubles. Therefore the figure shows that the

perceived threat to national unity and independence comprise other important pillar of youth Euroscepticism in Turkey.

The last two statements mainly assess the youth's opinion on the accession process. Figures are similar to the first three statements; again more than one person out of three seems to be disturbed by the accession process. As it would be expected hard Eurosceptics are even more discontent with the accession process. Since, the great majority of them expressed their agreement to the statements. It is possible to argue that the events during the accession process makes the youth question the EU membership and boils down to one of the important motivations behind youth Euroscepticism.

4.2.2.2. Scrutinizing the National(ist) Discourse

The national(ist) stance basically perceives threats to the unity and integrity of state and national space. This threat is embodied in the political criteria that the European Union sets in front of Turkey's membership. A deeper analysis of the main features by taking into accounts the focus group discussions and in-depth interview reveals complex make-up structure of this discourse. In the following part, while examining national(ist) discourse I will firstly consider the national interest and threat discourse. Secondly, I will talk about the discourse that put emphasis on the superiority of Turks and Turkey in the articulation of Euroscepticism. Thirdly, I will move onto the discourse of discontent that derives because of the accession process that is equated with the humiliation and the putting off of the country. Fourthly I will discuss the role of conspiracy theories in youth Euroscepticism. Lastly I will consider the importance of 'sensitive issues' and leftist discourse in the formation of Euroscepticism among the youth.

The national interest discourse can mainly be characterised as the reflections of the state ideology and it is articulated by Kemalist nationalist terminology that focuses on the preservation of national interest and national integrity. This Eurosceptic discourse is also shaped by the perception of threats from both outside and the inside of the country.

Hence, the declared advantages and gains that the EU membership will bring are only falsities and lies of the West, as in the long run they will come out to be threats for the unity of the nation state. In this stance the core of the argumentation is the indivisibility of the nation state. This national interest discourse also puts emphasis on exploitative relations that are apt to emerge as a result of the EU membership and it is often articulated by the reference to the last days of Ottoman Empire. This argument entails the regularly mentioned motto “their eyes are on our vast resources to exploit”. This line of thought has one of the strongest influences in the formation of Euroscepticism among the youth. The following is the typical statement that contains national interest elements:

I think European Union does not want us. Their aim is to divide the Turks. That's what I think! I think that they do not work to pull us on their side, but to split us. They want to get South-Eastern Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia and the straits and the rest. They still approve of Sevres Treaty and want to put it into force. They will leave us Central Anatolia. I think this is their aim. Besides, why would EU want us, does the EU need us? Their aim can be this: to establish a state like America, and take advantage of our human resources and geopolitical situation. I think that, they want to have control over rather than include us. (Osman Ögünç, Anatolian high school).²⁷

²⁷ Avrupa Birliği bizi istemiyor bence. Onların amacı Türkleri parçalamak bence. Ben öyle düşünüyorum! Bizi yanlarına çekmek için değil bizi parçalamak için çalışıyorlar diye düşünüyorum, Güneydoğu Anadolu'yu Doğu Anadolu'yu boğazları falan her tarafı almak istiyorlar. Hala Sevr Anlaşmasını onaylıyorlar ve bunu yürürlüğe koymak istiyorlar, bize İç Anadolu'yu bırakacaklar. Bence amaçları bu. Bir de Avrupa Birliği bizi niye istesin, Avrupa Birliği'nin bize ihtiyacı var mı? Belki onların amaçları şu olabilir: Amerika gibi bir devlet kurup bizim de insan gücümüzden ve jeopolitik konumumuzdan

The following words depict the EU membership as a threat to the unity of nation:

First of all they will exploit our straits, exploit our underground resources. Our politicians are very weak where diplomacy is concerned, we will be left with our mouths open and staring. Atatürk talks about the national power elements: politics, military, diplomacy, culture and.... There was one more. Was it economy? Probably it was economy. Our economic and political power is awful at the moment. We stand on two legs, one is military and the other is culture. Now, they have introduced pop and jazz. These are all EU's tricks. They brought in pop, jazz and hip-hop. First, they are trying to demolish the cultural. They are trying to come between the army and the people, so that the country will go under. That is it! (Uğur, Anatolian high school)²⁸

And furthermore those who were discontent with Turkey's attempts to integrate into the EU saw an unequal relationship between the two parties. They argued that Turkey membership to EU would only serve to the EU's interest and it would give rise to the harm for the Turkish state. The following is the speech in this motivation:

I am concerned with what it will take away from us rather than what it will bring. The straits.... Firstly, we are living on customs, that is, the taxes are very crucial for us. If we enter the EU we will also abandon the custom tariffs. Cyprus is also very important problem regarding the EU. They are adopting an integrationist policy, that is, they want the North and the South to unite, and they are following integrationist policies. Well, they divided Georgia, and destroyed Kosovo and Bosnia. I mean the EU, today's Germany and France. Well, why do they want unification in Cyprus? They want to unite the North and the South. That is because they will implement their own strategies there. It [Cyprus] will become a very nice harbour for the EU (Erdal, public high school)²⁹.

faýdalanmak olabilir. Bizi içlerine almak değil de bize sahip olmak gibi bir düşüncelerinin olduğunu düşünüyorum (Osman Öğünç, Anadolu lisesi).

²⁸ - Bir kere boğazlarımızı sömürecekler, yer altı kaynaklarımızı sömürecekler. Bizimkiler diplomasi açısından çok zayıf, yine böyle ağız açık ayran budalası gibi bakıcaz. Atatürk'ün milli güç unsurları var siyasi, askeri, diplomasi, kültürel.... Bir tane daha vardı. Ekonomik mi? Ekonomikti herhalde. Bizim ekonomik ve siyasi gücümüz şu an çok berbat. Biz iki bacağımızın üzerinde duruyoruz: bir askeri bir kültürel. Şimdi popu, jazzı falan soktular. Bunlar hep AB'nin oyunları. Popu, jazı, Hip-hop'u falan soktular, ilk önce bi kültürel yok etmeye çalışıyorlar. Halkla askeriye'nin arasını açıp memleketi batırmaya çalışıyorlar. Bu kadar. (Uğur, Anadolu lisesi)

²⁹ Ben getireceğinden çok görecekği ile ilgileniyorum. Boğazlar....Bi kere biz gümrükten geçiniyoruz, yani vergiler bizim için çok önemli. AB'ye girersek bu gümrük vergilerinden de vaz geçeceğiz. Bu Avrupa Birliği ile ilgili Kıbrıs da çok önemli bir sorun. Çok birleşmeci bir politika izliyorlar, yani Kuzey ile Güney'in birleşmesini istiyorlar, birleşmeci politikalar izliyorlar. Peki Gürcistanı falan böldüler, Kosova'yı Bosna'yı harabettiler. Avrupa Birliği, şimdiki Almanya, Fransa. Peki niye Kıbrıs'ta birleşme istiyor? Güney ile Kuzey'in birleşmesini istiyor. Çünkü kendi stratejilerini oraya koyacak, fıstık gibi bir liman olacak Avrupa Birliği'ne (Erdal, düz lise).

Similarly, the following words belong to a participant who emphasized the exploitation resulting from the EU membership. Interestingly, the rich mines of Turkey and the possibility of Europeans exploiting them are a real urban legend among the youth:

I think actually the states in the EU want Turkey to use it, to take the advantage of our mines, our petrol. For example, I don't know, the most abundant mineral in Turkey is boron. Most of the states in the EU lack this mineral. 90% of the boron mines are in Turkey. They are struggling over it [Turkey], their sole aim is to use. The American Minister of Foreign Affairs said "It is bad if we don't take Turkey in". Why is it so? (Tuğçe, public high school)³⁰

One of the outstanding emphases in this Eurosceptic discourse of some respondents is the romantic reference to the past, especially to the Ottoman period. We can resemble this to the concept of "romantic conservatism". What is central to this thinking is the attributed essential nostalgic contrast between tradition and modernity. The myth is articulated by the discourse of 'fall from grace'(Canovan, 1997:12).

Everything is on its head compared to old ages. For example, once upon a time, there were a lot of nations under custody of Ottoman Empire, we were the most powerful. Now they are taking revenge, they have become the most powerful (Derya, public high school)³¹.

Similarly, the following speech is showing the dynamic of Euroscepticism motivated by the past:

They have never included us in the EU and they never will, because as you now, they are actually a Christian community. In history there were the crusades. They have never wanted us, and there is hatred against the

³⁰ Bence gerçekten diğer AB'deki devletler Türkiye'yi kullanmak için istiyorlar. Madenlerimizden yararlanmak için, petrolümüzden. İşte ne biliyim, mesela Türkiye'de en fazla çıkan maden bor madeni, Yani AB'deki devletlerin çoğunda da bu maden yok. % 90'ı Türkiye'de bulunuyor zaten bor madeninin. Onun için uğraşıyorlar tek amaçları kullanmak. Ya mesela Amerika'nın Dış İşleri Bakanı "Türkiye'yi AB'ye almazsak kötü olur," demişti nedeni ne? (Tuğçe, düz lise)

³¹ Herşey taa eski devirden tam tersine döndü. Ya mesela eskiden Osmanlı Devleti'nin himayesinde bir sürü devlet vardı, en güçlü bizdik. Şimdi onlar intikam alıyor bizden, en güçlü duruma onlar geçti (Derya, düz lise).

Ottomans that comes from the past. Therefore they persistently never want us. They just want to take control over us. That is why we must not enter. They will not take us in anyway. They are just putting us off (Yasemin, Anatolian high school)³².

They recall the events that took place while the Ottoman Empire was crumbling down and believe that the recurrence of these events is quite possible:

We are irritated because they pose threat for our independence, actually. The same happened during the Ottoman period. An establishment was found. What was it? They were incessantly taking all the money and tax coming to the treasury as repayment for their debts. Probably, the same thing will happen to us. They were economically exploiting the Ottomans. In all probability they will exploit us in the same fashion as well (İlker, Anatolian high school)³³.

Another argument that has become part of the Eurosceptic discourse consists in the belief that ‘Turkey is already superior to Europe’. The superiority of Turkey is established by giving reference to past. According to this line of thought Turkey has nothing to gain from Europe: “If we are to take somebody as an example, we should take our history, ourselves as an example. Turkey will become Turkey with its own name, it shouldn’t be anything under the EU” (Emin, public high school)³⁴

Similarly, the following speech expresses the superiority of the Turks by going back to the roots of civilisation:

Some friends are saying that we will prosper, modernize. I don’t believe that we will modernize. Why? Man, your culture is 5000 years old, Turkish culture. At least 5000 years of culture. You haven’t modernized until now; will you become modernized with entering the EU? Will you

³² Bizi Avrupa Birliği’ne hiçbir zaman katmadılar ve katmayacaklar da, çünkü onlar bilirsiniz gerçekten Hıristiyan bir topluluk. Tarihte de haçlı seferleri vardı. Bizi hiç bir zaman istemediler. Osmanlıya da zaten geçmişten bir kin var. Sürekli o yüzden bizi hiç bir zaman istemiyorlar. Sadece yönetmek istiyorlar. O yüzden girmemeliyiz. Zaten almayacaklar. Sadece oyalıyorlar (Yasemin, Anadolu lisesi).

³³ Bizim bağımsızlığımız karşısında tehdit oldukları için gıcık oluyoruz, açıkçası. Osmanlıda da aynı şey olmuş. Bir kurum kurulmuş. Neydi o? Duyun-u Umumiye hazineye gelen bütün paraları, vergileri onlar kendileri borçlarına karşılık alıyorlarmış sürekli yani. Belki bizde de aynı şey olacak. Osmanlıyı orda ekonomik olarak sömürüyorlardı. Belki bizi de aynı şekilde sömürecekler (İlker, Anadolu lisesi).

