TURKEY AND ITS RELATION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION FROM A
RADICAL NATIONALIST PERSPECTIVE: THE NATIONALIST ACTION
PARTY FROM THE EARLY 1990'S UNTIL THE PRESENT

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

BY

ŞERMİN KORKUSUZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCES
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

MAY 2008

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.

_____

Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu
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.

_____

Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Özdalga
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Özdalga (METU, SOC.)   _____

Prof. Dr. Kurtuluş Kayalı (ANKARA UNI., HIST.) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu   (METU, SOC.) _____

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 : Şermin Korkusuz

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

TURKEY AND ITS RELATION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION FROM A
RADICAL NATIONALIST PERSPECTIVE: THE NATIONALIST ACTION
PARTY FROM THE EARLY 1990'S UNTIL THE PRESENT

Korkusuz, Şermin

M.Sc., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Özdalga

May 2008, 178 pages

The objective of this study is to analyse the discourse (from 1990s onwards) of the radical nationalist perspective about Turkey-EU relations. The EU is discussed as an actor within the globalization process. Therefore, in a broader context, the study presents the situation of the radical nationalist perspective in Turkey within the globalization process. In the study, the *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi/MHP* (Nationalist Action Party) has been selected as the political representative of radical nationalism in Turkey. The party's official discourse concerning the relations with EU is focused. In this framework, the party's perception of the EU, of Turkey-EU relations, of Turkey's position, of itself and of other actors in these relations are analysed. It is analysed which themes are prominent in its discourse. While doing this, I also try to reveal possible contradictions, uncertainties and ambivalences.

Key words: Nationalism, Turkish nationalism, Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi/MHP (Nationalist Action Party), Globalization, European Union (EU)

ÖZ

RADİKAL MİLLİYETÇİ BİR PERSPEKTİFTEN TÜRKİYE-AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ İLİŞKİLERİ: 1990'LARDAN BUGÜNE MİLLİYETÇİ HAREKET PARTİSİ

Korkusuz, Şermin

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Özdalga

Mayıs 2008, 178 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı radikal milliyetçi perspektifin, Türkiye-AB ilişkileri konusunda 1990'lardan bu yanaki söylemini çözümlemektir. AB, küreselleşme sürecinin bir aktörü olarak ele alınmıştır. Dolayısıyla çalışma daha geniş çerçevede Türkiye'deki radikal milliyetçi perspektifin küreselleşme sürecindeki durumunu ortaya koyacaktır. Çalışmada radikal milliyetçiliğin siyasi temsilcisi olarak Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (MHP) seçilmiştir. Partinin AB ile ilişkilere yönelik resmi söylemine odaklanılmıştır. Bu çerçevede, Parti'nin AB'yi, Türkiye-AB ilişkilerini, bu ilişkilerde Türkiye'nin konumunu, kendini ve diğer aktörleri nasıl algıladığı çözümlenmiştir. Söyleminde hangi temaların ön plana çıktığı analiz edilmiştir. Bu yapılırken de söylemdeki olası çelişkiler, kararsızlıklar ve ikilemler ortaya konmaya çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Milliyetçilik, Türk milliyetçiliği, Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (MHP), Küreselleşme, Avrupa Birliği

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKP   *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* (Justice and Development Party)

ANAP   *Anavatan Partisi* (Motherland Party)

AP   *Adalet Partisi (*Justice Party)

BBP   *Büyük Birlik Partisi* (Great Union Party)

CKMP   *Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi* (Republican Peasants' Nation Party)

CMP   *Cumhuriyetçi Millet Partisi* (Republican Nation Party)

DEP   *Demokrasi Partisi* (Democracy Party)

DP   *Demokrat Parti* (The Democrat Party)

EEC   European Economic Community

EU   European Union

MÇP   *Milliyetçi Çalışma Partisi* (Nationalist Working Party)

MHP   *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi* (Nationalist Action Party)

MP   *Millet Partisi* (Nation Party)

MSP   *Milli Selamet Partisi (*National Salvation Party)

NATO   North Atlantic Treaty Organization

OECD   Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

UN   United Nation

USA   United State of America

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this study is to analyse the discourse (from the 1990s onwards) of the radical nationalist perspective about Turkey-European Union (EU) relations. The EU is discussed as an actor within the globalization process. Therefore, in a broader context, the study will present the situation of the radical nationalist perspective in Turkey within the globalization process. In the study, the *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi/MHP* (Nationalist Action Party) has been selected as the political representative of radical nationalism in Turkey. The party's official discourse concerning the relations with EU is focused. In this framework, the party's perception of the EU, of Turkey-EU relations and of Turkey's position in these relations will be analysed. It will be analysed which themes are prominent in its discourse. While doing this, possible contradictions, uncertainties and ambivalences will be also tried to reveal.

Nationalism had been quite influential in the shaping the history of the 20th century. There exist very illuminating debates on the definitions, emergence, roots and fundamental components of nationalism and of nation. Along with the process of globalization, new dimensions were added to these debates. The concept of globalization, whose definition hasn't been clarified yet, is used to refer to the last 20-30-years period that the world has lived through. According to a definition that first comes to mind, it is the worldwide intensification of economic and social relations as a result of the development in communications technology. Transnational/supranational nature of globalization gave rise to various debates on the future of nations. Some thinkers claim that, nation-states will be eliminated; some claim that they will get even stronger; and some claim that they will transform and acquire new characteristics. Besides, there are some views suggesting that the process will activate nationalist movements. Because on the one hand, barriers

between countries are collapsing and relations are getting closer. However, on the other hand, a rise is observed in ethnic conflicts. Regardless of their predictions about the position of nationalisms within the globalization process, all these views suppose that there is a tension between nationalist movements and globalization. The influence of globalization is searched especially in the radical right/nationalist movements rising in Europe since the 1990s.

As mentioned before, the EU is discussed in this study as a part of the globalization process. As a matter of fact, transnational formations are one of the most important actors of the globalization process. EU is among the most significant of these institutions. It was established as an economic community (the European Economic Community/EEC) with the Treaty of Rome (1957). In the course of time, regulations that are beyond the economic field were also proposed. It got its current name (EU) in the year 1992. Today, there are many debates going on about the EU because of social, political and economic regulations that it stipulates for the member countries. The member countries face at a concrete level the changes proposed by the globalization process through membership to the EU (by means of freedom of movement, common currency unit, common policies in the fields such as agriculture, industry and security). Therefore, looking into the debates on the EU will also provide us with information about the positions concerning globalization.

Turkey's relations with the EU (then named the European Economic Community/ EEC) began with the Treaty of Ankara signed in 1963. Following this date, there have been ebbs and flows in their relations. The relations were static especially during the 1980s, and they were suspended in 1987. In the period between 1990 and 1995, a great stagnation predominated. With the Customs Union Treaty (CUT) signed in 1996, a new period began in the relations. In the year 1999, Turkey acquired the status of a candidate country. Following this date, the EU has become a predominant issue in Turkey's agenda.

In Turkey, the views of radical nationalists loom large in the debates over the EU. As stated above, in this study, the MHP was selected as the political representative

of radical nationalism. In the 1970s, the MHP started to be influential in the political life of Turkey. It drew attention with its Turkist ideas, and sometimes obviously brought the anti-Westernist discourse to the forefront. It leaned toward the alliances that would be established with Turkic peoples rather than with Western states. The EU is a formation, which puts pressure on these fundamental characteristics of it, and forces it. Therefore, it is considered that the debates over the EU would appear in a more explicit/crystallized form in the MHP's discourse.

The study focuses more on the period after the 1990s, although it also touches upon the previous period in general. There are a couple of reasons for this. Firstly, new nation-states were formed with the collapse of the Soviets in 1991, and the debates on nationalism were intensified. Turkic Republics had gained their independence within this period. These developments influenced the MHP, which had been arguing for a Turkish Union, in various ways. In the 1990s, there was a general rise in nationalist movements both in Europe and in Turkey. Secondly, with the Customs Union Treaty (1996), an active period has begun in terms of the relations with the EU. Thirdly, in the period after the 1990s, the MHP had become both the government party as a coalition partner (1999-2002) and also the opposition party (2002-). Therefore, it is suitable to focus on this period for comparing the MHP's discourses in different political positions (government party-opposition party). In other words, in this way it can be traced whether the party's discourse on the EU has changed depending on its power position. Fourthly, there are views suggesting that, the MHP has been changed since the end of the 1980s; and it has become more moderate and conciliatory leaving aside the Turkist and pan-Turkist elements. In this study, I will look into how the asserted change was reflected in the party's discourse on the EU. Again in the 1990s, an important development was experienced by the party. Leadership of the party has changed in 1997. Devlet Bahçeli became the president of the party upon the death of Alparslan Türkeş. Therefore, focusing on the period in question will provide us with the opportunity to trace the changes in the discourse that is likely to happen with the leadership change.

It should be noted that the MHP isn't a homogenous structure. The party involves different views within its structure although there had been a big dissolution/division at the end of the 1980s, and the party structure had become more homogenous. It covers diverse wings within its structure -radical Turkist, conservative or Islamist. However, the study mainly focuses on the party's central-official discourse. Of course, a comparative study, examining the discourses of the party's voters, supporters and adjacent/contiguous/neighbouring fields as well, could have been more fulfilling. However, since that kind of a study would have gone fairly beyond the limits of this thesis, discourses of the fields apart from the centre were excluded.

The second chapter of the study is devoted to the issues of nationalism, globalization and the EU. In that chapter, debates over the definitions and roots of the concepts of nation and nationalism are covered. The diverse classifications of nationalism are discussed. Views on the fundamental components of a nation are also included. Therefore, a general framework is presented related to nations and nationalisms. Again in the third chapter, debates over the condition and future of nations, nationalisms and national cultures within the globalization process are discussed. The focal points of these debates are introduced to be used as a framework for examining the MHP's discourse on the EU. In addition to this, a general historical background related to the course of the EU-Turkey relations is presented. Developments, which had become turning points in these relations, are discussed although there is not a detailed analysis. This chapter is expected to present a broad framework of the issue to the reader.

In the third chapter of the study, the MHP's intellectual and historical background is presented. The emergence of nationalism in Turkey and pre-Republican nationalist movements are discussed in order to understand the process leading to the MHP's establishment. Convergences and tensions between Turkism and Kemalist nationalism in the Republican period, and the state of Turkism during and following the World War II are interpreted. The *Dokuz Işık* (Nine Lights) Doctrine and the

party's historical development are introduced. By focusing on the mentioned points, it is aimed to reveal the MHP's understanding of nationalism and its prominent ideational characteristics. In this way, I tried to form a framework for understanding where the party's discourse on the EU can be located in their general thought.

Following this are analyses that are done on the basis of the party texts. Thus, in the fourth chapter, first of all, I focus on the following questions: Which characteristics of the EU were generally used to characterize it in the MHP's discourse; and in what kind of a discourse EU was the located by the MHP. I am trying to sort out concepts with which the EU was discussed, and also the type of identity that was attributed to it. While examining the MHP's discourse on the EU, firstly, focus will be on how the 'EU' was conceptualized by the Party. In this framework, I try to understand how the EU was identified fundamentally: a "total civilization", or an "economic union", or a "cultural entity". Since the European Union accession process is regarded as a stage of Turkey's Westernization, and as Turkish nationalists have an ambivalent approach to Europe and Westernization, I approach the texts/discourse as a field in which those ambivalences are reflected. Therefore, the texts are analyzed in terms of this ambivalence issue. In this framework, the study aims to reveal whether the MHP constructed its discourse around "hostile" concepts or "friendly" concepts. In this chapter, by analysing how the EU was constructed, it is aimed to better understand possible points of objection and the types of objection that might be raised by the MHP in Turkey's EU accession process.

In chapter fifth, characterization of the Turkey-EU relations in the MHP's discourse and the statements about Turkey's position are discussed. What I want to do in this chapter is to focus mainly on two points: Firstly, in general terms and briefly, how the Turkey-EU relations are constructed in MHP's discourse. Secondly, in the context of these relations, what kind of a subject Turkey is in the narrative. In this chapter, while looking into the characterization of Turkey in the relations, our starting point is the fact that Turkey is an independent country. Therefore, the

focuses of analysis are "national sovereignty", "nation-state structure" and "territorial integrity".

In chapter sixth, I examine how the atmosphere in the country was constructed in the MHP's discourse. In other words, I look into how the party's discourse addressed the influence of changes proposed by the accession process on the local dynamics/social structure.

In chapter seventh, I review how the party positioned itself in the picture that it outlined in terms of the EU-Turkey relations. In other words, I looked into the characteristics that the party, as a subject, attributed to itself in its discourse. While doing this, I have also discussed how the party constructed other actors than itself in its discourse.

As can be seen, while analysing the discourse, focus has been on the MHP's perception of the EU, Turkey, the Turkey-EU relations, itself and the other actors in the under consideration process.

Lastly, it is necessary to specify that in this study the globalization process is concerned by merely relating it with the European Union. The aspects of the globalization process which concerns and includes Turkey and political geographies such as USA and Middle East is excluded from the sphere of the analysis of this study. One reason for this is the concern for reducing the size of the scope of the study. The other reason is that, in discourse of MHP the globalization process is not predominantly dealt with by referring to the axis of USA. Besides, MHP's treatment of West and of the relations with West is approached from the European Union frame of reference.

1.1 Methodology

This study is based on qualitative methodology that offers adequate tools for the aim of the study, which is to analyse MHP's discourse on EU. This analysis is

attempted to be done through a documentary research which particularly involves the review of official documents, texts and the leader's speeches of the Party.

In terms of methodology, this study mainly relies on the primary sources published by the MHP Head Office, such as reports, books, booklets and statutes of the Party, the Party line, and the leader's speeches in the Parliament or in press statements and a photo-film about the EU broadcasted on the Party's web site. Almost thirty books/booklets and three reports prepared by the Head Office were evaluated and Devlet Bahçeli's approximately 375 speeches between 1999-2008 were reviewed.

Since the study intends to focus on the period after the 1990s, primary sources are mainly from this period. To evaluate the Party's discourse and its perception of the EU process before the 1990s through publications, some interviews with Alparslan Türkeş, the founder and the leader of the Party before Devlet Bahçeli, published in different dates were used as the other primary sources that the study relies on. Those documents and information were attained from the Party's web site, and the Parliament records. Thus, in this study, I attempted to achieve my objective by reviewing the documents mainly prepared by the Party itself. The documents are the formal, open-published primary sources from the MHP website, and the MHP publications. The analysis of these sources provides a representative, first-hand, reliable and meaningful information to explore the MHP's changing discourse on the EU in the course of time.

Since the study is focusing on the way meanings are constructed and how they are constructed through definitions concerning the issue, these resources are examined by a textual-interpretative method. The data is the content of the texts of which I made an in-depth reading; and it is analysed through reviewing. The methodological approach also includes descriptive presentation and interpretative-critical understanding in the course of the study. This kind of documentary analysis provide to understand documents' (public documents like media reports, government papers or publicity materials; procedural documents like minutes of meetings, formal letters or financial accounts; or personal documents like diaries, letters or

photographs) substantive content or to illuminate deeper meanings which may be revealed by their style and coverage.[1]

The thematic separation of primary sources is derived from reviewing literature on nationalism, EU, globalization, Turkish nationalism and historical and ideological background of the Party, all of which helps the researcher to interpret the content of the primary sources.

In the study Turkish originals of the texts, which are quoted from the statements of Alparslan Türkeş and Devlet Bahçeli, can be found in the footnotes. By this I aimed that; the Turkish readers can see the unique structure of the texts and some specific expressions. In showing the references for Bahçeli's speeches published on the party's web site, I adopted the following way: The links of the web pages, where one can see the dates and texts of the speeches, were given in the footnote. The titles of the speeches, which were given by the Head Office were not written exactly in the footnotes. Instead, to refer the speeches, some titles were a bit shortened.

---

[1] Jane Ritchie, "The Applications of Qualitative Methods to Social Research" in *Qualitative Research Practice,* ed. Jane Ritchie and Jane Lewis (London: Sage, 2003), 35.

CHAPTER 2

NATIONALISM, GLOBALISATION AND EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

2. 1 Nations And Nationalism

The concepts of nation and nationalism have been on the agenda among intellectuals, scholars and political activists since the time of the French Revolution. There is no general consensus concerning the meaning of these concepts. On the contrary, they have, ever since they became the focus of the public debate been contested and are still a source of controversy. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize some of the most common understandings and reflect on some of the related debates. One set of definitions describes nations[1] as communities sharing certain cultural attributes such as religion, language, and/or history. Another group of definitions emphasize the role of a community's belonging to the same governmental unit, and/or having common social and economic interests, i.e. it can be described as being more instrumental.[2]. Here the important distinction is between those underlining cultural identity and those underlining instrumental interests. A third group of definitions combines the focus on cultural identity and instrumental interests and focuses on the balance between culture, ethnicity and citizenship.[3]

---

[1] There are different opinions among scholars about ethimologic origin of the nation term. Since out of this study, this point will not be discussed. See for information about etimology and meanings in various languages of the word: Lewis, Bernard. *The Political Language of Islam* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991) 38-39, 41-42; Hosbawm, E. J. *1780'den Günümüze Milletler ve Milliyetçilik* (3rd ed. İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 2006) 30-35; Uzun, Turgay. *Türk Milliyetçiliği ve MHP* (Ankara: Ebabil, 2005) 2-3.

[2] Recep Boztemur, "Tarihsel Açıdan Millet ve Milliyetçilik: Ulus-Devletin Kapitalist Üretim Tarzıyla Birlikte Gelişimi". *Doğu Batı*, no. 38 (2006): 161-179.

[3] Turgay Uzun, "Ulus, Milliyetçilik ve Kimlik Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme". *Doğu Batı*, no: 23 (2003), 131-154.

Another distinction is the one between subjective and objective definitions. Watson, for example, emphasizes the role of how individuals themselves define their nationhood. He recommends that if a great number of people in a society assume that they bring forth a nation and behave like a nation, it means a nation has appeared. His argument is that it is not enough to define a nation in terms of some objective or 'scientific' criteria. The important thing to look at is whether the members of the community define themselves as constituting a nation.[4]

Long before Watson, Ernest Renan advocated the importance of the will of the individuals in the constitution of a nation. For Watson, the nation is not just a simple group of people under the shadow of shared history. [5] It's a group of "faith union". For Renan, the effects of cultural collectivization, the parallel visions and the ability of living together are the main points of being a nation.[6] He refrains from explaining a nation by means of objective elements like race, religion and language. According to Renan, the basic elements of a nation are a shared history full of heroism, great leaders and victories. In addition to that he also expressed the importance of "forgetting as a whole". Nations should remember their successes and forget their bad experiences in order to save their unities. Renan meant that a nation was like a daily plebiscite. So, the nation owes its existence to the approvals of each person taking part in it.

Max Weber also emphasized the subjective element, when saying that a nation is based on the feeling of warmth and affection that a group of people may show to one another. This feeling of warmness and sympathy arises from certain basic elements uniting a nation. These basic elements are language, religion, culture,

---

[4] Hugh Seton Watson, *Nations and States An Enquiry into Origins of Nations and Politics of Nationalism* (London: Menthuen Publishers, 1977), 5.

[5] Yves Santamaria, "Ulus-Devlet: Bir Modelin Tarihi" in *Uluslar ve Miliyetçilikler*, ed. by Jean Leca. Trans: Siren İdemen (İstanbul: Metis. 1998).

[6] Ernest Renan, "What is a Nation?", in *Becoming National: A Reader*, eds. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 41-55.

historical consciousness, morals and political targets. These characteristics are independent from ancestry and blood ties.[7]

The distinction between definitions emphasizing subjective and objective factors respectively has also been highlighted by Anthony D. Smith of the London School of Economics, one of the most well-known contemporary scholars of nationalism. Size of population, economic resources, communication systems, and bureaucratic centralism are objectives aspects. According to him, these factors are not sufficient themselves. Therefore subjective elements have to be taken into consideration, i.e. expressions of collective will, memory, value, permanent cultural characters of symbolism.[8] Thus, according to Smith, nation is a community sharing a common historical territory, myths, historical memory, mass public culture, economic system, and legal rights and obligations. Smith insists that a nation absolutely must be defined in relation to a political community. When defining a people as a political community this indicates that they share and are constituted as a community by means of certain common institutions.[9] The distinction pointed at here between subjective and objective factors underlies important debates around the definition of the nation. While some scholars emphasize a common territory, culture, language as making up the main components of a nation, other scholars are keen to underline that there is no valid, coherent and satisfying objective criteria to explain nation.

The historian Eric Hobsbawm argues that there is no *a priori* way of determining how one nation is distinguished from another. The question of why some communities turn into nations, while other communities do not, is encountered by a set of various criteria: language, ethnic origin, common territories and cultural properties. However, according to Hobsbawm, objective criteria like language and

---

[7] Max Weber, *Sosyoloji Yazıları* (trans. Taha Parla, İstanbul: İletişim, 1996), 257-259.