³⁴ Eğer birilerini örnek alacaksak, kendi tarihimizi kendimizi örnek alalım. Türkiye adıyla Türkiye olacak. Gidip AB altında birşeyler olmamalı.”(Emin, düz lise)

be modernized by money? While we were building civilizations here, they [Europeans] were living in the caves. Why are they selling civilisation to us? There were a lot of scientists and philosophers who came from your Anatolia, but they [the Europeans] claimed them. We have examples of it in the Turkic-Islam culture; they took a lot of our materials and use them against us. And we still talk about entering the EU (Erdal, public high school).³⁵

The argument mentioned above has parallels with the perceived humiliation with the EU membership, and think that Turkey has a lot more advantages compared to Europe:

I think if I starve to death, let me die here. I don't want to be treated as a second or third class citizen there. We are better regarding the agriculture. None of the countries have what we possess. We have the bests of everything. Take the fish or the sugar beet; we have the most exquisite of those. We have the bests of everything (Muharrem, public high school)³⁶

Interestingly enough though, while talking about the superiority of Turks, we see some criticisms pointed out Turks as well. The following is a reflection of double-mindedness in the opinion on the EU, it bears nationalist perspective in addition to criticism of Turkey:

I want somebody sensible to come to power in this country. I want my country to be respected in Europe. Actually, I'm not interested in Europe. I would starve to death in this country rather than go to Europe. Europe is none of my business. If I happen to establish a firm in Europe, how I would go there. Suppose they have superior qualities, I would go and take them as examples. But I know, we are many times their superior in many issues. But in our relations to each other we don't have the thing.... How should I put it? We lack solidarity and togetherness. Do I make myself clear? There is treacherousness, stabbing from

³⁵ Bazı arkadaşlar şöyle diyor, biz feraha kavuşacağız, çağdaşlaşacağız. Hiç ben çağdaşlaşacağımıza inanmıyorum. Neden? Lan senin kültürün 5000 yıllık, Türk kültürü en azından 5000 yıllık kültürün var. Bu zamana kadar çağdaşlaşmadın Avrupa Birliği'ne girince mi çağdaşlaşacan? Parayla mı çağdaşlaşacan? Biz burda medeniyetler inşa ederken onlar [Avrupalılar] mağrada yaşıyorlardı. Şimdi bize niye medeniyet satıyorlar ki? Senin Anadolu'ndan bir sürü alim çıktı, filazof çıktı. Adamlar [Avrupalılar] kendileri sahiplendi. Türk-İslam Kültüründe bazı örnekleri var, bir sürü materyalimizi almış, bize karşı kullanmışlar. Biz hala konuşuyoruz Avrupa Birliğine girecez diye (Erdal, düz lise).

³⁶ Bana göre, aklıktan öleceksem burada öleyim orada gidip 2.3. sınıf insan muamelesi görmek istemiyorum. Tarım bakımından daha iyiyiz. Hiçbir ülkede bizde olan şey yok. Herşeyin en iyisi bizde. Balıkça, şekerpancarsıya en güzeli bizden çıkıyor. Herşeyin en iyisi bizde (Muharrem, düz lise)

behind. Everybody is digging each others grave (Cenk, public high school)³⁷

During the discussions participants noted the long time period that Turkey has tried to become a member of the European Union and they think that the fault of its failure so far is the lack of European institutions' sincerity. This thread in the nationalist discourse has as its motto 'They are putting Turkey off, humiliating it' . Some of the participants viewed the accession process negatively mainly due to the idea that the EU is making this process endless, is trying to delay and distract Turkey's efforts. They are complained about the newly introduced criteria. The following speech is a typical example of youth Euroscepticism:

Turkey has been striving to enter the process of European Union for many years. In the newspapers there is continuously news saying we entered the European Union process, we will enter the European Union. The criteria are these and those. To me it seems as if we are under the protectorate of other European Union states. We are in a subordinate position. In my opinion we will be an inferior position in the end. They will take advantage of us when we enter the EU (Derya, public high school).³⁸

Similarly, the following speech reflects the soft version of Euroscepticism. There is no outright rejection of the EU but complaint about the humiliation that Turkey faces during the EU integration process:

Attempting to enter is bad; if we were immediately it is not that bad. Now we are a laughing stock in their hands. Actually, I know that they will not take us in. They are only putting us off. They say come next year and we will meet. The next year comes and they tell us to come the year

³⁷ Ülkenin başına adam akıllı birilerinin geçmesini istiyorum. Ben Ülkenin Avrupa'da saygın bir konuma gelmesini istiyorum. Açıkçası Avrupa beni hiç ilgilendirmiyor. Şu ülkede açlıktan öleyim ben yine gitmem Avrupa'ya. Benim işim olmaz Avrupa'da. Büyük konuşuyorum, ya hani Avrupa'da bir şirket falan açsam Avrupa'ya nasıl giderim. Diyelim ki bizden daha iyi yönleri var. Gider onlardan örnek alırım. Ama ben biliyorum ki biz onlardan bir çok konuda kat kat üstünüz. Ama bizim birbirimize şeyimiz yok.... Nasıl desem? Birlik beraberlik yok. Anlatabiliyor muyum? Bizde arkadan fesatlık var. Herkes birbirinin kuyusunu kazıyor (Cenk, Düz lise)

³⁸ Türkiye yıllardır Avrupa Birliği sürecinde girdik girecez diye uğraşıp duruyor. Gazetelerde her gün Avrupa Birliği sürecine girdik, Avrupa Birliği'ne giriyoruz yok kriterler şunlar bunlar, her seferinde haberler çıkıyor....Ya şimdi bana şöyle geliyor: Yani diğer AB devletlerinin altına koruması gibiyiz. Daha aşağı durumdayız. Ya ama sonuçta bana öyle geliyor daha ezik bir durumda olacaktık gibime geliyor, bizi kullanacaklar AB'ye girdiğimizde (Derya, düz lise).

after. They keep prolonging it. Firstly, they want us to fall apart. They can't stand us because they are Christians. Secondly, they think we will conquer their land, because of our young population. They are right. We have a population of 70 million. In the EU Parliament, the countries with more population have more right of say. That is it will be as if the people of the mountain will come and shove away the people living in the plain (Egemen, occupational high school)³⁹.

Another respondent complained about the Turkey's humiliation in this process:

It is as if Turkey is a puppet, and they say "do this and do that". This is the way I see it. We are being played with like a puppet. They make us move our hands and arms. Europe tells us to do this, America tells to do that. I have the impression that we can't do anything on our own. Of course, we have accomplishments, successes and positives things but Turkey lacks a considerable move forward of her own to make her voice heard. How can I put it? It does not have such a thing [deed] that would make the whole world say "wow" (Erol, public high school).⁴⁰

One of the respondents reflecting on the atmosphere that is created about the EU membership in the public opinion said that the polarisation of public opinion regarding the EU membership was just a division of the nation on a new axis, aiming at disturbing its peaceful unity:

In my opinion there are two powerful races in the world: the Arabs and the Turks, I think. They [the Europeans] kept dividing them and made them as they are now. They divided the Arabs and divided the Turks. Now there are a lot of Turkic states. Should we include Turkey or should we not? Either saying yes to the inclusion of Turkey in the EU or not, I think they only want to create conflict in Turkey. Under normal conditions I don't think they will take Turkey [in the EU]. By creating confusion within Turkey, by looking as busy with something else, they want to mingle in our internal affairs (Ozancan, Anatolian high school).⁴¹

³⁹ Girmeye çalışmak kötü, hemen girmiş olsak kötü değil. Şimdi onların ellerinde maskara gibiyiz. Tutup tutup dolaştırıyorlar aslında almayacaklar bizi ben bunu biliyorum ama. Oyalyorlar. Seneye gelin görüşelim diyorlar. Öbür sene geliyor bir sene sonra gelin diyorlar. Uzattıkça uzatıyorlar. Birincisi bizim yıkılmamızı istiyorlar. Hıristiyan oldukları için yediremiyorlar. İkincisi nüfusumuz genç olduğundan oraları fethedeceğimizi düşünüyorlar. Haklılar. 70 milyon nüfusumuz var. AB parlamentosunda nüfusu fazla olan ülkenin daha fazla söz hakkı oluyor. Yani dağdan gelip bağdakini kovmuş gibi olcaz (Egemen meslek lisesi)

⁴⁰ Sanki Türkiye bir kukla, adamlar şunu yap bunu yap. Yani ben böyle görüyorum. Biz kukla bigi oynatılıyor. Elimizi, kolumuzu oynatıyorlar. Avrupa deyince bunu yapıyoruz, Amerika deyince bunu yapıyoruz, yani kendi başımıza bir şey yapamıyoruz gibime geliyor. Elbette yaptıklarımız, başarılarımız, artılarımız vardır ama yani Türkiye'nin kendi başına ses duyuracak bir hamlesi yok. Yani, nasıl diyim? Dünyanın "vay be" diyebileceği birşey yok yani (Erol, düz lise)

Because of the perceived endless road to the EU, the overall pessimism about Turkey's internal affairs and relative weakness of Turkey in the international arena, some of the respondents talked in terms of conspiracy theories about Turkey's attempt to integrate with the EU and maintain good relations with the USA. For them, EU and the other "great powers" have different ideas in mind regarding Turkey's membership to the EU. They see an unequal relationship between Turkey and EU; this perception induces them to think that the EU is playing with Turkey.

I think there is a council that rules the world. I don't know whether the head of the council is changing or not, but they all deal with the same business. They have already classified the countries as the first world, the second world and the third world. Besides, Turkey is very lucky regarding our geographical position. It is not just Turkey; countries like Iraq and Iran are also very rich considering their petrol and minerals. They are making these nations slumber, in order to get hold of these [minerals]. For example, how do they do it? They invent various TV programs, and make up problems. For example, "Would You Be My Bride", everybody is talking about it. For instance, think of paparazzi, everybody is talking about who did go out with whom, who did what with whom. Girls are looking for boyfriends, boys are looking for girlfriends; the youth has already become indifferent and they only talk about football or basketball. They are directing everybody and they are putting off everybody to make them stay in a certain point, than everybody is stays at that point. While you are at that point they themselves move one step forward.

Either the external powers or the internal powers...everybody is a pawn, that is pincers. They are trying to put everybody to sleep. Particularly, the Jews, not as a religion, but Jews. Everybody thinks that America is ruling the world, but actually, I think the Jews are, because despite their small number, they mistreat people. America is their assistant, and so is the European Union (Egemen, Occupational High School)⁴².

⁴¹ Bence dünyada iki tane ırk var güçlü olan: Araplar ve Türkler bence. Ve bunları da böle böle bu hale getirdiler. Arapları da böle böle bu hale getirdiler, bizi de Türkleri de böldüler. Şu anda bir sürü Türk devleti var. Türkiye'yi Avrupa Birliği'ne alalım mı almayalım mı? Bence yine böyle bir ortam yaratarak, alalım diyenler, almayalım diyenler, Türkiye içinde bir karışıklık çıkartmak istiyorlar. Normalde alacaklarından değil de. Sadece Türkiye içinde karışıklık çıkartarak yine başka şeylerle meşgul ederek iç işlerimize karışmak için yaptılar bence (Ozancan, Anadolu Lisesi).

⁴² Dünyayı yöneten bir konsey olduğunu düşünüyorum. Konseyin başı değişiyor ya da değişmiyor bilmiyorum ama hepsi aynı işi yapıyorlar. Ülkeleri sınıflandırmışlar zaten: birinci dünya, ikinci dünya üçüncü dünya ülkesi olarak. Bir de bizim coğrafi konumumuz bakımından Türkiye çok şanslı, sadece Türkiye değil Irak, İran gibi yerler petrol ve bazı madenler yönünden çok zengin. Bunları kazanabilmek için milleti uyutuyorlar. Mesela nasıl uyutuyorlar? Değişik değişik programlar çıkartıyorlar, problemler çıkartıyorlar. Mesela "Gelinim Olur musun?", herkes onu konuşuyor. Paparaziler mesela kim kimle gezmiş, kim kimle ne yapmış herkes onu konuşuyor. Kızlar erkek arkadaş peşinde, erkekler kız arkadaş peşinde, Gençlik zaten umursamaz oldu. Futbol konuşuyorlar, basketbol konuşuyorlar. Herkesi yönlendiriyorlar bir

During the in-depth interviews and focus group discussions I witnessed that it is quite common for the youth to view the affairs through conspiracy theories. Especially when the matter is an international one, the prevalence of using conspiracy theories to understand the events increases. The following is a similar example of this attitude:

Their [European Union's] aim is to bring Turkey neither to ninety degrees nor zero degree, because if they bring Turkey to zero degree terror begins and the country begins to pose bigger threat, since in the end it is a neighboring country to Europe. If it brings it to ninety degrees it can not stop this country, because it has a very young population, a population that will work. It has it resources; its military will be strengthened. This is the reason they can not stop it. Besides we are a warrior nation that is why they are afraid of it too. They are always holding Turkey at the forty-five degrees, neither so good nor so bad. If you pay attention, you will see the economy begins to get better for a certain period of time. When you happen to say "it is good", most certainly something will come up, because they do not want this improvement. But just look at it when it is going bad, somebody comes out and rescues [us] (Mehmet, Anatolian high school)⁴³.

The following is another example of such theories:

The Turkic states in the Asia are quite rich in minerals. Now, Europe and America will utilize a country that is culturally and racially closer to them [the Turkic states], in order to establish relations with them. We are a strategically closer state to them [the Turkic states], due to our continental position, that is, we are connected to Middle-East and Asia, and due to our culture and the past. Now, in order to establish ties with them they have to make use of us. They have to utilize us because they can not establish direct connections and relationships with them. They want such a state. They are in need of us now. They do not want us to

noktaya, herkesi oyalyorlar, herkes o noktada kalıyor. Ama onlar sen o noktadayken bir adım öne atıyorlar kendilerini.