[8] Anthony D. Smith, *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni*. (Trans. Sonay Bayraoğlu, Hülya Kendir. Ankara: Dost, 2002), 24; Anthony D. Smith, *Millî Kimlik* (Trans. Bahadır Sina Şenel. 3rd edt. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004), 32.

[9] Smith, *Millî Kimlik*, 257-259.

ethnic belonging are not less fluid than subjective criteria. They are at least as fluid, variable, comprehensive, and ineffective for the problem.[10]

One could say that the ideas of thinkers are including some differences which related to their ideas about the emergence of nation and nationalism. Along with aspects related to how a nation and nationalism are identified, there is also a set of issue about the historical roots of nation and nationalism. This question constitutes one of the main discussion topics within the theories of nationalism and concern where in the evolution of human societies nationalism should be placed. In relation to this question scholars have been divided between primordialists, modernists and ethno-symbolists.

According to the *primordialist approach* ethnic communities and nations are the natural unities of history and supplemental components of human experience. It is possible to speak about socio-biologic version and sociologic version of the approach. For socio-biologic version expresses that ethnicity is an extension of kinship as an agent in surviving in fulfilling collective targets. More sociological one side of the approach regard language, religion, ethnicity, and territory as the main principles or connections that organize the people who have, during history, common aims. Nations and nationalism are not only natural but also enduring. Nationalist units and feelings in modern era, actually, are just more active and more extended versions of similar units and feelings there were very old times of human history. To belong to a group, kinship, to need a cultural symbolism in communication and meaning are characteristics which are peculiar to human nature. When those are considered as basic elements, then, nation and nationalism are enduring and universal. Thus, modern nations and nationalism are updated versions of pre-modern ties and feelings. Even if, there are some differences in their violence and projecting, in every human group, they're available. There are some periods of

---

[10] Hosbawm, *1780'den Günümüze*, 19-22.

recessions in the histories of nations. But this cannot erase the essence of nation. The true attitude is awaking the nation and giving birth to the fire of nationalism.[11]

According to the *modernist perspective*, nation is not a natural and given element in the historical-social mosaic. On the contrary, like capitalism, bureaucracy, secular pragmatism, it is a modern phenomenon. Though, nationalism has accorded strongly to modern conditions, essentially, roots of nations are neither settled in human nature nor pre-modern in history. This approach argues that nation and nationalism, mainly, has appeared during the second half of the 18th century. Social and cultural formations in ancient or medieval era, which have been similar to nation and nationalism, are conjunctions or exceptions. According to this view nation and nationalism as a development that goes hand in hand wider in industrial civilizations. This starting point, therefore, is the rise of modernization. Thus, nation and nationalism occur in a reciprocal relation with modernization and modernity; and is a branch connected with this main body. To put it in a different way, modernists assume that there is a radical breaking point between modern nations/nationalism and pre-modern units/feelings. It should also be stressed that different approaches are available among the modernists. They are distinguished from each other concerning which stress is give to the economical or the political base of modern nations. Thus, they apply different modernization perspectives, with in which they try to understand nationalist feelings.[12]

Furthermore even if human beings have been living in culturally defined community from the earliest times, obtaining a characteristic nation is only realized in present eras. The nation concepts appeared as a natural result of sociological and political changing process in West. In Europe, with the decline of the feudal system,

---

[11] Smith, *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni,* 34-36; Umut Özkırımlı *Milliyetçilik Kuramları Eleştirel Bir Bakış* (Ankara: Doğu Batı, 2008) especially see: 3rd part**.** Again**,** highly detailed evolutions of this approach see: Anthony D. Smith, *Küreselleşme Çağında Milliyetçilik* (Trans: Derya Kömürcü, İstanbul: Everest, 2002).

[12] Smith, *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni*, 30-33; Smith, *Küreselleşme Çağında*, xv-xxi.

it appeared. New economic, social and political relations, as well, new common belonging feeling were needed.[13]

Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm are important supporters of the modernist approach. In order to understand nation and nationalism, Anderson analyses how they obtain historical existences, how and why their meaning change over time, and why they have so great legitimacy in present. He argues nationalism appeared toward the end of the 18th century when different historical powers intercepted. Essentially, according to Anderson nationalism indicates very radical transformation even ruptures in form consciousness. He tries to explain what kind of function nationalism obtained in a time period when all ancient being the property of a certain religious community and a confident dynasty.

Anderson defined a nation as "an imagined political community [that is] imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign"[14] According to Anderson, the creation of imagined communities became possible because of what he calls *print-capitalism.* For him capitalist entrepreneurs printed their books in the vernacular not in an exclusive script language in order to maximize their circulation. As a result, readers speaking various local dialects became capable of understanding each other, and a common discourse emerged. So, the first-European nation-states built around national print languages.

An imagined community is different from a real community for the reason that it is not/ and cannot be based on quotidian face-to-face interaction between its members. Instead, members hold in their minds a mental image of their affinity. Anderson determines that, this "imagined community" is not just imagined, it is imagined as restricted, sovereign and a certain community:

---

[13] Uzun, "Ulus, Milliyetçilik ve Kimlik..", 132.

[14] Bendict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991), 6.

The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind.
.....

It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm. Coming to maturity at a stage of human history when even the most devout adherents of any universal religion were inescapably confronted with the living pluralism of such religions, and the [direct relationship] between each faith's ontological claims and territorial stretch, nations dream of being free, and, if under God, directly so. The gage and emblem of this freedom is the sovereign state.

Finally, it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings.[15]

Anderson underlines the importance of the Industrial Revolution on the emergence of nationalism. Key factors in his analysis are: the movement to abolish the ideas of rule by divine right and hereditary monarchy; the emergence of printing press capitalism; and the reduced import of privileged access to particular script languages because of mass vernacular literacy.[16]

Like Anderson, Gellner advocates nationalism constructed community: "Nationalism is not awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where do they exist."[17] Moreover he defines nationalism like this:

Nationalism is primarily a political principle that holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent.
Nationalism as sentiment, or as a movement, can best be defined in terms of this principle. Nationalist *sentiment* is the feeling of anger aroused by the violation of the principle, or the feeling of satisfaction aroused by its

---

[15] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6-7.

[16] Ibid; Anthony Smith, *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni*.

[17] Ernest Gellner, *Thought and Change* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolcon, 1964), 169.

fulfillment. A nationalist *movement* is one actuated by sentiment of this kind.[18]

For Gellner, nations are not universal necessities like states:

> Neither nations nor states exist at all times and in all circumstances. Moreover, nations and states are not the same contingency. Nationalism holds that they were destined for each other; that either without the other is incomplete, and constitutes a tragedy. But before they could become intended for each other, each of them had to emerge, and their emergence was independent and contingent. The state has certainly emerged without the help of the nation. Some nations have certainly emerged without the blessings of their own state. It is more debatable whether the normative idea of the nation, in its modern sense, did not presuppose the prior existence of the state.[19]

Thus, a concept that's used by Gellner on the one hand "refers to peculiar link between ethnicity and state. Nationalisms are, in this view, ethnic ideologies which hold that their group should dominate a state."[20] On the other hand, his theory is based on necessities of industrial society. He states in the agro-literate stage (previous times) there were no nation and nationalism's place; elites and masses that product food are decomposed from each other by cultural lines. Rulers had little incentive to impose cultural homogeneity on the ruled. In this kind of society, an ideology that can overcome such decomposed structure is not achievable. Whereas, modern societies need cultural homogeneity in order to survive; and appropriate ideology can be created by homogeneity. Modern industry requires literate, technologically well-qualified population. Because in modern society work becomes technical; one must operate a machine, and as such one must learn. There is a need for high degree of cultural standardization. Modern state is the primarily even unique agent is to provide by means of massive, public, imperative and standard educational system. As industrialization and modernization spread into non-Western geographies in non-equalitarian way destroyed conventional structures and cultures;

---

[18] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 1.

[19] Ibid, 6.

[20] Thomas Hylland Eriksen, *Ethnicity & Nationalism: Antropological Perspectives* (London, Boulder, Colorado, 1993).

and had people broken by force from their environments and roots. As a result of this process, a class conflict appears between old classes that have been living in the cities for a long time and new classes that are getting urbanized. If newcomers cannot be fuse into dominate-literate culture by means of educational system, then, possible result is two separate nations occurred by two different nationalisms.[21] However, as a caution against that kind of danger "nationalism stresses solidarity between the poor and the rich, between the propertyless and capitalists. According to nationalist ideology, the sole principle of political exclusion and inclusion follows the boundaries of the nation –the category of people defined as members of the same culture."[22]

According to Smith, modernists in general and Ernest Gellner in particular are justified in their theories. He supports their arguments that in spite of the fact that nationalist feeling or national communities are encountered already at the end of the 15th or at the beginning of 16th century, nationalism in the full sense of the word, including a legal or state system, is a phenomenon that did not appear until the end of 18th century. Even if the European States System was formed already with the Westphalia Treaty in 1648, then, these states did not begin to turn into nation-states until the 19th century, indirectly; a nation state system did not exist in that time. In this context, it's seen that 'nation' and 'national character' are modern concepts.

On the other hand, it is difficult to argue that modern national identity is completely modern. It's possible to find, some movements, in pre-modern era even ancient world, that are similar to modern-nationalist ones. Like Ion resistance against to Persian expansion and Gal confrontation against Caesar's expeditions at the end of the 6th century BC can be given as examples, which are based on aspiration to rescue

---

[21] According to Smith, Gellner's theory is fail both to explain the revival of nationalism post-industrial era and in non-industrial societies. For Smith's critics about this matter see: *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism* (London: Routledge, 1998); Smith, *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni*; Smith, *Küreselleşme Çağında Milliyetçilik*. Moreover, Hobsbawm criticizes Gellner's theory because of that it is not sufficiently appropriate to evaluate movements arising from base , see E. J. Hobsbawm, *1780'den Günümüze*.

[22] Eriksen, *Ethnicity & Nationalism.*

territory occupied by aliens. So, Smith emphasizes, nation and nationalism is neither natural/inherent as primordialists argue nor completely modern as modernists defend. He recommends a third approach to analyse nationalism matter and says that it's necessary to be put national identities and ideologies and in group feelings' and identities' long-timed perspectives.[23] For him myth, memory, symbol, and value identifies nation; and in order to understand these aspects, pre-modern ethnic formation should be considered. Even if ethnicity transformed and changed, it provided an effective model. The approach that appears in Smith's ideas is Etno-Symbolist approach. Like Smith, J. Armstrong also assumes this idea and tries to get the synthesis of primordialism and modernism. These writers focus on the ethnical background and culture for their analysis about nationalism. Because for their idea, the myths, symbols, rituals from past, form the basics of nationalist pronunciation. On the other hand, they don't ignore the effects of connection between nationalism, capitalism and industrializing. For them, only modernism is not enough to explain nationalism.[24]

In addition to discussions above on modernity or pre-modernity of nation and nationalism, categorizing of nationalism looms large in studies in this field. It's not possible to talk about all nationalisms and one nation idea in the same case.

Carleton Hayes is the first scholar who tries to categorize nationalist ideology types[25]: Humanitarian, traditional, Jakoben, economic and integral ("state means nation" idea).

L. Synder also tries to classify nationalist ideas.[26] He talks about four kind of nationalism ideas; integrative, distruptive, aggressive and contemporary nationalism. For Synder, every kind of idea about nationalism signs a period. His

---

[23] Smith, *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni,* 27, 33-34.

[24] Özkırımlı, *Milliyetçilik...*, 5th chapter.

[25] Ibid, 61.

[26] Louis Synder, *The Meaning of Nationalism* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1954).

classification is also chronological. For this classification, integrative nationalism is dominant between 1815-1871; distruptive nationalism is dominant between 1871-1900. Between 1900-1945 is the aggressive period of nationalism. Contemporary nationalism is dominant after 1945.

Breuilly is another writer who classifies nationalism in periods. "John Breuilly's complete treatment of nationalism makes systematic use not just 'revolution from above' but also of the distinction between separatist and unification nationalism.[27]

Another kind of classification on nationalism is East-West nationalisms. Hans Kohn focuses on this kind of classification. According to Hans Kohn there are two nationalisms: one of them is Western/voluntaristic and the other one is Eastern/organistic nationalism. For him, in America, England, and France, nationalism is much more rationalist and pluralist. In these countries since nationalism is based on social contract, it serves middle-classes' social progress thought. On the other hand going towards much more romantic/emotional and authoritarian nationalism are encountered. This kind of nationalism is dominant in Russia and Asia; and it's supported by the intelligentsia and low levels of aristocracy. It underlines populist points.[28]

Smith assumes a similar classification. He bases his ideas on Western and Non-Western nationalist ideas. In this classification, western ideas of nationalism mean territorial, non western ideas of nationalism mean ethnical[29] For Smith, the territorial idea is dominant on western nationalism. For this idea, nations must have well defined countries. Territory is the place of historical memories and associations. It's one and only and holy. The second fact of western nationalisms is having a collective command under the laws and associations. Another characteristic of western nationalism is approaching to its' individuals in totally

[27] John A Hall, "Nationalisms, Classified and Explained" in *Notions of Nationalism*, ed. Sukumar Periwal (Budapest, London, New York: Central European University Pres, 1995), 20.

[28] Özkırımlı, *Milliyetçilik*, 62.

[29] Smith, *Milli Kimlik,* 25.

legal equality. Western nationalism idea also focuses on some approaches like ambition, collective understanding, sentimental, idea, cultural dimensions and civil ideologies. System of education and mass media devices make this situation possible. For Smith, the basic facts of western/territorial-nationalism rises on the facts of historical country, legal-political group, legal-political equality of individuals, collective civil culture and ideology. This nationalism signs the French-English nationalism model. According to Smith, the main difference of Non-Western nationalism idea is, its' basic which rises on the birth-rooted thoughts. For western idea, a person can choose his/her own nation by his/herself. But non-western nationalism never gives this right to individuals. The person and the nation related to each other organically. For ethnical idea of nationalism; the nation is a group from the same origin. The origin of nation bases on the same ancestry. On western idea, the nation is a group under the same laws and associations. In non-western ideas, nation is a part of nationalist ambitions. It means the leaders legalize the ideas by leaning to nation. So mobilizing the nation is very important for the non-western nationalism. Another characteristic of non western nationalism is, putting the culture instead of law. Especially language and traditions are very important. So working on linguistic and ethnographic searches are important too. This workings rise the collective soul and history. Reminding the political memories and lands is also important. As a result, for Smith, the basics of non-western nationalist idea are genealogy, hypothetical, eugenies, mobilizing the nation, language and traditions.[30]

J. Plamenatz is also talks about Eastern-Western types of nationalism like Kohn and Smith[31] Eastern nationalism of Plamenatz doesn't exists on a homogeneous geography. This kind of nationalism exists on the territories where imperialist and colonial effects are dominant (Like Slavs, Africa and Asia). According to Plamenatz the nations of Central and Eastern Europe were modernised fairly later than Western nations. So, their peoples suffered from 'a feeling of inferiority or

---

[30] Ibid, 28-30.

[31] Partha Chatterjee, *Milliyetçi Düşünce ve Sömürge Dünyası* (Trans: Sami Oğuz. İstanbul: İletişim, 1996), 34.

inadequacy'. They had to catch up by imitating West European rivals which are more successful than themselves. The people in the East had to create both their states and nations. So, Eastern nationalism is imitative and fiercely competitive. It is prone to hostility and illiberal behavior. Western nations (i.e. France, England, Germany and Italy) were already prepared culturally when they established their modern nations. They had correct instruments and culture with which to progress. However, the peoples in the East had to make themselves anew, to create national identities for themselves. They were drawn into a new and alien civilization. This new civilization of modernity required to adopt new values, ideas and practices. Eastern nationalists recognized both their "backwardness" and their need to overcome that. So, their relationship with the West had an ambivalent which is characterized by feelings of admiration mixed envy and resentment.[32]

These are the classical approaches on nation and nationalism. Özkırımlı indicates the period of the 1980s and its' effects on nationalism researches. Some researches about the visions of colonies, women, black people, ethnical minorities and working class started in this period. In late period the approach which perceiving nationalism as an understanding method, is also important. Nationalism is a chronic vision in daily life. For this kind of approaches, nationalism divides the world into two parts like us and them or friends and enemies. Nationalism considers itself as the main legal vision. Michael Billig is a name who assumes this kind of approach. Billig's *Banal Nationalism*[33] working is a mile stone for the vision on this idea. Billig claims that the nationalist symbols are totally fused in daily life. So in this situation the daily life easily turns in a nationalist atmosphere. This atmosphere tells "our own" story. So "the others" can speculate easily. Normal is us and abnormal is the others. So, "banal nationalism" is this ideological condition.[34]

---

[32] John Plamenatz, "Two Types of Nationalism" in *Nationalism: The Nature of an Evolution of an Idea*, ed. Eugene Kamenka, (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1975), 29-34.

[33] Michael, Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London: Sage, 1995).

[34] İbid, 6.

As mentioned above the difficulties encountered in the explanation of a nation exist also in the explanation of nationalism. Nationalism is a multi-dimensional factor that includes a large number of components. Thus, there are lots of different explanations of nationalism in the literature. Some elements that go into such a definition are consciousness, the expression of national identity and loyalty to the nation. "As an ideology it is a form of political expression; as a subjective element it defines the nature of the relationship of a person to a collectivity. The -ism in nationalism is a practice, a process of development, an activity, 'a mechanism of adjustment and compensation', acting as a vehicle of delivery for both the mass and elite within a community."[35] In literature, nationalism refers to ideas, to political actions or to sentiments.[36] For Breuilly, scholars who define it as an idea focus on the writings and speeches of nationalist intellectuals; those regarding it as a movement see political action and conflict; lastly those who treat nationalism as a sentiment focus on language, common ways of life, culture and religion. This third group concentrates on how these folk ways are taken up; and examine how they make up national consciousness. Handler identifies "nationalism" as an ideology:

> Nationalism is an ideology about individuated being. It is an ideology concerned with boundedness, continuity, and homogeneity encompassing diversity. It is an ideology in which social reality, conceived in terms of nationhood, is endowed with the reality of natural things.[37]

The values that are spun around the emergence and consolidation of nation states are articulated by various interest groups or parties. This opens up into the field of "nationalist politics". Breuilly, is one of those scholars, who has insisted on the idea that nationalism is a form of politics. Thereby he distances himself from the more "culturalist" approaches defended by Anthony Smith and others. He writes: "the

---

[35] Margareta Mary Nikolas, 1999. "False Opposites in Nationalism: An Examination of the Dichotomy of Civic Nationalism and Ethnic Nationalism in Modern Europe". http://www.nationalismproject.org/articles/nikolas/ch3.htm (accessed August 11, 2007).

[36] John Breuilly, *Nationalism and State* (2nd ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 404.

[37] Richard Handler, *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988), 6.

key to an understanding of nationalism lies in the character of the modern state, which nationalism both opposes and claims as its own."[38] Breuilly's focus is on nationalism as various kinds of opposition movements. "The focus here is with nationalism as a form of politics, principally opposition politics. The principle of classification will, therefore, be based upon the relationship between the nationalist movement and the state which it either opposes of controls. A nationalist opposition can seek to break away from the present state (separation), to reform it in a nationalist direction (reform), or to unite it with other states (unification)"[39] It can be said that in Turkey context, the Kurdish movement is an example of the first and *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi/MHP* (Nationalist Action Party) is an example of the second one.

2.2. The Role of Nationalisms in the Globalization Process

No general consensus concerning the definition of globalization. It is defined in different ways according to the author or the context. In a general sense, it means the global increase in human relations, capital accumulation, goods and information, and the intensification of international interaction connected to the development of transportation/communication facilities.[40] According to Giddens[41], the remote settlement, is a process in which the local events are shaped by the developments miles away, and thus remote settlements are connected to each other and social relations are intensified on the global scale. Globalization has economic, political, socio-cultural, technological and ecological aspects. Focusing on some points of the political and socio-cultural aspects that are important in terms of nationalism suffices for the study.

---

[38] Breuilly, *Nation and State*, 15.

[39] İbid, 9.

[40] Cahit Gelekçi, *Küreselleşme ve Milli Kültür* (Ankara: Hacettepe Univ. Social Scienses Faculity, unpublished PHd thesis. 2003).

[41] Anthony Giddens, *Modernliğin Sonuçları* (Trans. Ersin Kuşdili İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 1998), 66.

One of the most important issues in the *political aspect* of the globalization debates is the transference of sovereignty to supra-national institutions. This brings along debates related to the future of nation-states in the globalization process. McGrew[42] states that the political aspect of globalization involves the following points: Political interactions have become supra-national, and as can be seen in the UN example, they have institutionalized in an international manner. The new centers of authority at the state level, and below and above the state level have increased in number, like the EU and multi-national companies. A global political structure emerged. Connected to this, some thinkers assert that the nation-states will vanish (hyperglobalists); some assert that they will get even more important (skeptics), and some assert that they will transform (transformationists).