Dış güçler olsun iç güçler olsun herkes bir piyon, maşa yani mileti uyutmak için uğraşıyorlar. Özellikle Yahudiler yani din olarak değil de, yahudiler özellikle, herkes Amarikayı dünyayı yönetiyor zan ediyor ama aslında bence Yahudiler, çünkü insanların az olmasına rağmen kök söktürüyorlar insanlara yani. Amerika onların yardımcısı, Avrupa Birliği de onların yardımcısı (Meslek lisesi, Egemen)

⁴³ Onların amacı Türkiye'yi ne doksan derece yapmak ne sıfır derece yapmak çünkü sıfır derece yaparsa terör başlar ülke daha büyük tehdit olmaya başlar çünkü sonuç olarak Avrupa'ya komşu bir ülke ama doksan derece yaparsa da önüne geçemez bu ülkenin, çünkü çok genç bir nüfusu var, çalışacak bir nüfusu var, kaynakları var, ordusu kuvvetli olur, o yüzden önüne geçemeyecekleri için. Bir de biz savaşçı bir milletizdir, yani bundan dolayı ondan da korkuyorlar. Türkiye'yi her zaman kırkbeş derecede tutuyorlar, ne çok iyi ne çok kötü. Dikkat ederseniz, bakıyorsunuz ekonomi bir süre iyileşmeye başlıyor tam iyi diyorsunuz kesinlikle bir olay patlıyor. Çünkü iyiye gitmesini istemiyorlar. Ama bakın tam kötüye giderken biri çıkıyor kurtarıyor (Mehmet, Anadolu lisesi).

fall apart entirely, but they don't want us to be stronger either. They will turn us into their slaves so as to realize their demands related either to Middle-East or Asia (Osman Ögünç, Anatolian high school)⁴⁴.

In the national(ist) discourse, the tendency to see the international affairs as a conflict and view nearly all other nations as the threat and enemies who are waiting for the weakness of the country is quite general stance that is appropriated by the youth. The national(ist) view has been borrowed by a wide spectrum of ideological positions from Atatürkists, to ultra-nationalists, Islamists and leftists. The wide spread adoption of this discourse among the youth highlights the fact that national(ist) discourse is the hegemonic discourse that is conveyed through the national education and nearly all other symbolic realm. Üstel (1996) writing on the citizenship in Turkey sustains that in the Citizenship Knowledge books published between 1985 and 1996, the superiority of Turkish nation was emphasised in order to create a stronger national unity and healthy and strong citizens. In these books internal and external threats to Turkish republic were disclosed with special emphasis. The external threats were mentioned by country names and through this operation 'us' and 'them' feeling were deliberately constructed as a militant reflex in the Turkish citizenship. The results, according to her were militant citizens and our youth research confirms her finding.

The end result of a national(ist) discourse is also the production of a sphere of 'sensitive issues', which is reflected in the Eurosceptic discourse as well. The very existence of these sensitive issues can also be attributed to the perception of threat to

⁴⁴ Asya'da Türki devletler yeraltı ve maden bakımından zengin baya bi zengin. Şimdi onlarla ilişki kurmak için Avrupa ve Amerika onlara kültür bakımından ve ırk bakımından daha yakın bir milleti kullanacaklar. Ki biz hem stratejik, Ortadoğu'ya bağlantılı, Asya'ya bağlantılı, bulunduğumuz kıta durumu olarak, hem de kültür bakımından, geçmiş bakımından biz onlara daha yakın bir devletiz. Şimdi onlarla bağ kurabilmek için bizi mutlaka kullanmak zorundalar. Bizden istifade etmek zorundalar çünkü direkt olarak onlarla bağlantı kuramazlar, ilişki kuramazlar. Öyle bir devlet istiyorlar. Şu anda bize ihtiyaçları var. Bize ihtiyaçları olduğu içinde bizim tamamen yok olmamızı istemiyorlar ama bizim tamamen güçlenmemizi de

the national integrity and the source of this threat is the European Union and the political criteria, the obligations that Turkey should fulfil in order to become a full member of the EU. During the in-depth interviews I touched upon such issues as human rights and freedoms, examples being freedom of expression, use of one's native language and right to get education and broadcasting in native language; and freedom of conscience and religion, that is mainly discussed around the exercise of cultural rights of Alevis. I asked the respondents whether these rights should exist in Turkey, and whether or not these issues can be considered as the basic democratic human rights. I also asked them to comment on the role of EU in these matters. The following is the typical Eurosceptic stance that comes up when talking about these 'sensitive issues':

European Union is trying to bring terrorism and separatism in to the country by introducing issues like independence and human rights. If you watch, the Leyla Zana case in the Human Rights Courts and similar others, it is crystal clear that these people are traitors to their country, who make oaths in Kurdish. They think that we should welcome these events as normal; they forget that this is Turkey (Onat, Anatolian high school).⁴⁵

They thought the implication of this issue was related to the Kurdish question and expressed their discontent. The blame is on the EU for intruding in internal affairs of Turkey. Considering one's liberty to exercise her/his cultural rights two stances can be observed. Some of the participants are against those rights to be exercised in Turkey. As expected, the argument is that Europe is intermingling into Turkey's internal affairs with the main aim being to weaken and divide Turkey:

- It would divide Turkey, if other languages were also spoken. We are already not well attached to each other despite the fact that we are

istemiyorlar. Şuan bizi köle haline getirecekler her istediklerini Ortadoğu'yla ilgili olsun Asya ile ilgili olsun bizi kullanarak çoğu şeylerini gerçekleştirecekler (Osman Öğünç, Anadolu lisesi).

⁴⁵ Avrupa Birliği bağımsızlık, insan hakları gibi konuları öne sürerek terörizmi ve bölücülüğü ülkeye sokmaya çalışıyor. Seyrederseniz insan hakları mahkemesinde Leyla Zana olayı falan olsun, bu insanların vatan haini olduğu açık ortadadır, Kürtçe yemin etmeye kalkan insanlar. Bunları normal bir şekilde karşılamamız gerektiğini düşünüyorlar; burasının Türkiye olduğunu unutuyorlar. (Onat, Anadolu Lisesi,)

comfortably speaking Turkish. If Kurdish were to be spoken too, everyone would fight everyone else.

- Well, why do you think European Union wants this?

- I think they want to divide [us]. It says "I am strong, I can divide." I said this just a while ago, Europe does not like Turkey that much anyway; they have a Turkish complex. Probably, that is the reason. Europe wants to establish a Kurdish state, but we will not let this happen (Emel, Anatolian high school)⁴⁶.

Other participants mentioned her reasons of the rejection of Kurdish education and broadcasting:

Their broadcasting can be controlled or not. I think it is too difficult. In this way, the means are provided for them to propagate easily. I think this is too dangerous, because of the difficulty of controlling it. I don't think it is right to accept both broadcasting and education. I think you can brain wash people when they are child, but how can you raise them with positive feelings toward Turkey in a school where the pupils and the teachers are Kurdish? (Yasemin, Anatolian high school)⁴⁷

Others considered the EU's motivation to interfere with the ban on turban issue in a similar vein:

Headscarf is a symbol in Turkey; it is a symbol of Islam. They [the Europeans] know this, that is, why they say it can be worn and permitted in the universities. This way they are trying to start a conflict between pro-headscarves and anti-headscarves. In the old days it was left-right conflict. Now they are investigating these [issues] cautiously, they are playing with balances, to see which one of these will work out (Kerem, Anatolian high school).⁴⁸

⁴⁶ - Bence başka dillerin de konuşulması Türkiye'yi böler, zaten rahat rahat Türkçe konuştuğumuz halde bir birimize sahip çıkamıyoruz. Bir de Kürtçe konuşulursa iyice herkes birbirine düşer yani.

- Peki Avrupa Birliği neden istiyor?

- Bence bölünmesini istiyor. Ben güçlüyüm bölerim diyor. Ben az önce de dedim. Zaten Avrupa Türkiye'yi pek sevmiyor, Türk kompleksi var. Herhalde o yüzden... Avrupa Kürt devleti kurmak istiyor, ama biz öyle şeye izin vermeyiz (Emel, Anadolu lisesi).

⁴⁷ Yayın yapımları kontrol edilebilir yada edilemez. Bu çok zor bence. Gayette rahat bir şekilde propaganda yapımları için ortam sağlanmış oluyor. Bence çok tehlikeli yani kontrol edilebilmesi çok zor olduğu için kabul edilmesini çok doğru bulmadım. Yayını da, okulu da. Bence küçükten de insanların beyinlerini ona göre yıkayabilirsiniz ama öğrencilerin Kürt, öğretmenlerin de Kürt olduğu bir okulda onları siz nasıl Türkiye'ye olumlu yetiştirebilirsiniz ki. (Yasemin, Anadolu lisesi)

⁴⁸ Türkiye'de türban bir sembol, İslamiyet'in bir sembolü. Onlar da (Avrupalılar) bunu biliyor o yüzden türban hani herkes orada da giyilsin üniversitelere alınsın diyorlar böyle yaparak işte türban taraftarları ve karşıtlarını bir araya getirip, eskiden de sağ sol çatışması vardı, şimdi buna benzer bir çatışma yapmaya çalışıyorlar. Şimdi bunları yavaş yavaş kurcalıyorlar, dengelerle oynuyorlar hangisi tutarsa diye (Kerem, Anadolu Lisesi).

The second standpoint with respect to the exercise of cultural rights sustained that they were democratic rights to be fulfilled. One can speak or broadcast or get education in his/her own mother tongue, or exercise his/her own religious practices, and the state should be in equal distance to all. But even for those, the EU's interest in these kinds of issues is to intrude in Turkey's internal affairs to divide and weaken Turkey. Therefore even for the one's who see the exercise of cultural right as ones democratic rights and in favour of these implementation, the 'sensitive issues' attitude served to strengthen one's Eurosceptic attitude. As their words: "It can be a democratic right but Europe is trying to divide that is why they interfere into our internal affairs" (Cem, Anatolian high school)⁴⁹.

The democratization steps should be taken, but these are happening because Europe is demanding them, these are delicate topics for Turkey. European Union is forcing those topics where the balances can be changed. For example, the right of broadcasting in native language. Or they are continuously pushing the Kurds, but there are a lot of nations in Turkey, take the Lazes or Armenians or there are Jews. As if their rights are not violated, are only the Kurds rights being violated? (Zuhal, public high school)⁵⁰

In general it can be concluded that 'the sensitive issues' play an important role in triggering the rise of Euroscepticism in Turkey. Furthermore, this sphere comprises one of the important pillars in understanding the dynamics of Euroscepticism in Turkey as it is one of the main motivations behind Euroscepticism.

In the survey, we assessed the respondents' opinions about the admittance of other languages in the education system; we asked to the respondent about the approval of the statement that "No matter one's own native language, the language in

⁴⁹ "Demokratik hak olabilir ama Avrupa bölmeye çalıştığı için iç işlerimize karışıyor". (Cem, Anadolu Lisesi)

⁵⁰ Demokratikleşme adımları atılmalı ama bunlar Avrupa Birliği istiyor diye olan şeyler, Türkiye'nin hassas olduğu konular. O dengelerin değişebileceği konuları Avrupa birliği zorluyor. Mesela anadilde yayın hakkı. Ya da sadece sürekli kürtlere bastırıyorlar Türkiye'de bir sürü millet var Lazından tutun Ermenisi'ne

the education must be solely Turkish”. The results showed that 72, 6% of the respondents were agree to this statement while 16, 4% disagreed. When we look into the responses of the Eurosceptics we see a slight increase to 76, 4% for the supporters and slight decrease to 15, 6% for the opponents.

Similarly, in line with our results, Çarkoğlu deriving from a Turkey representative survey regarding the sensitive issues such as freedom of thought and speech, lifting of the death penalty, right to get education, and broadcast in ones own native language found out that a clear majority of total respondents were against the Copenhagen adjustments (Çarkoğlu, 2004:24). Therefore, it is not surprising to find similar trend in the youth opinion.

The last important strand that can be placed under national(ist) discourse is the radical leftist argumentation that opposes the EU because of its particular emphasis on imperialism and liberalism. The emphasis on imperialism comprises the point of convergence of opinions in nationalism and leftism. Interestingly, these two otherwise opposing positions converge on the issue of national interest discourse as well. The following quotation is an example of the leftist perspective; I should also note that only one person in the in-depth interviews spoke in this fashion and overtly declared his affiliation to a leftist party. The following long quotation nicely depicts this motivation:

First of all, I should say that I am against the European Union. I view European Union as follows: European Union is an imperialist organization eventually. It is an organization of exploitation. EU is just like America ultimately, in the same way it exploits a lot of regions, has control over a lot of resources and exhausts those regions. EU is just the same.

Speaking in terms of economy, there is an article in the EU standardization laws, actually there are a lot of articles, but let me give this one as an example. There are four million farmers that are living on

kadar ya da Yahudiler var. Onların hakları ihlal edilmiyor da Kürtlerin burada hakları mı ihlal ediliyor? (Zuhal, Düz lise)

agriculture in Turkey. The European Union wants to reduce these four million families to four hundred thousand. Most of the Turkish people earn their living by working on the land and they provide most of the recourses from the land, that is, raw materials and other things from the land. Eventually, the agriculture is a kind of work that is self sufficient, in terms of geography and in terms of everything. Eventually, by demanding to reduce four million families to four hundred thousand, the EU says: “you don’t produce sugar beet, you don’t produce barley, and I can sell them to you as the EU’s. This is exploitation, in terms of economy; I am opposing it [the EU] in terms of economy. In terms of culture, economic structure effects cultural structure, eventually. It is clear how the American culture, with its eating style, art and music is imposed onto Turkish culture. For example, the culture of ‘Pop Star’, ‘Big Brother’, hamburgers, McDonalds etc is imposed on our culture. Eventually, your culture is not... , you are not able to offer your culture when you entered into the European Union. That is there won’t be a cultural exchange. There will be cultural influx [in Turkey]. They can be more advanced in certain things, for example the law, yes; in terms of law they are more advanced. They have equality. It is not like Turkey, how I can put it, for example those who have stolen baklava imprisoned for many years while corrupted people go out after three months. In terms of law, yes, if it will bring about such changes, in terms of law yes. But, European Union in terms of economy and culture means directly imposition.

The fact is that there is no such thing like most of the people do want the EU. Some want the EU because it is represented as if the borders are open, everybody can go whatever country they like to go, it is as if, let’s go to France, we can have our breakfast in France, we can hang out in Belgium in the afternoon, we can travel around England and other places as we wish and come back to Turkey in the next day. Some are thinking in this way, it is represented in this way. As if European Union is a union of freedoms. But eventually, it is not for the benefit of you and me. Which worker, or section [of the society] could ever say let’s take a flight in the morning and have a breakfast in France. There are those who can not even go to a restaurant and have a dinner in his/her own street. We are living in such a country. The EU will not be beneficial either in terms of culture, or in terms of economy. (Nedim, Anadolu Lisei)⁵¹.

⁵¹ Ben baştan şunu söyleyeyim, ben Avrupa Birliği’ne karşıyım, ben Avrupa Birliği’ni şöyle görüyorum AB sonuçta emperyalist bir kuruluştur. Sömürü kuruluştur. Sonuçta nasıl Amerika bir çok bölgeyi sömürüyorsa bir çok kaynakları ele geçirip o bölgeleri yiyip bitiriyorsa sonuçta AB de aynı.

Ekonomik anlamda AB uyum yasalarında bir madde var, ya bir çok madde var ama sadece bunu örnek olarak veriyim. Türkiye’deki 4 milyon tarımla uğraşan çiftçi, yani 4 milyon ailenin 400 bine indirilmesini istiyor Avrupa Birliği. Türkiye’nin büyük çoğunluğu tarım arazilerinden geçimini sağlıyor ve bir çok kaynağını da tarım arazisinden sağlar, yani ham maddesini falan tarım arazisinden sağlar. Sonuçta tarım kendi kendine yetebilecek bir iş konumundadır, coğrafi anlamda da her türlü anlamda da. Sonuçta AB 4 milyon ailenin 400 bine indirilmesini isteyerek şey diyor: “siz şeker pancarı üretmeyin, siz arpa üretmeyin ben AB olarak size satarım” diyor. Sonuçta bu sömürü, ekonomik anlamda bu böyle, ben ekonomik anlamda karşı çıkıyorum. Kültürel anlamda, sonuçta ekonomik yapı kültürel yapıyı da etkiliyor. Sonuçta nasıl Amerikan kültürünün işte, yemek tarzıyla, sanatıyla, müziğiyle Türk toplumuna empoze edildiği açıksa. Örneğin bir çok şeyde pop star kültürü, biri bizi gözetliyorlar, hamburgerler, Mc Donalds’lar şunlar bunlar empoze edildi kültürel anlamda. Sonuçta kendi kültürün şey değil, Avrupa Birliğine girildiği zaman

Although only one person declared his support for a left party and talked in the above manner, the discourse has much more influence in the formation of Euroscepticism among the youth. To assess its effect we set the statement “Turkey’s membership to the EU will serve to imperialism” in the questionnaire. We required the participants to respond in a three-point scale. The results show that 36,8% of the respondents are agreed, while 27,8% disagree with this statement. Assessing particularly the responses that are against Turkey’s membership the figure rise up to 73,0% for those who agree and decrease to 6,4% for those who disagree.

4.2.2.2. Grounds of the National(ist) Discourse

In an attempt of explaining the adoption of national(ist) discourse in youth Euroscepticism, I will firstly discuss the identity approach then I will proceed to the peculiarities of Turkish political sphere in promoting nationalism by briefly considering the main actors and main points of the discourse. Lastly I will reflect on the reasons of their motivations while trying to bridge their discourse with that of youth.

Similarly to the moral degeneration discourse, national(ist) discourse can best be analysed through identity theory of support for European integration. This theory provides better tools for us to understand the phenomenon. As Sean Carey (2002)

sen kültürünü veremeyeceksin, yani kültür alış-verişi olmayacak. Kültür akışı olacak. Bazı şeylerde ileri olabilirler, mesela hukukta, tamam hukuk anlamında evet, bir eşitlikleri var, Türkiye deki gibi şey değil, nasıl deyim, mesela baklava çalanlar yıllarca yatarken, hortumlayanlar üç ay sonra çıkıyor. Böyle çarpıklıklar falan tamam. Hukuksal anlamda evet, eğer böyle değişiklikler sağlayacaksa hukuksal anlamda evet. Ama Avrupa Birliği ekonomik ve kültürel anlamda direk empose anlamına geliyor.

Aslına bakarsan bir çok insan AB’yi istiyor diye birşey yok, kimisi isiyor AB’yi çünkü insanlara şey olarak lanse ediliyor: işte sınırlar açık, isteyen istediği ülkeye gidiyor, ya işte sabah Fransa’ya gidelim, kahvaltımızı Fransa’da yaparız, akşam Belçika’da takılırız, kafamıza göre İngiltere falan şuraları gezer ertesi gün döneriz Türkiye’ye falan gibi düşünüyor bir çok insan ki öyle lanse ediliyor. Avrupa Birliği özgürlükler birliği işte. Avrupa Birliği sonuçta sana bana bir faydası olmayacak Türkiye’de hangi işçi. Hangi kesim sabah olunca uçağa atlayıp Fransa’ya gidelim kahvaltı edelim diyebilir. Adam kendi sokağındaki lokantaya bile gidip yemek yiyemiyor. Böyle bir ülkede yaşıyoruz. Avrupa Birliği’nin ne kültürel anlamda, ne ekonomik anlamda bir faydası olmayacak (Nedim, Anadolu Lisei).

pointed out the strength of national identity predicts one's approval or disapproval of EU membership, in other words stronger feelings of national identity lead to lower level of support for the EU. Christin and Trechsel (2002: 417) also gave importance to the effect of national identity and by basing their argument on social identity theory they emphasized the importance of the formation of self-concept to the individual membership in social groups or categories. In sum, they sustain that individuals perceive and identify themselves as belonging to certain groups, and a nation is one of the most important groups contributing to the formation of the national identity.

Besides the individual level Carey (2002:390) suggested that "how states define themselves culturally, politically and economically is important to the dynamics of integration", and one's attitude toward EU. The nation-state plays a crucial role in one's adoption of national identity. Given the research findings that nationalist discourse comprise one of most the important strands of youth Euroscepticism, it is worth it to reflect on the underlying factors and motivation of the emergence of nationalism among the youth with regard to the integration of Turkey in the EU. In doing this I will depict the national(ist) discourse, a very important stance in Turkish politics and its perspective on EU membership. I believe highlighting the similarities between the nationalist discourse in the political sphere and the youths' discourse will especially help us understand the dynamics of newly emerging Euroscepticism that has become manifest after 2000's.

There are three main groups in the Turkish political sphere that subscribe to this discourse from the 2000's and onwards. Starting from the right to the left of the

political spectrum we see the ultra nationalists⁵², the representatives of the Republican tradition⁵³ and the national leftists⁵⁴. The Republicans differ from the ultra nationalists because the former take a very strong secular stance towards religion, while the latter prefer a discourse that shows tolerance to religion in the public sphere. The Republicans are also different from the others, because in terms of politics the former claim to be above the political spectrum. Although all three groups' attitudes towards political issues in general diverge, when it comes to the Eurosceptic discourse they have a lot in common. Firstly, they adopt such a discourse; and secondly they build their arguments in terms of national interest and integrity. But in their Eurosceptic stance while some of them favor a secularist discourse hence rejecting the Ottoman heritage others glorify the Ottoman past and Turkishness, still others adopts leftist argumentation in line with Kemalism. Although there are slight differences in their discourse of Euroscepticism, these differences are not reflected in youth's national(ist) discourse as they are articulated in a blended form. But in order for us to understand the appropriation of nationalist discourse by the youth we should concentrate on the national(ist)s and their motivations.

Before discussing the main motivations behind the national(ist)'s Euroscepticism it should be acknowledged that this is a quite recent phenomenon for

⁵² The members of MHP, BBP, and their youth organisations, and the groups that identify themselves as 'ülküçü' (idealists).

⁵³ This is an attempt to come up with a typology so as to avoid confusion as all the three groups make claims to the Kemalist legacy. Even though the Republicans have various profiles, some generals and high bureaucrat of the state would be the representatives of this group.

⁵⁴ Some of the prominent representatives of National Left are Confederation of Turkish Labour Unions, some NGO's such as Association of Atatürkist Thought, and some professional associations such as Confederations of Chambers of Engineers and Architects. Besides the NGO's, an academician and a party president Mümtaz Sosysal, an ex-Constitution Court's president Yekta Güngör Özden, President of Labour Party Doğu Perinçek, one of the prominent poet and intellectual Attila İlhan and some intellectuals around daily news paper 'Cumhuriyet' can be counted among the key figures of this approach in Turkey

Kemalist republicans, while Westernization and modernization have been a central objective of Atatürk and his followers and it has been proclaimed as the official state ideology since the beginning of the Turkish Republic. The nationalist ideology which was equated with Kemalism formed the framework of Turkish modernisation and the model for national development. However, the political transformation that Turkey has been going through since the Helsinki summit in 1999 when Turkish candidacy for membership in the European Union was approved has involved the changes in the political structure and power positions.

Commenting on the changes in the post-Helsinki period, Dağı (2005) argues that secular nationalists abandoned the “Westernisation” and democratisation ideal. Dağı (2005:32-33) sustains that the reason of this shift is Kemalists’ interpretation of the EU’s challenges about the Kurdish issue, human rights and freedom of religious conscience as threat to the integrity of the country and the regime. For them EU’s push of democratisation will bring about Kurdish separatism and paves the road to the coming to power of the Islamists.

Öniş (2003:12) similarly claims that the reforms proposed by EU (the ones emphasising minority rights, freedom of expression, freedom of association, etc) presented a major challenge to the principles of “hard-core republicanism” which underlie the Turkish state. The age-old motivation of Islamist’s rejection of Western world is cliché already; however the scepticism of Kemalist intellectuals signal a new tendency and deserves attention, since the Eurosceptic tone of this discourse is becoming the major argumentation formula which many people uphold. It is for this reason that I discussed the national(ist) in more detail compared to the moral degeneration discourse.

Alike the republican tradition, as I have noted in the second chapter, the ultra nationalists namely MHP, underwent important change in their EU stance after the 1990s. In the beginning of 90's the MHP assumed a more Eurosceptic stance, which became more pronounced in the issues of sovereignty, security and national identity. Güneş-Ayata (2003:211) discusses several reasons for this shift: firstly, the fall of Communist Block made it unnecessary to worry about Communism as it was the case in the 80's; therefore the alliance with Western Europe against communism became redundant. Secondly, the independence of Turkic states gave rise the possibilities of new political and economic alliances where Turkey could play a leading role with its experience of democracy and market economy. Alliance with the states in Central Asia seems to have been particularly appealing for MHP as this means putting a stronger emphasis on the origins of Turkish people in the Central Asia. Apart from the crucial international upheavals, the Copenhagen Criteria that put emphasis on the rights of minorities and the abolition of death penalty also disturbed MHP which paved the road to their Eurosceptic stance that become manifest during 1990s and 2000s.