According to *hyperglobalists*, local and national differences, autonomy and sovereignty have been diminished, and a more homogenous global culture and economy have come into existence.[43] In the near future, regional administrations and global institutions will become more powerful than the state's autonomy and sovereignty. Thus, the state will be eroded.[44] According to Ohmae[45], the nation-state is a temporary unit of economic organization within the course of the history. However, it doesn't hold the same function any more. According to this approach, nation-states are being eroded from the bottom, by a superstructure which leads to political, economic and cultural integration on the global level on the one hand and

[42] Anthony McGrew, "Power Shift: From National Government to Global Governence" in *An Introduction to the Social Sciences Understanding Social Change, a Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*, ed. D. Held (London and New York: The Open University, 2000), 140-142.

[43] Hugh Mackay, "The Globalization of Culture" in *An Introduction to the Social Sciences Understanding Social Change, a Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*. ed. D. Held, (London and New York: The Open University, 2000), 46-55.

[44] Anthony Mcgrew, "Globalization: Conceptualizing a Moving Target" in *Understanding Globalization: the Nation-state, Democracy and Economic Policies in the New Epoch*. ed. J. Eatwell, E. Jelin (Stockholm: Pierre Frühlig, 1998), 11; Ohmae, Kenichi. *Ulus-Devletin Sonu, Bölgesel Ekonomilerin Yükselişi* (Trans: Zülfü Dicleli. İstanbul: Türk Henkel Dergisi Yayınları, 1996), 21-23.

[45] Ibid, 179-182.

through disintegration and decomposition in the context of micro-nationalisms[46] on the other hand.

According to Hirst and Thompson[47], events taking place in Eastern Europe after 1989 caused nation states to lose their administrative competences, and the idea that national processes lose their priority to global processes to become prevalent. States' control over the economic and social processes in their countries and their power of maintaining national originality and cultural homogeneity decreased. Gelekçi[48] discusses two aspects of the sovereignty of the nation state: External sovereignty and internal sovereignty. External sovereignty means that, the nation state acts independently in its international relationships. Internal sovereignty means that, the state represents the cardinal power within its own territory. Rapidly intensifying international relationships render it harder for the nation-states to make decisions by themselves within their own boundaries. According to Erdoğan[49] globalization threatens the dominating position of the nation-state in the political arena.

According to *skeptics*, globalization hasn't brought about changes that are as big as claimed. The exchange of goods and cultures and the liberal economic relations have continued from the nineteenth century. Nation-states hold their powerful position. National cultures, national economies and national boundaries aren't dissolved; and social life isn't largely shaped by the global processes. The international system is still organized on the nation-state basis. Members of the international organizations, such as NATO and UN, are again nation-states. Nation-

---

[46] Gelekçi, *Küreselleşme*, 193.

[47] P. Hirst and G. Thompson. "Küreselleşme ve Milli Devletin Geleceği" *Türkiye ve Siyaset*, trans. Selçuk Can, no: 5 (2001) (November-December), 126-131.

[48] Gelekçi, *Küreselleşme*, 175.

[49] Mustafa Erdoğan, "Siyaset ve Hukuk Perspektifinden Küreselleşme" in *Siyasi, Ekonomik ve Kültürel Boyutlarıyla Küreselleşme* (İstanbul: Ufuk Kitapları, 2002), 31-32.

states are the ones having their militaries and holding the use of legitimate power on the territory under their sovereignty.[50]

According to *transformationists*, nation-states are still powerful in economic, military and political terms. However, the process of globalization may have very complicated and unexpected consequences. Talking about full independence is impossible in the present day world. Under these conditions, the concept of national sovereignty has become non-absolute. As a matter of fact, sovereignty has never been absolute in any period of history; and therefore, this isn't a new development. While handing part of their sovereignty over supra-national structures, nation-states continue to hold and even enhance their sovereignty in other fields.[51] In this process, national governments are reconstructing their authorities, powers and functions.[52]

---

[50] Umut Ökırımlı, *Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye-AB İlişkileri* (İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2008), 105; Gelekçi, *Küreselleşme*, 88.

[51] Özkırımlı, *Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye-AB İlişkileri*, 105.

[52] Anthony Mcgrew, "Globalization…", 15.

Table 1: Tree Tendencies Reconceptualizing Globalization

	Hyperglobalists	**Skeptics**	**Transformationists**
What's new	A global age	Back to future	Historically unprecedented
Dominant features	Global capitalism, Governance	Less interdependent world	Thick (intensive, extensive)
Power of governments	Decline, erode	Enhance	Redefine, reconstitute
Driving forces	Capitalism, ICT	States, markets	Forces of modernity
Pattern of global stratification	Erode North-South hierarchy	Increase South marginalization	Social not geographical division
Global solidarity	Enhanced	Worsening	Ambiguous
Conceptualization	Reorder framework of human action	Internationalization or regionalization	Reorder interregional actions at a distance
Summary arguments	End of nation-state	Internationalization depends on state auth	Globalization transforming world pol
Ideological roots	Neo-liberal radical left	Conservative, social democratic, left	Social democracy, left
Future scenario	Global civilization vs maniac global capitalism	Regional blocs, clash of civilizations	Global integration and fragmentation
Typical representatives	Ohmae, Grieder, Permutter	Hirst, Thompson, Weiss, Gilpin, Krasner	Giddens, Castells, Held, Rosenau

Source: McGrew 1996: 25

One of the most important points in nationalism debates on the *socio-cultural aspect* of the globalization process is the matter of uniformization and domination of a single global culture. There is a claim that, globalization will turn the world into a global village; and in this regard, it will have a standardizing effect and will eliminate differences.[53] In this aspect, globalization means the process of leveling of the world's societies and the emergence of a single global culture.[54] In this process,

---

[53] Kadir Koçdemir, "Küreselleşme ve Türk Kültürü". *Kök Araştırmalar Dergisi*. Vol 1, no: 1 (1999) (Spring), 8.

[54] Fuat Keyman, Ali Yaşar Sarıbay. "Giriş: Küreselleşme, Siyaset ve Toplumsal Yaşam" in *Küreselleşme, Sivil Toplum ve İslam*, ed. F. Keyman, A. Y. Sarıbay, (Ankara: Vadi, 1998), 9.

national cultural codes and norms face an alteration.[55] Intense mutual interaction, as the fundamental characteristic of the process, gives rise to debates on culture. Some thinkers consider globalization as the expansion of the West's domination in terms of culture,[56] and as the new form of imperialism.[57]

On the other hand, not only homogenizing but also diversifying dimensions of globalization are talked about. Sarıbay[58] says that globalization involves both repudiation and adoption. Adoption means the consumption of the cultural codes of Western societies by non-Western societies. As for repudiation, it takes place in two forms: Firstly, in the form of purification from the advanced societies' cultural codes or prevention of their intervention into local cultural codes. Secondly, in the form of dissemination of the belief that the West's cultural codes actually correspond to codes which exist in the local culture. There exist views suggesting that, in this regard, the process of globalization goes hand in hand with 'localization'. According to Keyman,[59] the fundamental characteristic of today's globalization is the tension between "universalism and locality". The division between the global and the local is gradually becoming more complicated and problematic. The level of consciousness about civilization, society, religion and

---

[55] Büyükuslu, A. Rıza. 2000. "Küreselleşmenin Sosyal ve Kültürel Hayata Etkisi" in ed. V. Bozkurt, *Küreselleşmenin İnsani Yüzü*, İstanbul: Alfa, 117-118.

[56] George Ritzer, *Toplumun McDonaldlaştırılması, Çağdaş Toplum Yaşamının Değişen Karakteri Üzerine Bir İnceleme* (trans. Şen Süer Kaya, İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 1998); Hatice Nur Erkızan, "Küreselleşmenin Tarihsel ve Düşünümsel Temelleri Üzerine" Doğu Batı, no: 18 (2002), 65-79.

[57] Orhan Gökçe, "Milli Kültür ve Küreselleşme" in *Milli Kültürler ve Küreselleşme*, eds. B. Yediyıldız, M. Ç Özdemir, F. Unan, (Ankara: Türk Yurdu Yayınları, 1998).

[58] Ali Yaşar Sarıbay, "Kültürel Bir Olgu Olarak Globalleşme" *Siyasi Ekonomik ve Kültürel Boyutlarıyla Küreselleşme* (İstanbul: Ufuk, 2002).

[59] Fuat Keyman, "Globalleşme ve Öteki Sorunu: Postmodernizm, Feminizm, Oryantalizm" in, *Küreselleşme, Sivil Toplum ve İslam*, ed. F. Keyman, A. Y. Sarıbay (Ankara: Vadi, 1998), 207.

race is rising.[60] Nationalisms are re-emerging. On the other hand, national communities are transforming into multicultural societies.[61]

According to Kloos[62], globalization is a trigger for the identity movements directed to cultural-specific identities and localization. The nation-state is losing its sovereignty in the political arena in a fast manner. Under these conditions, some minorities demand more autonomy and political independence. Therefore, national cultures are exposed to the pressure of superstructures from above and the pressure of local identities from below. In terms of globalization, the state is 'the loser'. With the rising localization demands, the delegation of authority to local authorities is proposed; local cultures are revived, and ethnic divisions are deepened.[63] Big states get even closer to each other in the globalization process. With the unification of multi-national companies, the other companies are driven to an even deeper helplessness.

According to Smith, the global dependency's fundamental influence on the styles of organization of people was to erode the basis of traditional community structures, and to spread nationalist ideology through 'taking it out of' its specific national contexts.[64] In the globalizing world, on the one hand, closer affiliations are being formed among economies and societies; societies are being included in an international community by complex interstate organizations and regulations network; trade barriers are collapsing; labour and capital are flowing freely between the continents; old traditions and religious values are crumbling. On the other hand,

---

[60] Roland Robertson, "Mapping the Global Condition: Globalisation as the Central Concept", in *Global Culture, Nationalism, Globalisation, and Modernity*. ed. Mike Feat Herstone (London: Sage, 1990), 15.

[61] Roland Robertson, "Toplum Kuramı, Kültürel Görecelik ve Küresellik Sorunu" in *Kültür, Küreselleşme ve Dünya Sistemi*. ed. A. D. King (trans: Gülcan Seçkin & Ümit Hüsrev Yolsal, Ankara: Bilim Sanat, 1998), 117.