National leftist's argumentation is quite important for us to understand the origins of youth nationalist discourse regarding their Euroscepticism and the entirety of nationalist motivations in foreign affairs in Turkish context. Ahmet Insel's argument on the definition of National Left while talking about nationalism in Turkey in general gives us important clues about this standpoint and its place in the political sphere. According to Insel (2002), national leftist approach perceives the nation as a total unity and defines the national interest with the interests of the state with ever-alive, deep obsession with inner enemies. For him, this Atatürkist nationalist leftism, in fact is no different than the classical nationalism. Unlike the

case in other countries, the nationalist ideology is not representing just a small portion of political spectrum, but it encompasses almost all of it.

Insel quotes the Ecevit's⁵⁵ definition of national left: "What we understand from democratic left, national left is safe guarding the integrity, unity and right of the Turkish Nation and Republic of Turkish State".⁵⁶ Insel argues that this definition is deriving from Atatürkist Nationalism that has been a forced official ideology in Turkey. In the Turkish political sphere everybody is expected to share this notion, those who are against this definition are judged guilty of high treason, are labeled as separatist, which in fact amounts to the same thing (Insel, 2002).

Günes- Ayata (2003:214) illustrates Insel's arguments by providing examples of themes that are common in this discourse. One theme goes as follows: Western State's strategies to weaken Ottoman Empire are still put to use in the attempt of impoverishing Turkey, only the tools have changed as they now are the IMF, Customs Union and privatization, which will result in making Turkey dependent to global economies by huge depths. Another theme is that Western nations, by imposing liberties like human rights and minority rights try to create conflicts in Turkey and these conflicts may weaken and even divide Turkey.

Why do the actors feel the need to adopt the nationalist discourse while formulating their position towards the EU? I believe that the term "Tanzimat syndrome" coined by Yılmaz is a good explanatory tool, which reveals the underlying motivations of Euroskepticism for the adoption of this discourse. Yılmaz calls it a syndrome as it is based on the presumption that "its own reading of history

⁵⁵ The concept of National Left was firstly used by Bülent Ecevit, just before the 3 November 2002 elections. According to Gunes-Ayata (2003:214) Ecevit pick up this concept strategically so as to emphasise the sensitivity to national interest.

⁵⁶ "Demokratik soldan, ulusal soldan anladığımız, Türk ulusunun ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti devletinin bütünlüğüne, birliğine, haklarına sahip çıkmaktır".

is the only correct one and that history always repeats itself". The founders of the Turkish Republic lived through the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and its dismembering due to nationalist wars. Cizre (2000: 226) sustained that this event has turned into a historical scar, a reminder of failure and humiliation. She also asserted that today whenever "unity and integrity" come up in the public speeches, they evoke memories of the 20th century mutilation.

The roots of the disintegration were found in the implementation of ethnic, religious and communal rights, which had been demanded by the Great Powers and served their interests. "The Tanzimat Syndrome assumes that demands for rights, even those for the most innocent and basic rights, are not what they seem to be on their face value and that they all conceal a hidden agenda that might endanger the unity of the nation and the security of the state" (Yılmaz, 2003:5). The individuals or groups that are given these rights, according to the syndrome, will in turn become agents of the Great Powers who are just waiting to get a piece of Turkish territory. As mentioned above, the syndrome incorporates the belief that history will repeat itself, and this position provides legitimacy for the fears and threat perception that feed the national(ist) discourse.

Öniş, (2003) offers another explanation for the existence of the national(ist) discourse. According to him the resistance to EU is in fact a resistance to the changes that are global in character and that are taking place in the process of "trans-nationalisation". This tendency started in the 1980's and continued during the 1990's, while the stress was on human rights and democratisation. In the European Union the trans-nationalisation tendency at the supranational was also accompanied by decentralisation at the local level. In other words, while sovereignty is pooled in at the supranational institutions of the EU, decentralisation refers to the domestic

politics becoming the concern of non-state actors such as civil society groups. These tendencies allow for the appearance of multiple identities and the promotion of minority rights (Öniş, 2003:11).

When reflecting on the situation in Turkey, Öniş (2003:10) argued the well-established state tradition produced a political system that is not welcome to wider democratisation. The shift and sharing of authority disturbed power holders that endorse modernist authoritarian visions of nationalism in Turkey. Therefore their language of resistance to change becomes one that is articulated through the framing of cultural rights as major threats to the unity of the nation (Öniş, 2003:29).

Yılmaz (2004:6-7) goes a step further than Öniş by arguing that the de-synchronization between Turkey and the European institutions began after the Second World War, when Europe decided to put a stop to authoritarian attitudes in politics. Since then, according to Yılmaz, Turkey has had difficulty in following suit with Europe. In my opinion this argument is unwarranted. In spite of everything, after WWII Turkey moved to a pluralistic political system and democracy has been a cherished concept in Turkish politics. It is the depth of this democracy that is being challenged by the emergence of subjects who want to be recognised by their own identities. Consequently, in my opinion what is going on in Turkish politics is not a question of de-synchronization, but rather a power struggle for the definition of democracy and its deepening.

European Parliament Committee on Foreign Affairs prepared a draft report saying “The underlying philosophy of the Turkish state, “Kemalism”, implies an exaggerated fear ... an important role for the army, and a very rigid attitude to religion, which means that this underlying philosophy is itself a barrier to EU membership” (EP draft report cited in Fokas, 2004:163). However, because of harsh

complaints about the matter, the references to Kemalism were removed from the report. Instead of it, the military as an obstacle to democratisation was reported (Fokas, 2004).

Even pinpointing the source of the problem provokes discontents in the Turkish counterpart. This unrest itself gives clues about the background of Euroscepticism in Turkey. The common point of the explanations that I tried to put forward so far indicates that the main motivation of Turkish Euroscepticism emanates from the founding principles of Turkish State. And this also comprises the main obstacles of Turkey-EU integration. The irony is that the promoters of Westernisation are ready to abandon their discourse as soon as they feel threatened by deeper democracy.

So when we return to the youth discourse on Euroscepticism we see a general acceptance for “Tanzimat Syndrome” and a lack of questioning of the reasons that lie behind it. Even the participants, who show Europhilic attitudes in most of the cases, are unlikely to talk about the advantage of EU membership in terms of more freedom, individual rights and liberty. Besides, as I pointed out in the discussion of moral degeneration discourse most of the youth who participated in focus groups or in-depth interviews frame the question of democratisation by EU membership through a dialectic which posits on the one side honour and dignity and on the other more rights and technological advancement. The constant reminder of the national scar leads them to think of minority rights as a threat to Turkish national unity.

4.4. Loyalties and Betrayal

Hansen (2003:311) pointed out “domestic debates on European integration can be seen as structured by a set of discourses that articulate a particular construction of the

concepts of ‘state’, ‘nation’ and possibly other collective ‘we concepts’”. The Eurosceptic discourse in the youth is also constructed around certain attributed meanings of ‘state’, ‘nation’ and ‘we concepts’ as it can be traced in the words of the youth. The importance of the state in the construction of these discourses, particularly the one that is related to nationalism, can not be underestimated, as Üstel showed in her research of the construction of citizenship in Turkey.

The cross-cutting theme in these two discourses is the implicit emphasis over loyalty and the condemnation of betrayal of this loyalty to the holy “we concepts”. In the first case, the moral degeneration discourse, the loyalty is assumed towards the Turkish ‘national’ culture, its traditions and values. And in the second, the loyalty is to the nation and the state. The EU support means the betrayal of these loyalties, selling one’s deeply cherished values to material gains. Under the present circumstances, thinking critically about the “sensitive issues” is enough to be condemned as guilty of “stabbing the nation from behind”⁵⁷. The possible gains through EU membership are considered as soap bubbles that would easy come and easy go like money. However, the founding building blocks of the society and the nation state are here to stay, and they are presented as the real thing.

In the first discourse the emphasis is put on assuming responsibility for the women in a man’s life, like the mother, the sister or the wife. This in turn is also associated with a deep respect for the father figure. Denying the responsibility for the women or respect for the father means to be disloyal to those deeply held values and is considered to be the last stage of the shame, it is the loss of one’s honour, which is the most important value that a man could ever possess. The EU or the European

⁵⁷ Articulated by Minister of Justice and Government Representative Cemil Çiçek while expressing his discontent about “Armenian Conference” which was to be held in Bosphorus University in May 2005, but was postponed several times.

way of life is considered to be decadent, and the examples of this are picked from the media and the movies. The EU membership means opening the doors of Turkey for the free flood of this decayed culture. In the described circumstances it is difficult for the one to express the sympathy over European culture, because any sympathy expressed would mean for some to agree to let your women be degenerated or forget respect for the father.

In the second discourse, the nation and the state are the values that were gained by the blood was spilled during the war of independence against the Western allies whose ultimate aim was to divide and conquer the nation. They are considered as enemies who have age-old demands over the Turkish territory and the nation. Furthermore, they are trying to actualise their demands by making Turkey give concessions to internal and external enemies who are in close relations with the Western nations. In these circumstances, the concession that is given on the way to the EU actually paves the road of Turkey's weakening and ultimate division by the Western alliances. Following this line of thought any sympathy towards the EU demands means 'selling the country' and disloyalty to the Turkish nation and spilled blood.

I observe this dialectic dynamic especially in the focus group discussions. The domination of these discourses inhibits the possibility of articulating critiques and speaking in favour of the EU. The focus group implementation gives the chance of observing the spontaneous reaction of the youth. In the discussion of EU the spontaneous reaction often is the either/or situation that is posed by culture versus civilisation dilemma. In line with Goffman's theory if we think of the individuals possessing a 'face' in interaction with others, needing continuous respect, legitimisation for self integrity (Goffman, 1963), then I can argue that the group

dynamic conditions individual's ideas to be reasonable and makes them maintain 'face' in front of 'others'. The reasonable and powerful ideas among the youth are those that are expressed either through moral degeneration discourse or nationalist discourse. Under these circumstances the youth tend to perpetuate the widely shared ideas to keep their face in front of others. Although I sometime challenged their stance with arguments about freedom and democracy, they persist in their dialectic thinking style of perceiving values as mutually exclusive.

4.5. Conclusion

In this chapter I concentrated on the results of the field research in search of youth Euroscepticism. The findings showed that the phenomenon is more intense in Anatolian high schools and preacher and religious leader high schools. Furthermore, participants belonging to the higher SES group were more prone to assume Eurosceptic stances compared to middle or lower SES groups. In youth's Eurosceptic discourse two strands appear to be dominant. The first is moral degeneration discourse that is formulated by a threat perception to Turkish culture and lifestyle. The second one is nationalist discourse that is expressed by threat perception to the unity and integrity of the nation state.

Considering the main motivation of the youth in their appropriation of these two discourses I argued that the identity theory provides plausible explanations to understand this phenomenon. The identity is formed around the "we concepts" that are mainly derived from Turkish nationalism and culture. Turkish state's founding principles contribute to this construction. I pointed to the incompatibilities and breaks between Turkish nationalism and founding principals of European Union by referencing prominent scholars who contemplated on this issue.

Especially, in the focus group discussions, when the others are present because the moral degeneration and the place of 'women' is discussed it is difficult for the one to undermine this sensitivity. If one happens to deny the importance of morality it is quite possible for one to lose face in the close groups of friends. The same is also true for the second discourse, as the result of denying the sanctity of the nation or that of the state would lead to having one blamed of 'selling the country' to foreigners or labelled as dissident by the rest of the close friends.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The thesis explored the dynamics of Euroscepticism in Turkey. Despite the fact that the term connotes one's scepticism over Europe and Europeans in the first sight, the meaning of it differs in the literature. It refers to the idea of rejecting the project of European integration both regarding its deepening and enlargement, or one's rejection of his/her country's membership to the EU.

The equation of Euroscepticism with one's scepticism over Europe and Europeans per se comprises one of the main dynamics of Turkish Euroscepticism in general. This equation overlooks the difference between a political project such as the European Union and the diversity that exists between the European and Turkish culture. In other words, the attempt of perceiving Turkey's EU membership through the glass of cultural differences with 'Europeans' and 'Europe' by both intellectuals and academicians sheds crucial light on Turkish Euroscepticism and it is a component of its dynamics.

And secondly, the failure to see the difference between a political project and different societal cultures that want to share it, leads to unproductive extension of the concept of Euroscepticism and contributes to a scientific confusion rather than clarification.

The findings of the field research interestingly show that on the issue of EU support qualitative and quantitative techniques yield different results, which can be interpreted as the separate sides of the same coin. While the survey results shows that

great majority of the youth expresses support for the EU, face to face account with the youth reveals serious reservations on this support. This shows that the “yes” answers are not without hesitations. The phenomenon itself transcends the “yes”, “no” dichotomy, and there are intense grey areas that the researcher should take into account on the study of EU support.

The enhanced analysis of research results reveals two core motivations for youth Euroscepticism: one is emanating from perceived cultural threat the other is from perceived threat to national unity. These two motivations are manifested among the youth via two discourses the first is moral degeneration discourse and the second is national(ist) discourse. Usually the two positions are intertwined and are manifested in a blend in youth’s interpretation of EU membership of Turkey.

The widespread Europhilic attitude towards the EU is best explained by the utilitarian approach to EU support, as the youth perceive materialistic gains by EU membership. However, the utilitarian approach does not equip us with necessary tools to understand the Euro-pessimists or hard Eurosceptic stances. Euroscepticism among the youth is best explained by the identity approach to EU support, that is the perceived cultural and national identity determines one’s negative attitude towards the EU.

Regarding the two main pillars of the youth Euroscepticism, firstly I believe the manifestation of highly nationalistic discourse in today’s youth Euroscepticism owes a lot to the specific atmosphere of 80’s onward. As I pointed out in the chapter on the field research the Eurosceptic youth were articulating their opinions on EU through the perception of continues threat, obsessions with internal and external enemies, and through the glass of conspiracy theories; an atmosphere was deliberately constructed in the atmosphere of 80’s and 90’s.

When it comes to explaining the great prevalence of the moral degeneration discourse, the literature is not helpful as I did not come across any study of this kind. My tentative explanation is the following. It can be argued that during the 80s ethnic nationalism was not the only ideology that dominated the public scene. This discourse was closely associated with the Islamic discourse, in what is known as the Turkish-Islam synthesis. Again the intention was to create a nation that was close, tight and proud, so as to prevent the political scenes that were common in the 70s. A research that shows whether the Turkish-Islam synthesis was as successful in creating “virtuous citizens” as it was in creating “militant citizens” would be very enlightening.

Besides the Islamic ideology, another factor that can be identified as influential in causing the triumph of conservative ideas in Turkey is the popular culture, that is the movies and the media which reinforce a conservative attitude; but unfortunately this is as far as I can go in the attempt to explain the dominance of this discourse.

The place of opinions in the political realm shows that we can locate the national(ist) discourse and find representatives of it among the political elites in the post-Helsinki period, namely the secularists/Kemalists, national leftists and MHP are the main agents of this type of Euroscepticism. Besides, throughout the history of Turkey-EU relations Euroscepticism was manifested among the elite as in the form of national interest discourse, sometimes highlighting economical concerns sometimes political ones. Deriving from its high popularity among the elite, I had an impression that the main dynamics of Euroscepticism in Turkey is mostly confined to the sphere of nationalism. In addition, closer reading of the literature and looking

into discussions on the issue of EU membership in the public sphere confirmed this assumption.

However, our research findings showed that fear of moral degeneration of the society is another important motivations behind the Euroscepticism that is mostly manifested in the public opinion and hardly heard in elite discourse. Among the youths the moral degenerations concerns even surpasses the effect of nationalist discourse for some groups. However, even though the moral degeneration discourse is more popular than the national(ist) discourse among the youth, unlike the national(ist) discourse its representatives are hard to find among the political elites. Only some Islamist intellectuals overtly articulate their discontent through moral degeneration discourse about EU membership.

As I mentioned in Chapter II, the potential bearers of moral degeneration discourse, that is the Islamist political elite has shifted their stance to support for the EU and its founding principles; scholars (cf. Fokas, 2004) have interpreted this change as pragmatic shift aiming political and social survival. They realised that the real threat to their existence is not coming from the West but from 'elitist republicanism'. The ideal of democracy and human right serves to their interests and the adoption of 'modern political values' and at the same time provides them with necessary tools to built a broader front against Kemalists (Dağı, 2005:31-33). But it should be acknowledged that while they adopt modern liberal stance in the political an economic sphere and come closer to the idea of European membership they still hold a conservative stance on moral issues. Despite their discontent regarding the moral sphere it is hard to hear any criticism of Europe and EU membership of Turkey with this respect. Besides, the voting base of this political camp did not achieve this shift towards EU. Çarkoğlu's (2003:174) research showed that the

smallest numbers of support for EU membership comes from SP and AKP supporters, 38% and 52 % respectively. The moral degeneration discourse shows that this finding is supported by our data as well.

Considering the popularity of this discourse in the public opinion we can expect a pragmatic shift in the elite discourse towards morality issues in the near future. Like youth's Euroscepticism, I think we can anticipate that elite Euroscepticism will soon incorporate dimensions of moral degeneration discourse besides nationalist discourse, given that the conservatism and nationalism are some of the rising trends in public opinion and Turkish political sphere during the AKP incumbency period.

The research on the youth was the first attempt to study the youth opinion on the EU in detail. The researches on youth conducted so far either dwelled on the matter as a secondary topic or tried to measure EU support in a very limited way. Most of the studies conducted on the issue of EU mainly assessed crudely the public's approval or disapproval of the Turkey's EU membership, and only very limited number of them tried to understand the reasons and motivations behind the attitudes towards the EU. The current research is an endeavour to assess the youth opinion on EU in depth, specifically it tried to discover the dynamics of negative attitudes towards the EU. Moreover, the research findings yield contradictory results compared to previous opinion polls on EU support, as the latter showed that Euroscepticism in Turkey is more of a lower SES, uneducated and rural phenomenon (Çarkoğlu, 2003, Yılmaz, 2004). However, our survey results indicated that the highly educated and higher SES group's sons and daughters are more prone to assume Eurosceptic stance compared to their counterparts. We can interpret this contradiction in two ways: it can be argued that the youth are a qualitatively different

population compared to the larger population of Turkey, and this accounts for youth's opinion divergence from that of total population on the matter. Or we can say that the divergence in the youth stance on the EU is foreshadowing a qualitative change for the near future that is the dynamics of EU support in Turkey is changing, and it is shifting from utilitarian to identity concerns.

Either way, these interpretations bring about a need for further longitudinal studies to assess whether it is a cohort effect or not. With regard to the national(ist) discourse, the parallels with the core state ideology confirms and gives support for Üstel's argument that it is deliberately constructed through threat discourse in the citizenship books used in Turkish education system. However, it is difficult to locate the originators of moral degeneration discourse and a research conducted through qualitative methods on how the discourse is perpetuated will be very helpful.

Lastly, Euroscepticism and its place in European countries are already studied extensively, and there is a barometer continuously measuring it. But what is mostly neglected in the literature is the main dynamics of particularly Turko-scepticism in Europe, or broadly anti-immigrant sentiments in predicting of Euroscepticism. I came across only one study in 2005 that confirms the effect of it. More comprehensive studies should be conducted on EU countries to locate its effects. Studies targeting anti-immigrant sentiments and scepticism on Turkey in such countries like Netherlands, Austria and France can be a good start. Scholars in Turkey should dwell on the issue to discover the positions of Turkey scepticism in these countries in order for Turkey to take effective steps towards EU membership, and its policy implications for public relations between Turkey and these countries.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Distribution of Participants

Table 1. The cities and the participants

Cities	N	%
Istanbul	411	9.0
Ankara	430	9.5
İzmir	384	8.5
Balikesir	379	8.3
Bursa	373	8.2
Adana	361	7.9
Kayseri	365	8.0
Malatya	361	7.9
Gaziantep	387	8.5
Erzurum	350	7.7
Trabzon	364	8.0
Samsun	377	8.3
Total	4542	100.0

Table 2. Type of the school and the participants

Type of School	N	%
Public High Schools	989	21.8
Anatolian High Schools	892	19.6
Occupational High Schools	914	20.1
IHL Schools	902	19.9
Private Schools	845	18.6
Total	4542	100.0

Table 1.2. and Table 1.3. show that the participants were approximately equally distributed along the selected cities and school types. The minute differences in both cases are due to different classroom's populations.

APPENDIX II

Public Opinion in Turkey

In this appendix I will discuss the field research that has been conducted in Turkey with regard to the Turkish public opinion on the European integration. As I mentioned before the researches on this issue are quite limited, nevertheless I think it is important to mention their findings with some detail as they contributed to the interpretation of my own data. The focus will be the dynamics of EU support and its distribution in Turkey, in doing this I will talk about main pillars of both Eurosceptic discourse and EU support.

Although EU Turkey relations, goes back more than forty years, only from the 1990's onwards public opinion became the matter of study. This situation though is not peculiar to Turkey, because as I showed above this was the case in Europe as well, given that the public opinion on EU integration gained importance after the Maastricht treaty.

Esmer conducted two field researches; the first survey was conducted in 1993 with the participation of 434 respondents from Istanbul, and the second one held in 1994 with participation of 364 respondents from Konya and 570 respondents from Istanbul. These researches gave the first clues about the public support of the EU. The results of these researches showed that those who favoured Turkey's alliance with Europe were more than twice as much as the supporters of alliance with Islamic States. In addition, the results showed that as the level of education increased the support of the EU membership also increased. The finding that religiosity was

negatively correlated with EU support, was reproduced by the consequent researches too (Esmer, 1997).

Erder also conducted a series of survey beginning from 1994. In 1996, in a survey conducted with the participation of 2396 respondents, the EU support was 54,8 %. Erder conducted a similar survey with 1800 respondents in 1998 and the support results were 61,8 %. These researches parallel to the Esmer's findings showed that: (i) as the education level increased the EU support also increased; (ii) those who disapproved of Sheriat were significantly more supportive of EU membership; (iii) considering the left-right political spectrum, the leftists are more likely to support the EU (Erder cited in Çarkoğlu, 2003:173).

Another survey that was conducted in 1998 and focused on youth in general, asked also questions concerning attitudes towards the EU. As a response to the question "Which international groupings would you prefer Turkey to join?" 39,1 % of the participants thought that Turkey should join the EU, 28,7 % Turkish Republics, 18,0 % Islamic Countries, 3,0% Balkan Countries. 29,9% of the respondents believe that Turkey joins neither of them but establish good relations with all. Besides this, 54.7% of the respondents disagreed with the statement that "The EU membership would separate us from our essential values" while 30 % agreed with this statement. Most of the respondents agreed that "The EU membership would improve Turkey with respect to human right and democracy" (69, 2 %), only 17.4 % of the respondents disagree with this statement. Similarly the majority of the respondents thought that "EU membership would be beneficial for Turkish economy" (71, 08%), while 12.7 % thought the opposite. Interestingly, 54.6 % of the respondents agreed upon the statement that "Rather than being dependent to the EU, we should search for opportunities to improve our selves" while 26, 8 % disagreed. Other question in

the survey focused on the assessment of respondents' attitudes towards Turkey's Westernisation policies. 35.2 % agreed with Turkey's Westernisation policies, but believed that the EU was acting with prejudice using and hypocrisy against Turkey. 26, 2 % agreed with the statement that "Turkey's Westernisation attempt was a total imitation and it had been shallow. 9, 7 % agreed that "Turkey's Westernisation attempts had been a mistake right from the beginning, while 28, 8 % replied by saying that they had no idea (Mülkiyeliler Vakfi, 1998). Similar to the frequently conducted more recent opinion polls these results confirm the strong support to the EU, however, besides this strong support existence of contradictory ideas and ambivalence is also evident among the youth as the distribution of the answers along the preferred alliances shows.

In the year 2000, McLaren and Müftüler-Baç conducted a study that focused on the perspectives of Turkish members of parliament (MPs) during ANAP, MHP and DSP coalition government. They chose 61 MPs weighted proportionately from all the parties in the parliament at that time. Therefore this study can be regarded as political elite study that is somehow reflecting public opinion. Results of the study showed that MPs were considering same problems that had been identified by report⁵⁸ of the European Commission to Turkey as barriers in front of Turkey's membership to EU. In the overall assessment of the results, MPs consider the political problems, particularly human right violations and democratisation as the main and most important obstacles in front of Turkey's membership. Economic problems come in the secondary importance in front of Turkey's membership for the

⁵⁸ The report summarised the political problems as threefold: Human right violation (i), military effect over civilian control (ii), and the Cyprus issue (iii). Most of the Turkey's chronic problems like inefficiency in the agriculture sector and financial sector, inflation, socioeconomic problems like illiteracy, infant mortality, poor health care, regional disparities in GNP and development were mentioned as the economic problems in front of Turkey's membership to EU.