[62] Peter Kloos, "The Dialectics of Globalization and Localization" in *the end of Globalization: Bringing Society Back*, ed. D. Kalb and others (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2000), 281-282.

[63] Muharrem İskenderoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Ulus-devletin Geleceği ve Türkiye", *Türkiye ve Siyaset*, no: 5 (2001) (November-December), 191.

[64] Smith, Küreselleşme Çağında, xii.

there is a rise in the demand for any kind of identities and civil rights, and in religious awakening; protests for autonomy and separation are intensifying; racial conflicts and xenophobia are increasing.[65] Consequently, the process of globalization also covers the diffusion of nationalist movements.

According to some points of view, the globalization process is influential not only in the spread of nationalist movements but also in their form/degree. According to Hall, the erosion of nation-states, national economies and national identities are very dangerous. As the nation-state era is declining in the globalization process, national identity is being moulded into an 'over defensive' and 'very dangerous' form by an aggressive racism. A return to the local arises generally as a reaction to globalization.[66]

The globalization process can be said to affect nationalist movements in another respect too. The process causes inequalities in terms of information, ownership of the means of communication, and information flows.[67] These inequalities, which also create economic gaps, become gradually deeper both in national and international terms. The excessive imbalance due to globalization paves the way for the rise of radical movements. Besides, the globalization process renders human relations more dependent upon the market relationships. Therefore, it dissociates and atomizes individuals and communities. Thus, it increases the existential anxiety of individuals, and so their nervousness against others increases as well.[68] This is consequently effective in the advancement of nationalist perception, which divides the world into us and others. According to Özkırımlı[69], the globalization process was effective in the rise of radical right parties in the 1990s. Because radical right

---

[65] Ibid, xi-xxi.

[66] Stuart Hall, "Yerel ve Küresel: Küreselleşme ve Etniklik", in *Kültür, Küreselleşme ve Dünya Sistemi*, ed. A. D. King (trans. Hakan Tuncel, Ankara: Bilim Sanat, 1998), 46-47, 54-57.

[67] Hugh Mackay, "The Globalization of Culture", in *An Introduction to the Social Sciences: Understanding Social Change, a Globalization World? Culture, Economics, Politics*, ed. D. Held (London, New York: The Open University, 2000), 47-84.

[68] Ulrich Beck, *Siyasallığın İcadı* (Çev. Nihat Ülner. İstanbul: İletişim, 1999).

[69] Ökırımlı, *Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye-AB İlişkileri*, 73.

parties canalized the fears in question into the politics by their discourses and by the policies they proposed.

There are also various views about the rise and position of nationalist movements in the process of globalization. According to some views, rising nationalist movements are the remnants of previous nationalisms, and they will be wiped off in a short while. Ethnic nationalisms and racisms will also be depoliticized and normalized shortly after. As a matter of fact, homogenous societies have been collapsing and multi-ethnic societies have been emerging. There won't be much room for nationalism as a political force in the post-modern era. For another view, nationalism is the product and the producer of modernity. Global modernization had transformed our life styles largely (by means of: industrial capitalism, bureaucratic state, total war, mass social mobilization, science and rationalism, computer supported mass media, electronic media, fall of traditional family values, sexual revolution), and it brought about disintegration. In this disintegrating and alienating world, 'nationalism is the means of controlling destructive effects of the mass social change'. It is the popular force that legitimizes and gives meaning to the state's activity. Just like nations, nationalisms are also perpetual. What are temporary are the modern, global and post-modern eras. Nationalism is the fundamental force in both pre-modern and modern period. It is a part of the natural process. Even if the members of a nation were made to forget their history for a while, this history will manifest itself and the nation will be reborn.[70]

Of course, it's quite hard to guess the positioning of nation-states and nationalism in the globalization process. However, currently it can be said that, the process affects the economic, cultural and political sovereignty (either by eliminating, or consolidating, or transforming it), national cultures and the understanding of a homogenous society; and it supports ethnic revivals. These elements -sovereignty, common culture, territorial integrity etc- are the basis of the modern state and the components of the nation. Therefore, they are directly the concerns of nationalism.

---

[70] Smith, *Küreselleşme Çağında*, xi-xxi.

In this regard, nationalist reactions directed to globalization can be expected to concentrate on these points. Thus, in this study, these points were utilized in the formation of the thematic framework, which was used to discuss the MHP's approach to EU.

When the above mentioned points are considered, nationalist movements can be thought to adopt a discourse that is directly against globalization. However, as stated by Erbaş[71] as well, the rapid and effective implementation of globalization is presented as 'contemporaneity'. Not to be involved in the process of globalization is seen as 'backwardness' or 'undevelopedness'. If Turkey's objective of modernization is considered, the difficulty of being anti-globalization can be understood. Under these conditions, nationalist movements can be expected to remain in between two alternatives, namely, being anti-globalization (by adopting the elements that are claimed to vanish with globalization, and regenerating nationalism from this) and not seeming to be backward. This can render the globalization discourses of nationalist movements stuck/indecisive.

2.3 European Union and Turkey

Turkey has tried to join all security or political organizations, like OECD and NATO, in Europe after World War II, in frame of its modernization policy.[72] Turkey's membership of EU talks were symbolically opened in October 2005. But the path of Turkey's Europe journey extends over the last 50 years. Still a number of stumbling blocks remain on the road to Turkey's EU accession in this period. Discussions about minority problems, geographic position, cultural differences, human rights, economics, historical events, agreements and relations between neighbour countries. This course intents to put a very general outline and milestones of the Turkey-EU relations historically.

---

[71] Hayriye Erbaş, "Küreselleşme ve Ulus-devletin Aşınımı Sürecinde Toplumsal Eşitlik/Adalet", *Doğu Batı*, no: 13(2000), 214.

[72] Baturalp Kaplan, "Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri ve Gümrük Birliği", *Türkiye ve Siyaset*. No: 8 (2002) (May-June), 17.

2.3.1 Timeline

1952 - Turkey becomes a full member of NATO.

1959 - Turkey applies for associate membership in the European Economic Community.

1963 - Association Agreement signed, acknowledging the final goal of membership.

1964 - Association Agreement comes into effect.

1970 - Protocol signed providing a timetable for the abolition of tariffs and quotas on goods.

1980 - Freeze in relations following the 1980 Turkish coup d'état.

1983 - Relations fully restored following elections.

1987 - Application for formal membership into the European Community.

1989 - European Commission refuses to immediately begin accession negotiations, citing Turkey's economic and political situation, poor relations with Greece and their conflict with Cyprus, but overall reaffirming eventual membership as the goal.

1995 - European Union-Turkey Customs Union is formed.

1999 - European Council recognises Turkey as a candidate on equal footing with other potential candidates.

2002 - European Council states that "the EU would open negotiations with Turkey 'without delay' if Turkey fulfils the Copenhagen criteria".

2002 - Turkish general election brings the pro-EU Justice and Development Party (AKP) to power.

2004 - Turkish government and Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus back the Annan Plan for Cyprus.

2004, December - European Union agrees to start negotiations.

3 October 2005 - Opening of six chapters of the Acquis: Right of Establishment & Freedom to provide Services, Company Law, Financial Services, Information Society & Media, Statistics and Financial Control

12 June 2006 - Chapter on Science and Research opened and closed.

11 December 2006 - Continued dispute over Cyprus prompts EU to freeze talks on eight chapters and state no chapters would be closed until a resolution is found

29 March 2007 - Chapter on Enterprise and Industrial Regulations opened

25 June 2007 - Chapters on Statistics and Financial Control opened, but the opening of the chapter on economic and monetary policy was blocked by French President Nicholas Sarkozy

20 December 2007 - Chapters on Health & Consumer Protection and on Trans-European Transport are opened.

Ever since the foundation of Turkey has been a secular democracy closely aligned with the West. Turkey was a founding member of the United Nations, and a member of NATO (since 1952), the Council of Europe (1949), the OECD (1961) and an associate member of the Western European Union (1992). Ankara chose to begin co-operating closely with the then European Economic Community (EEC) in 1959, and Turkey's prospective membership in the EEC's successor, the European Union, has been a source of much debate since.

2.3.2 First Steps

The period starts with the first application in 1951. The first application includes three parts about membership. The government of Turkey makes the plans about 22 years and after this years the adding protocol gets ready to sign. This application also bases the customs unity conditions.[73] Its application was successful and, four years later, in 1963, the Ankara Agreement put Turkey on the road towards a customs union with the EEC, with a view to eventual membership.

Between the first steps and full membership application, there is an important historical event shows its' effect on relation period. September 12, 1980 military intervention cuts all the progress and this situation costs Turkey about ten years in delayed progress. Europe first approached positively in this situation and decided to protect the conditions of agreements for military government. But the time of elections and internal crisis made this period so ineffective for the relations.[74] And it

---

[73] VIII. 5 Yıllık Kalkınma Raporu, DPT Arşivi, 2000, 7.

[74] *Turkish Dairy* "Chronology of Turkish-EU Relations" (January-March), 161.

is easy to understand that the problem of EU about military insurrection was a problem of trust. The conditions about human rights and freedom of thought became ineffective. This period launched as a period of hesitation or recession for different thinkers. In this situation, the military intervention be accepted as a zero-point for Turkey-EU relations. Then, in April 1987, disregarding the advice of German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who said neither Turkey nor the European Community were ready, Prime Minister Turgut Özal applied for full EC membership.[75]

2.3.3 The Application of Full-Membership

After gathering of EEC and Turkey again in September 1986, the relations started from where it had been left. Against Germany's negative insistences, Turkey applied to EU again in April 1984.[5] At a summit two years later, Turkey's application was turned down by EC leaders, who concluded that at the present time, Turkey and the Community cannot be easily integrated. However, they promised to re-examine Ankara's request for membership at unspecified intervals. In order to accede to the EU, Turkey must first successfully complete negotiations with the European Commission on each of the 35 chapters of the EU's acquit and then the member states must unanimously agree to Turkish membership. Public opinion in EU countries generally opposes Turkish membership, though with varying degrees of intensity, although political leaders and politicians of the European Union generally support it. Some countries, notably France and Austria, have discussed putting the decision to a referendum.

---

[75] Amanda Akçakoca Enlargement and neigbourhood Europe Programme, European Policy Centre (September 2004), 22.

2.3.4 The Decisions of Customs Union and EU-Turkey Partnership Relations

The most important development in the relations of EU and Turkey in the beginning of the 1990s is the decision of Custom Union. As a result of one and only decision in EU and the approach of Turkey about membership attacks, Custom Union opened a different dimension in relations.