MPs (McLaren, Müftüler-Baç, 2003: 203). This reflects important divergence with public opinion because researches show that public is more concerned with the development in economic and social life.

Considering the possible drawbacks that Turkey would face with the EU membership, 26% of the MPs foresaw no problems at all; 24 % considered the cultural degradation as the most important negative influence of EU membership; while similarly 23 % argued that the economy would deterioration if Turkey joins the EU as a full member state. As it can be expected, the deputies of Virtue Party and Nationalist Action Party were more concerned about the cultural degradation while deputies of Motherland Party and Democratic Left Party pointed out at the economic and social problems that would come up with Turkey's full membership (McLaren, Müftüler-Baç, 2003; 209).

Contrary to the expectations, only 17 % of the deputies pointed the loss of power or loss of sovereignty as a negative impact of EU membership. McLaren and Müftüler-Baç explains this by the limited knowledge of MPs about the EU integration process. As it is well known from the experiences of other candidate states the most provoking issue is the delegation of national interest and sovereignty to the trans-national authority, resulting in the relative weakening of nation states (McLaren, Müftüler-Baç, 2003:210).

MPs also raised some more points of obstacles for Turkey that were not indicated in the Copenhagen political criteria or the annual reports of the European Commission. Firstly, they viewed religion, Turkey's large population and the mass immigration potential to Europe as important obstacles in front of Turkey. Secondly, the MPs also note the EU's hesitancy of Turkey's membership because of extensive share of Turkey's votes and seats in the main EU institutions, such as European

Parliament, European Commission and Council of Ministers (McLaren, Müftüler-Baç, 2003:203). On the other hand, MPs did not consider the Cyprus problem as a barrier to EU membership. McLaren and Müftüler-Baç explain this attitude of MPs as their failure to accept that there is a problem in Cyprus. According to them, if one side perceives that there is nothing done wrong, it is hard for them to bear any responsibility in the solution of the problem (McLaren, Müftüler-Baç, 2003:205).

In May 2002 Çarkoğlu and his colleagues conducted survey with a participation of 3060 respondents. They asked the typical Eurobarometer question “If there were to be a referendum about Turkey’s full membership to the EU, would you vote in favour or against full membership?” Results showed that 64 % of the respondent voted in favour while 30 % voted against and 6 % did not provide any answer or declare any preference (Çarkoğlu, 2003, 173).

According to the results of the Çarkoğlu’s survey, males are more supportive of EU than the females but Euroscepticism has not been proved to be significantly different between the sexes. Age also proved to be insignificant for both EU support and Euroscepticism. Those who have high socioeconomic statuses are significantly more supportive of EU membership. Similar to the socioeconomic status, the dwelling type is proved to be influential. Furthermore, Kurdish speakers are also more supportive of EU membership compared to non-Kurdish speakers (Çarkoğlu, 2003:174).

Çarkoğlu also compared the geographical regions of Turkey with respect to support for EU membership. The respondents from Eastern and South-eastern regions showed the highest level of support: about 72 % of the individuals vote for EU membership in this region. Metropolitans come in the second place with approximately 71% support for EU membership. 60% of the respondents from

coastal provinces, inner Aegean and a few provinces in the Central Anatolia vote for the EU membership. Lastly, lowest level of support came from the participants from the Central Anatolia: 52 % support the EU membership (Çarkoğlu, 2003:174). We can draw some parallelisms with the electoral distribution, and political party preferences along the geographical regions. Because, typical election results in Turkey show that the nationalist and religious parties voter base is mostly in the Central Anatolia, while social democratic parties attracts vote mostly from the metropolitan areas and the coastal regions.

Çarkoğlu also shed light on the distribution of EU support and Euroscepticism along with the party preferences through the reported votes of the respondents. He found that the Felicity Party (SP) supporters bear the highest levels of Euroscepticism. Most of the SP supporters vote against Turkey's full membership to EU (58%) and only 38 % vote for the EU. AKP follows SP with respect to Euroscepticism, 41 % of the AKP supporters declared that they are against EU while 52 % declared their enthusiasm. The highest level of EU support comes from HADEP with 85 %, supporters of CHP follows HADEP with 79 % "yes" vote to EU. Clear majority of MHP supporters (68%) reported that they were favouring Turkey's EU membership (Çarkoğlu, 2003:174). This picture also shows that the supporters of the parties with high religious affiliation also tended to be more Eurosceptic compared to other party supporters. This also confirms Taggart and Szczerbiak's finding that Eurosceptic tendencies don't correspond to the preferred party's position on the issue. The best examples are the Europhile stances of AKP and of SP after 1999.

Çarkoğlu also investigated the effects of nationalism/patriotism, 'Euroscepticism', religiosity and democratic attitudes on EU support. For the effect

of nationalism/patriotism, he indicated that nationalism and patriotism should be differentiated from each other. According to him, patriotism means the love of country, or attachment to one's homeland. However, nationalism derives from the belief that one's country is naturally superior to others. Although Çarkoğlu differentiates this in the theoretical level, he failed to find support for this differentiation in the survey outcomes. As a result he reported that the nationalistic/patriotic respondents were less likely to support EU membership than the other respondents. He explained this by the current tendency of equating the EU support with the acceptance of minority rights and giving concession in Aegean Sea and Cyprus (Çarkoğlu, 2003:180).

Çarkoğlu also considered the effect of religion on the EU support. He assessed individual's religiosity through their attitudes on certain issues of religious significance. Issues like headscarf ban, the necessity to provide freedom of conscience and religion, religious practices and choice of using "Muslim" as one's primary identity, and perception of the EU as a "Christian club". Similar to the previous researches he found that religiosity is negatively related with EU support (Çarkoğlu, 2003:182). Lastly, he examined the effect of one's attitude towards democracy. He assessed the respondents' reactions to the issues concerning democracy's ability to deal with various problems, and whether certain freedoms could be banned depending on circumstances. Consequently, he reached a category of anti-democratic stances. As expected, anti-democratic attitude proved to be negatively related with EU support. Moreover, the highest level of Euroscepticism is detected in this group (Çarkoğlu, 2003: 183).

In 2002 the daily newspaper "Milliyet" in collaboration with Input Research Company carried out a survey with youth. They have found out that 69% of the

youth prefers Turkey's EU membership. The youth from the metropolitans were more in favour of the EU compared to the youth in the squatter houses (74% and 69% respectively). The percentages of the groups who say that Turkey should not join the EU differ from 22% to 24%. Youth thought that EU means education opportunities (46%), high living standards (45%), and job opportunities (41%). On the other hand 5% of the respondents say that EU means "racism" and other 8% thought EU means nothing for them. Almost 60% of the respondents thought that the EU does not want Turkey as a full member state. Similarly 58% of the respondents thought that Turkey should not give any concession in the accession negotiation with the EU. On the other hand, 20% of the respondents believed that Turkey might give concession in the death penalty, and 12% education only in mother tongue (Milliyet, 2002).

In November 2003 another representative survey was conducted. According to the result of this survey, 74% of the respondents said that they would vote "yes" in a referendum on Turkey's membership in the European Union, whereas 17 % of the participants assumed a Eurosceptic stance. One of the researchers, Yılmaz, attributed the 10 % increase in the EU support compared to the survey that were conducted in 2002 to the change of the government and new government's enthusiasm and determination for EU membership prospect, that became manifest after the election in November 2002 onwards.

According to the results, this time CHP supporters are the first group to say "yes" to EU membership with 86 %. This enthusiasm in the voter base do not translate itself into elite enthusiasm, as the speeches of Baykal, CHP's leader are full of examples of soft Euroscepticism, especially on issue concerning reforms. The second group were the supporters of the pro-Kurdish Democratic People's Party,

who are in favour of the EU membership by 84%. Similar to the survey results of 2002, the lowest “Yes” rates are from the supporters of the two far-right parties: the Nationalist Action Party (60%) the Felicity Party (58%). AKP followers EU support increased to 71 % in 2003, however it was still slightly below the national average. Similar to the other survey results higher levels of EU support were also observed among Kurdish speakers (78%) (Yılmaz, 2004:8).

When asked about their primary identity 54% of the respondents chose “Turkish” as their primary identity over other identities such as “European” and or “Turkish European”. This figure is much higher than the European average (38%). Only 4% of the respondents chose only “European” as their primary identity. According to the survey outcomes the majority of the respondents believed that Turkey is part of Europe geographically and historically. However, considering culture, economy and religion only a minority saw Turkey as a part of Europe, furthermore only 22% felt themselves as belonging to Europe while, this figure increased to 33% when it was asked in relation to Asia (Yılmaz, 2004:10).

Respondents also reported their anxieties in some of the areas. For instance 60% think that the EU treated Turkey with double standards in its demands compared to other new member or candidate countries. Similarly, one third of the respondents believed that the EU accession process is the repetition of the history that Ottomans lived through with capitulations, the unilateral concessions of the Tanzimat era, and the Sevres Treaty. Similarly, 55% believed that EU is founded on the Christian values, and 40 % believes that there is no place for Muslim Turkey in EU, which is considered exclusively a Christian Club. As an example of the anxiety provoking domains, 45% of the respondents fear that the EU membership will entail the rise of ethnic separatism, and will degrade the national unity. 35% fear that EU

membership will give rise to disintegration of Turkey along ethnic differences. As the negative impact of the EU membership, most of the respondents believe that the EU membership will bring the erosion of the moral values of youth and religious values (Yılmaz, 2004:10-11).

In his overall assessment of the survey results Yılmaz concluded that Euroscepticism was higher among the lower income and education groups. The traditional and rural sections of society who were enrolled in low skilled occupations tended to assume Eurosceptic stance when compared to modernized, urban sections with high-tech occupations. Besides, religious self-identification is a crucial indicator of Euroscepticism. As far as political party positions are concerned those who support the right-wing of the ideological spectrum, and/or the Islamic-oriented political parties and/or extremist political parties comprised the basis for Euroscepticism (Yılmaz, 2003:11).

In 2004 the Arı Group also conducted a mini-survey in high schools. A book was prepared for the representation of the EU and it was part of an EU sponsored project; the book was disseminated to 100.000 students in Arı schools all over Turkey and the survey questions were attached to the book. As a result approximately 24.000 students responded to the survey. According to the results of the survey 70.5 % of the students were in favour of EU membership while 16 % say “no” to Turkey’s full membership of the EU. 30.2 % of the students declared that they did not believe that Turkey would become a full member of the EU while 69.1%, sustained that Turkey’s full membership would be accomplished eventually. 92,5% reported that they had limited or no knowledge of the EU. Students are asked, “What is the EU?” and 17, 6 % responded that it is an “economical union”, 8.6 % “political union”, % 5.2 “social union”, 7.1 % “composite of values”; on the other

hand 59.2 % said that EU represents all of the above mentioned choices. Students said that TV and the newspapers were the main transmitters of information about the EU.

Interestingly, 20.9 percent of the students, who believed that Turkey would eventually be a full member state, also thought that Turkey would be a full member in 2007, while % 16.1 of the students believed that Turkey would become a full member in 2020. 83 % of the students thought that EU membership would bring about an increase in the education level in Turkey; while similarly, 82 % believe that it will result in improvements in the health services. 79 % of the respondents hope the betterment of the Turkish economy and % 76 of the students judged that EU membership would entail the increase in the respect for human rights. %60 believed that their family's economical condition would be affected positively from EU membership. However, only 44 % said that EU membership would bring about more transparent politics in Turkey (Radikal, 2004).

REFERENCES

- 1) Avcı, G. (2003) Turkey's Slow EU Candidacy: Insurmountable Hurdles to Membership or Simple Euro-skepticism? *Turkish Studies*, Spring, Vol 4, issue 1
- 2) Aydoğan, M. (2002) *AB'nin Neresindeyiz: Tanzimattan Gümrük Birliğine*, Kum Saati Yayınları
- 3) Başkan, F. (2005) At the Crossroads of Ideological Divides: Cooperation Between Leftist and Ultranationalists in Turkey, *Turkish Studies*, Vol.6, No.1, 53-69
- 4) BBC News (2005) Q&A: Turkey's EU entry talks. 4 October 2005, Retrieved on November 12, 2005 from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4107919.stm>
- 5) Beicheld, T. (2004) Euro-skepticism in the EU Accession Countries, *Comparative European Politics*, 2, 29-50 retrieved on 22/11/2005 from <http://www.jpes.euv-frankfurt-o.de/Publikationen/euroskept.pdf>
- 6) Bielasak, J. (2004) Party Systems and EU Accession: Euroscepticism in Eastern Europe. Retrieved on 16/11/2005 from www.indiana.edu/~iupolsci/euconf/Bielasiak.pdf
- 7) Canovan, M. (1997) Hannah Arendt as a Conservative Thinker, in *Hannah Arendt: Twenty Years Later*, eds: Larry, M, Kohn, J, Mit Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England
- 8) Carey, S. (2002) 'Undivided loyalties: is national identity an obstacle to European integration?' *European Union Politics*, 3(4):387-413
- 9) Christin, T, Trechsel, A.H. (2002) Joining the EU Explaining Public Opinion in Switzerland, *European Union Politics*, 3(4):415-43
- 10) Cizre, Ü. (2000) Turkey's Kurdish Problem: Borders, Identity, and Hegemony in *Right-sizing the State: The politics of Moving Borders*, eds: O'leary, B, Lusic I.S., Calloghy, T. Oxford:Oxford University Press
- 11) Çarkoğlu A. (2003) Who Wants Full Membership? Characteristics of Turkish Public Support for EU membership , *Turkish Studies* Spring 2003, Vol 4, Issue 1, Routledge, London & New York
- 12) Çarkoğlu, A. (2004) Societal perceptions of Turkey's EU membership: Causes and Consequence of Support for EU membership, in *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*, eds: Mehmet Uğur, Nergis Canefe, Routledge, London & New York.

- 13) Çayhan, E. (2003) Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler ve Avrupa Birliği, in *Dünden bugüne Avrupa Birliği*, eds: Beril Dedeoğlu, Boyut Kitapları, İstanbul
- 14) Dağı, İ.D. (2005) Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernisation, *Turkish Studies*, Vol 6, No.1, 21-37
- 15) Doğan, E. (2005) The Historical and Discursive Roots of the Justice and Development Party’s EU Stance, *Turkish Studies*, Vol 6. No.3, 421-437
- 16) Duran, B. (2004) Islamist redefinition(s) of European and Islamic Identities in Turkey, in *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*, eds: Mehmet Uğur, Nergis Canefe, Routledge, London & New York.
- 17) Ecumenical Council of Churches in the Slovak Republic (2005) Week of Prayer for Christian unity 2005, Ecumenical situation in Slovakia. Retrieved on Nov 16, 2005 from www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/faith/wop2005-8.pdf
- 18) Ehin, P. (2001) "Determinants of public support for EU membership: Data from Baltic Countries", *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol.40, No.1, 31-46
- 19) Esmer, Y (1997) *Türk Kamuoyu ve Avrupa: Türkiye Avrupa Birliği’nin Neresinde? Gümrük Birliği Anlaşması’nın Düşündürdükleri*, Ayraç Yayınevi, Ankara
- 20) European Commission (2002) Candidate Countries Eurobarometer 2002.1 Highlights October, EU webpage
- 21) Faris, E. (1925) "The Nature of Human Nature" Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. XX , 15-29. Retrieved from on 12/11/2005 http://spartan.ac.brocku.ca/~lward/Faris/Faris_1925.html
- 22) Fidrmuc, J., Doyle, O. (2004) Testing for East-West Similarities: Determinants of Support for European Integration – within EU – 25 retrieved on 17/10/2005 from www.dur.ac.uk/john.ashworth/EPCS/Papers/Fidrmuc_Doyle.pdf
- 23) Fokas, E. (2004) The Islamist movement and Turkey –EU relations, in *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*, eds: Mehmet Uğur, Nergis Canefe, Routledge, London & New York.
- 24) Gabel, M. (1998) Public Support for European Integration: An Empirical Test of Five Theories, *Journal of Politics*, 60(2): 333-354
- 25) Glyptis, L.A. (2005) The Cost of Rapprochement: Turkey’s Erratic EU Dream as a Clash of System Values, *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 6, No.3, 401-420

- 26) Goffman, E. (1963) "On Face-Work", *Interaction Ritual*, New York: Anchor Books.
- 27) Güneş-Ayata, A. (2003) From Euro-scepticism to Turkey-scepticism: Changing Political Attitudes on the European Union in Turkey, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Volume 5, Number 2, August
- 28) Hagevi, M. (2002) Religiosity and Swedish Opinion on the European Union, *Journal for the Scientific Study*, 41:4 759-769
- 29) Hansen, L. (2003) Domestic Opinion and Identity Politics, Cooperation and Conflict, *Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, Vol. 38(3): 311-317, Sage Publications.
- 30) Hayırlı Olsun, Kolay Gelsin (2004) *Radikal*, Retrieved on October 30, 2005 from http://www.radikal.com.tr/index_dinamik.php?tarikh=07/10/2004
- 31) Henderson, K. (2001) Euroscepticism or Europhobia: opposition attitudes to the EU in the Slovak Republic. Retrieved on 15/11/2006 from www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/documents/wp50.pdf
- 32) Hooghe, L. (2003) Europe Divided? Elites vs. Public Opinion on European Integration *European Union Politics*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 281-304
- 33) Hug, S., Schulz, T. (2005) Using Mass Survey Data to Infer Political Positions, *European Union Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 339-352
- 34) Hughes, K. (2004) Turkey and the European Union: Just another Enlargement? Exploring the Implications of Turkey's Accession. Retrieved on 10/10/2005 from <http://www.friendsofeurope.org/pdfs/TurkeyandtheEuropeanUnion-WorkingPaperFoE.pdf>
- 35) İkinci Büyük Türk Devrimi (2004) *Hurriyet*, Retrieved on 30/10/2005 from <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/anasayfa/0,,tarikh~2004-10-07-m,00.asp>
- 36) Inglehart, R. (1970) Cognitive Mobilization and European Identity, *Comparative Politics*, 3(1):45-70
- 37) İnsel, A. (2002) Ulusalçı Milliyetçilik, *Radikal* 2, 01.09.2002
- 38) Janssen, J. (1991) Postmaterialism, Cognitive Mobilization, and Public Support for European Integration, *British Journal of Political Science*, 21(2): 443-468
- 39) Jones, E., N. van der Bijl, (2004) Public Opinion and Enlargement: A Gravity Approach *European Union Politics*, 5(3): 331 - 351.
- 40) Kazimiers, M. Shabad, S., Shabad, G. (2003) Dynamics of Support for European integration in Post-communist Poland, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 42, 503-539

- 41) Kopecky, P. Mudde, C. (2002) Two sides of Euroscepticism: Party Position on European Integration in Eastern and Central Europe, *European Union Politics*, 3(3) 297-326
- 42) Kritzinger, S. (2003) The influence of Nation-State on Individual Support for European Union, *European Union Politics*, 4(2) 219-41
- 43) Kubicek, P. (2005) The European Union and Grassroots Democratisation in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, Vol.6, No.3, 361-377
- 44) Lees, C. (2002) 'Dark Matter': Institutional Constraints and the Failure of Party-based Euroscepticism in Germany, *Political Studies*, Vol 50, 244-267
- 45) Losh, S. (2001) Edf 5481 Methods of Educational Research Fall 2001. Retrieved on 25/ 11/ 2005 from <http://edf5481-01.fa01.fsu.edu/Guide2.html>
- 46) Lubbers, M., Scheepers P. (2005) Political versus Instrumental Euro-scepticism Mapping Scepticism in European Countries and Regions, *European Union Politics*, 6(2): 223 – 242
- 47) Maier, G., Rosenmayr, T. (2000) The Iron Curtain in the Mind: A comparison of mental maps of business students in Vienna and Bratislava, in *Integration and Transition in Europe: The Economic Geography of Interaction* (Eds) Petrakos, G. Maier, G. and Gorzelak, G., Routledge, London, New York
- 48) Manisalı, E., (2002) *Türkiye – Avrupa İlişkilerinde “Sesiz Darbe”*, Derin Yayınları, İstanbul
- 49) McLaren, L. M. (2000) Turkey's Eventual Membership of the EU: Turkish elite Perspectives on the Issue, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.38, No.1, 117-129
- 50) McLaren, L. M. (2002) Public Support for European Union: Cost Benefit Analysis or Perceived Cultural Threat?, *Journal of Politics*, 64 (2) 551-66
- 51) McLaren, L., Müftüler-Baç, M. (2003) Turkish Parliamentarians' Perspectives on Turkey's Relations with the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Spring 2003, Vol 4, issue 1.
- 52) McLaren, L.M. (2000) Turkey's eventual membership of the EU, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.38, No.1, 117-29
- 53) Milliyet (2002) Genç Türkiye 2002: Ekonomik Yaşam, Tüketim Davranışları, Sosyal Yaşam, Siyasete Bakış, Avrupa Birliği, Milliyet Gazetesi, İnter Araştırma ve İletişim A.Ş., retrieved on 05/11/2004 from <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2002/07/19/ekonomi/eko02.html>

- 54) Ministry of National Education, Research and Coordination Board Presidency. (2005). *Milli Eğitim İstatistikleri 2004-2005*. Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü Basımevi.
- 55) Müftüler-Baç, M. (1997) *Turkey and the new European Order, in Turkey's Relations with a Changing Europe*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, Newyork
- 56) Müftüler-Baç, M. (2001) *Türkiye ve AB: Soğuk Savaş Sonrası İlişkiler*, Alfa, İstanbul.
- 57) Öniş, Z. (2003) Domestic Politics, International norms and Challenges to the State: Turkey-EU Relations in the post-Helsinki Era, *Turkish Studies*, Spring 2003, Vol 4, issue 1
- 58) Papagiannidis, A.D (2005) Greece may Slip Back into 1980's style Euroscepticism, Retrived on 12/11/2005 from http://europeworld.link.be/PDFs/EW1_4.4_Greece.pdf
- 59) Radikal (2004) Liseli AB'ye girme yanlısı, 22/09/2004
- 60) Ray, L. (2003) When Parties Matter: The Conditional Influence of Party Positions on Voter Opinions about European Integration, *Journal of Politics*, Vol 65, No 4 pp: 978-994
- 61) Sanchez-Cuenco, I (2000) The political Basis for Support for European Integration, *European Union Politics*, 1(2), 147-72
- 62) Szczerbiak, A., Taggart, P (2000) Opposing Europe: Party System and Opposition to the Union, the Euro and Europeanisation, SE1 Working Paper 36, Opposing Europe Research Network Working Paper No 1, Oxford
- 63) Szczerbiak, Aleks. (2002) After The Election, Nearing The Endgame: The Polish Euro-Debate In the Run-up to the 2003 EU Accession Referendum. Retrieved on Nov 16, 2005 from www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/documents/wp53.pdf
- 64) Şen, M., Küçükural, Ö., Arslan, B. Arun, Ö. (2005) *Gençlik, AB ve Zıt Hisler: Bedenini İsterim ama Ruhunu Asla*, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara.
- 65) Taggart, P and Szczerbiak, A. (2002) The party politics of Euroscepticism in EU and Candidate Satates", SE1 Working Paper 51, Opposing Europe Research Network Working Paper No 6, Oxford
- 66) Taggart, P and Szczerbiak, A. (2004) Contemporary Euroscepticism in the party systems of the European Union Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe, *European Journal of Political Research* 43: 1-27

- 67) The European Constitution: Post-Referendum Survey in France, Flash Eurobarometer. Retrieved on November 10, 2005 from http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/flash/fl171_en.pdf
- 68) Tucker, J., Pacek A., Berinsky, A. (2002). Transitional Winners and Losers: Attitudes Toward EU Membership In Post-Communist Countries, Retrieved on Nov 16, 2005 from http://www.wws.princeton.edu/jtucker/EU_Ver3.6_AJPS.pdf
- 69) Ugur, M. (2003) Testing Times in EU-Turkey relations: the Road to Copenhagen and Beyond, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 165-183
- 70) Üstel, F (1996) Yurttaşlık Bilgisi Kitapları ve Yurttaş Profili, *Yeni Yüzyıl*, 25.04.1996
- 71) Vreese, C.H., Boomgaarden, H.G. (2005) “Projecting EU Referendums: Fear of Immigration and Support for European Integration” *European Union Politics*, 6(1): 59 - 82.
- 72) Vujcic, Z (2004) Transition online: A Eurosceptic Candidate, *Transition Online*, 10/18/2004 retrieved from EBSCOhost, Accession Number: 14843795
- 73) Yılmaz, H. (2003) Europeanization and Its Discontents: Evidence from Turkey, Working Paper, presented in the annual meeting of European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), Marburg, Germany. Retrieved on October 20, 2005 from www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/generalconference/marburg/papers/26/3/Yilmaz.pdf
- 74) Yılmaz, H. (2004) Turkey : Within or Outside Europe? An Historical perspective. Seminar to be held at IMEIS and Collingwood College, University of Durham 1 to 4 July 2004. Retrieved on October 30, 2005 from http://periples.mmsh.univ-aix.fr/REMSH/seminaires/Durham/HakanYilmaz_DurhamConferencePap.pdf