2.3.4.1 The Luxemburg Summit

After the effects of Customs Union agreement, the stability of EU-Turkey relations went into a negative dimension. In the Luxemburg Summit (December 1997) EU made a statement about possible 11 candidate countries and Turkey was not in the list. EU leaders decided that Turkey was finally eligible to apply for membership – although not ready to be given 'candidate country' status. This was an accepted decision for some authorities. The summit's conclusions stated that Turkey would 'be judged on the basis of the same criteria as the other applicant states. While the political and economic conditions allowing accession negotiations to be envisaged are not satisfied, the European Council considers that it is nevertheless important for a strategy to be drawn up to prepare Turkey for accession by bringing it closer to the European Union in every field.' This decision angered Turkey, which felt it was being discriminated against, since post-communist states were being accepted. Some with weak economic and political records, such as Romania were put ahead of it in the membership queue, even though Ankara had a longer relationship with the EU than all the other applicants. As a result, Turkey decided to suspend political dialogue with the EU.

2.3.4.2 The Helsinki Summit

Three years later, at the Helsinki Summit in December 1999, EU leaders finally decided to grant Turkey candidate country status. This was, in effect, a reversal of the 1997 decision, with the EU agreeing to treat Turkey in the same way as the post-communist states. However, EU leaders insisted that Turkey still fell short of

meeting the conditions set out in the 'Copenhagen criteria' for starting membership talks and thus was not eligible for immediate accession negotiations. The Helsinki decision was nevertheless hailed by the Turks as a major victory and an affirmation of their European aspirations.

There were numerous reasons for the EU's change of heart: its fears of alienating Turkey permanently; its recognition that Turkey had legitimate complaints about unfair treatment; a change of government in Germany, where the Christian Democrats, who had vigorously opposed Turkish membership, were voted out of office; and a critical change in Greek policy towards relations with Ankara. The tragic earthquake in Turkey in August 1999 also resulted in a mass outpouring of sympathy for the country.[76]

From 1956, EU went through important changes concerning vision, politics and intentions. Six organizer countries which they need the others just for trade and economics in the beginning, became a powerful group on military, political, economics and culture.[77] But it's easy to say that the most important effect on this change for Turkey is "vision". After 50 years of experiences, the view point of EU turned on the phrase "continuity".

---

[76] Interview with European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso: www.euobserver.com.

[77] Amanda Akçakoca, "Enlargement and Neighborhood Europe Programme", European Policy Centre (Septermber 2004), 45-46.

CHAPTER 3

NATIONALISM IN TURKEY AND *MİLLİYETÇİ HAREKET PARTİSİ/MHP*

(THE NATIONALIST ACTION PARTY)

As stated in the previous part, it is not possible to talk about a single nationalism in the general sense. The same thing also holds true for the context of Turkey. It is only possible to talk about different Turkish nationalisms that change and transform within history and interact with each other[1] However, in this chapter, I will discuss MHP's historical and intellectual background in general terms. Although the heading includes the expression "Nationalism in Turkey", the chapter will not focus on each one of the wide range of nationalisms that exists in Turkey. This expression

---

[1] There are different classifications/denominations related to Turkish nationalisms both for different periods and for the same period: According to the classification of Türköne (Mümtaz'er Türköne,. *Siyaset* (Ankara: Lotus, 2003), there are *Türkçü-Turancı milliyetçilik* (Turkist-Turanist nationalism), *sosyalist milliyetçilik* (socialist nationalism), *ılımlı* (*liberal-muhafazakâr*) *milliyetçilik* (moderate [liberal-conservative] nationalism), *Atatürk milliyetçiliği* (Atatürk's nationalism). Bora ("Türkiye'de Milliyetçilik Söylemleri: Melez Bir Dilin Kalın ve Düzensiz Lügati", *Birikim,* vol. 67(November 1994)), introduces five types of nationalisms for 1990s' Turkey: *Resmî milliyetçilik/Atatürk milliyetçiliği* (Official nationalism/Atatürk's nationalism), *Kemalist ulusçuluk* (Kemalist nationalism), *liberal 'yeni milliyetçilik'* (liberal 'the new' nationalism), *Türkçü radikal milliyetçilik* (Turkist radical nationalism), *İslamcılıktaki milliyetçilik* (nationalism in the Islamism). Özkırımlı (*Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye-AB ilişkileri,* 50, 51), adds two more types to the Bora's nationalisms for 2000s: *Ulusalcılık* (nationalism) and *Kürtçü hareket* (Kurdish movement). Besides, he also mentions the presence of nationalisms, which names themselves as *ulusçuluk* (nationalism), *vatanseverlik* (patriotism) and *yurtseverlik* (patriotism). Merdan Yanardağ (Merdan Yanardağ, "MHP'nin Geleceği: Sonuçlar ve Olasılıklar" in *Milliyetçilik, Faşizm ve MHP*, ed. Seyfi Öngider (İstanbul: Aykırı Güncel, 2002) 19-23) states different types of nationalisms as follows: *Batıcı milliyetçilik* (Westernist nationalism), *muhafazakâr milliyetçilik* (conservative nationalism), *melez milliyetçilik* (hybrid nationalism), *ülkücü milliyetçilik* (idealist nationalism). Özkırımlı (*Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye-AB ilişkileri,* 26) explains the emergence of different types of nationalisms as follows: Society produces alternative nationalisms to the state nationalism as it is not a homogenous whole. Sometimes alternatives from the formation process of the nation-state come out again. Sometimes new nationalisms come into existence according to new conditions. Neither in the process of state formation nor after the establishment of the state, there is a single nationalism; there are nationalist projects.

in the heading means that focus will be on, the emergence in Turkey a specific political movement that defines itself as nationalistic.

3.1 Pre-republican Turkish Nationalism

Two structures were shaping Ottoman identity: The Ottoman elite and the Ottoman *millet* system.[2] *Millet* connoted belonging to a religious community. Organization of the society wasn't based on ethnic identity. The basic social dichotomy was between non-Muslims and Muslims. Muslims and non-Muslims were two different *millet*s. There existed introverted communities (Jews, Armenians, Assyrians) that had relatively independent social structures. There was no discrimination among the Muslims in terms of race or official language. The conception of nationalism was built upon this sort of a social structure in the Ottoman geography. In the 19th century, the notions of nationalism and nation state had influenced the Ottoman Empire considerably. This was a time frame in which the dissolution period of the state had begun and the dominance of the West had been accepted. Under these circumstances, Ottoman intellectuals had embarked on both an intrinsic and an extrinsic quest for identity. Turkish nationality had appeared as one alternative that could have prevented the dissolution of the state. Therefore, Turkism (*Türkçülük*) (and other alternatives offered)[3] was involving a defensive reflex against humiliation in front of the Western imperialism.[4]

Reforms that were embarked on to prevent the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire were such as to change the traditional *millet* organization. In the *Tanzimat* (Reform)

---

[2] İlber Ortaylı, "Osmanlı Kimliği". *Cogito*. No: 19 (1999 August). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi, 82.

[3] For more information about the trends of Ottomanism, Islamism and Turkism, which were seen as ways of preventing the dissolution of Ottoman Empire at the end of 19th century, see: Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak.* 4th ed. İstanbul: Toker; 1997; Akçura, Yusuf. *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset.* Ankara: Lotus, 2008; Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey, A Modern History.* 3rd rev. ed. London, New York, I.B. Tauris; 2004; Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey.* 3rd rev. Ed. USA: Oxford University Press, 2001; Ahmad, Feroz. *The Making of Modern Turkey.* Kindle ed. Taylao & Francis, 2007; Akçura, Yusuf. *Türkçülük.* İstanbul: Toker, 2000; Türköne, Mümtaz'er. "Tanzimatta Millet Fikrinin Doğuşu" *Türkiye Günlüğü*, No: 8, 1989 November; Türköne, Mümtaz'er, *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu.* İstanbul: İletişim, 1994.

[4] Günay Göksu Özdoğan, *"Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a: Tek Parti Döneminde Türkçülük (1931-1946).* İstanbul: İletişim, 2002), 41.

Era (1839-1876), it was aimed to create an Ottoman citizen/individual with a multi-ethnic and multi-religious nature. *Islahat Fermanı* (Rescript of Reform) (1856) brought about a change that promised a single and equal citizenship to everyone. Thus, Ottomanism (*Osmanlıcılık*) had become the official state ideology of the *Tanzimat* (Reform) Era. However, Ottomanism wasn't able to function as an adhesive agent that could bind together the diverse elements of the Empire. Separation of Balkan nations, which had autonomy in many fields, from the Empire caused disappointment in those arguing for Ottomanism. Neither Muslim Turks nor Christian communities gave up their claims for the sake of the Empire. Nationalistic ideas arisen among the minorities were later on adopted by Turks as well; and the conception of Ottoman citizenship has lost its meaning.[5] Thereby, Ottomanism ceased to be a solution.

Islamism was a notion emphasized for preventing the separation of Muslim elements from the Empire. Islamism had become the official ideology of the state during Abdulhamid II's rule. This ideology started to lose its influence as well following the separation of Muslim Arabs and Albanians from the Empire.

In the meantime, the notion of Turkism[6] started to win supporters increasingly among the intellectuals. Turkism harboured two principal points: Establishment of a state which is based upon the sovereignty of the Turkish element in the Empire and a probable union with the Turks outside the Empire.[7] However, at the beginning of

---

[5] Kemal, Karpat, *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1967), 124.

[6] It is known that the idea of Turkism arised from the Turcology studies that was originated in the West. Landau (Jacop M. Landau, *Pan Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation* (London: Hurst, 1995), 28), mentions two fundamental reasons of the emergence of Turkism in the West: The first is the negative circumstances that the Empire was into; the second is the influences of intellectuals inside and outside the Empire. Göçek points out that, Turkish nationalism has emerged out of the interaction among three structures within the Ottoman Empire: 1. wars, change in the commercial relationships and nature of reforms 2. newly emerged opinions in the society related to history, literature and education 3. organizational framework prepared by charity organizations, secret accociations and political parties. See: Fatma Müge Göçek, 2003. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Oluşumu: Sosyolojik Bir Yaklaşım". *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: 4-Milliyetçilik*. 2nd. Ed. İstanbul: İletişim; Kemal Karpat (*İslam'ın Siyasallaşması*, çev. Şiar Yalçın, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yay., 2004)) points out the emergence of a new middle class in the formation of the perception of Turkishness.

[7] Turgay Uzun, *Türk Milliyetçiliği*, 97.

the 1900s, nationalism was still not the fundamental ideology of the multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire. Besides, there wasn't a national consciousness among the public and intellectuals till the late period of the Empire. One reason for this is that, the issues of Turkish language, culture and history hadn't been highlighted in the Ottoman period. On the other hand, with the rise of nationalism, Ottoman intellectuals had become aware of linguistic, cultural and racial (ethnic) nationalism in the West. However; after all, they hadn't supported a nationalism that is based upon racial unity for a long time.[8] It can be said that, Turkism was stuck in the cultural field at the end of the 1890s. It had the characteristics of linguistic nationalism at the beginning.[9] According to Önem[10], at bottom 'One of the fundamental aims of the Ottoman Turkists was to build up the category of Turkish nation'. They were in favour of forming a nation that is ethno-culturally defined; and they were distanced from the understanding that consider nation as identical with the borders of the state. Turanists considered Anatolian Turks and peoples living outside the Ottoman Empire (Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Turkmens, Kyrgyzs...) as the parts of a single nation.

One of the most important factors in the development of the conception of Turkism was the Turkist intellectuals, who emigrated from Russia to the Ottoman Empire. These intellectuals had been influential on the underlining of language within the conception of Turkism and on the acceleration of Turanist ideas. Owing to them, Turkism had become a political ideology in the 20th century following its historical, philological and literary capital.[11] Yusuf Akçura, İsmail Gaspıralı, Sadri Maksudi, Zeki Velidi Togan, Hüseyinzâde Ali and Ahmet Ağaoğlu can be listed among these intellectuals. These intellectuals had made studies on the language, culture,

---

[8] Yusuf Bayraktutan, *Türk Fikir Tarihinde Modernleşme, Milliyetçilik ve Türk Ocakları* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1996), 54.

[9] Mehmet Ali Ağaoğulları, "The Ultranationalist Right", in *Turkey in Transition: New Perspectives*, eds. Irwin Cemil Schick and E. Ahmet Tonak (New York: Orxford University Press, 1987), 184; Mümtaz'er Türköne, *Siyaset* (Ankara: Lotus, 2003), 653.

[10] Nizam Önem, *İki Turan: Macaristan ve Türkiye'de Turancılık* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2005), 118, 325-335.

[11] Mustafa Çalık, *Siyasi Kültür ve Sosyolojinin Bazı Kaynakları Açısından MHP Hareketinin Kaynakları ve Gelişimi (1965-1980)* (Ankara: Cedit, 1995), 96.

economic development and history of Turks. Thus, they had become effective on the awakening of national consciousness. For example, Yusuf Akçura had transformed Turkism from a cultural trend to a political trend, and systematized it. Also the first traces of Turanist Turkism can be seen in his article "*Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Three Policies)" written in 1904. He suggested 'a political Turkish nation that is based upon race'.[12]

The Constitutional Era had presented a favourable ground for the development of Turkism. The relatively libertarian atmosphere and the government of the Committee of Union and Progress were influential on this. Turkism had started to have more radical characteristics from that period on. The principal target had turned out 'to achieve the unity of a race'. Thus, the aim of Turkists had been directed to a vast geography, and evolved into a utopia.[13] Turanism/Pan-turkism[14] had appeared as the ideal of gathering all Turks under the same flag. In the writings of Ziya Gökalp[15], one of the leading ideologists of Turkish nationalism, 'Turan' represents the fatherland of Turks. It is a Red Apple myth. It is an indefinite and unlimited space rather than a real and existing geography. Gökalp considers

---

[12] François Georgeon, "Yusuf Akçura" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce-4: Milliyetçilik.* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2003), 505-511.

[13] S. Seyfi Öğün, Türkiye'de Cemaatçi Milliyetçilik ve Nurettin Topçu (İstanbul: Dergah, 1992), 19.

[14] These two terms were used as synonymous to each other in the Ottoman Empire although they have different contents. They started to be used as synonyms especially after the Second Constitutionalist Era. See Nizam Önem, *İki Turan,* 114-115; Günay Göksu Özdoğan, *"Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a,* 26-27.

[15] Gökalp is among the most important figures in the development of Turkish nationalism. His understanding of nation is important. According to Gökalp, nation is a community of people having a common culture (language, religion, morals and aesthetic values). *Millet* is a unity of culture. Culture is the constitutive and protective element of the Turkish identity. It has a sacredness that can't be changed by Westernization. Therefore, negative influence of the West on the Turkish culture should be prevented. That is, not the culture but only the technique of the West should be adopted. Gökalp's idea of Westernization within the framework of Turkish culture has been influential on the following nationalisms. See Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (ed. Mahir Ünlü, Yusuf Çotuksöken, İstanbul, İnkılâp, 1994); Mustafa Çalık emphasizes that, Gökalp's Turkism or his understanding of nationalism doesn't involve racism. He states that, the Turkism represented by Gökalp is usually identified with racism but this is a lack of care. See Mustafa Çalık, *Siyasi Kültür,* 103.

Turanism as the biggest ideal and the superlative of Turkism. This idea was later on adopted by Turkist nationalism.[16]

In this period, Turkish associations (Türk Derneği, Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti, Türk Bilgi Derneği, Genç Kalemler Hareketi, Yeni Lisan Hareketi, Türk Ocağı), Turkist publications (Halka Doğru, Türk Sözü, Türk Yurdu, Bilgi Mecmuası) and nationalist parties (Milli Ahrar Fırkası, Milli Meşrutiyet Fırkası, Milli Türk Fırkası) have played important roles in the Turkist organization. The majority of these associations and publications highlighted the issue of language. Linguistic Turkism and purification of Turkish language were important study subjects. Turkist thought had already started to reveal a linguistic structure in the 1880s.[17] National economy, Turkish history, literature and culture, and the use of domestic products were other important topics besides language.

Following the World War I, culturally based design of Turkism has been carried to a political ground. Its irredentist aspect had come into prominence during the War. Most of the Ottoman territory was carved up by the European states following the War. For this reason, according to Arslan,[18] Turkish nationalism has gained a Turanist characteristic, which was reactive and disposed to imperialism. If it is looked at the whole process, according to Taner Akçam, Turkish national identity was belated. It had the aim of catching up with other countries. This caused it to be aggressive.[19]

---

[16] Mustafa Çalık, *Siyasi Kültür*, 103.

[17] Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri*, 65.

[18] Emre Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti: MHP'nin İktidar Bloğu Karşısında Değişen Strateji ve Konumları", *Praksis* (2002) (5), 302.

[19] According to Akçam, belatedness of the formation of Turkish national identity was due to: Prevention of Turkish identity by Islamic identiy, negative approach of the Ottoman Empire to nationalism, unfamiliarity of the idea of nationality for the state. Taner Akçam, *Türk Ulusal Kimliği ve Ermeni Sorunu* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1995), 39.

3.2 Turkism (*Türkçülük*) and Kemalist Nationalism in Republican Era

Turkist legacy from the Ottoman Empire formed a basis for the nationalism of Republican period. However, the founding cadre of the Turkish Republic redefined nationalism during the establishment period of the Republic. In this way, Turkist-Turanist nationalism became differentiated from Atatürk nationalism/Kemalist nationalism. However, it should be noted that, it is neither possible to describe these two types of nationalism nor possible to make a clear cut differentiation between them.[20] There are points of difference, overlapping aspects, and quite a complicated relationship between the two nationalisms.

The national movement that have brought about the establishment of the Turkish Republic was shaped within a struggle for independence. It is a nationalist movement organized against the occupant forces/imperialism in the atmosphere of the War of Independence. In 1921, yet at the beginning of this struggle, M. Kemal stated that irredentist policies won't be pursued. He expressed that Islamic unity and Turanism can not be the policies of Turkey.[21] Even the names that were used for the War of Independence (such as 'national' struggle) indicated that, Anatolian movement was a nationalist movement.[22] It can be said that, this is the most prominent characteristic of Kemalist nationalism distinguishing it from the Turkist-Turanist nationalism.

---

[20] As a matter of fact, Türköne points out the difficulty of making a satisfactory definition of Atatürk nationalism (Türköne, *Siyaset*, 660). One of the reasons of this, according to him, is the appropriation of this name by different types of nationalisms wishing to provide legitimacy for themselves. The other reason is the differing nature of Atatürk's words related to nationalism from period to period. In other words, it's the lack of consistency. As for Baskın Oran (*Atatürk Milliyetçiliği* (Ankara: Bilgi, 1990) 17-19), there are two basic reasons for the undefinable nature of Atatürk nationalism: The first is the taboo about the name Atatürk. The second is that, the concept of nationalism is considered as sacred by racists and sacredists. That is, nationalism has also become a taboo.

[21] Jacop M. Landau, *Pan Turkism,* 72.

[22] Yusuf Sarınay, *Atatürk'ün Millet ve Milliyetçilik Anlayışı* (Ankara: Türk Kültürü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yay., 1990), 43.

With a Gellnerian approach, Atatürk points out that, the presence of the nation is possible with the presence of an independent political formation. Atatürk was influenced from the conception of *millet* of Ziya Gökalp. He highlighted the following points in his conception of *millet*: A common history, a wish for living together and a common will for protecting the legacy possessed.[23] *Millet* was defined with the political unity, territorial unity, linguistic unity, unity of lineage and roots, shared history and shared morality.[24] With this aspect, Kemalist nationalism is a cultural nationalism. However, it acquired some chauvinistic aspects at times, and revealed some racist characteristics in patches.[25] In the 1930s, an authoritarian statist regime was adopted with its predominant corporative aspects, and Kemalist nationalism canonized Turkish ethnic identity extremely. These were the times (especially the 1930s) when the concept of Turkism based on lineage became prominent. With this aspect, Kemalist nationalism also harboured an understanding of ethnic nationalism that depended upon the unity of lineage and roots. It overlaps with the Turanist thought in this regard. Both approaches highlight the ancientness of Turks, and place emphasis on exploring the ancient history of Turks. They both aim to raise individuals who are proud of Turkish language, history and culture.[26]

One of the most important characteristics of Kemalist nationalism is that, it aims at the adoption of a Western life style / it is Westernist-modernist. Nationalism with this aspect is seen as one of the important pillars of the modernization project.

The Turkist-Turanist movement remained passive for a while (between the years 1923-1939) in the period following the establishment of the Republic. The nationalist movement limited itself to helping Turks, who emigrated from various countries to Turkey, and to activities in the fields of literature and language. It

---

[23] Ibid, 50.

[24] Nurhan Tezcan, *Atatürk'ün Yazdığı Yurttaşlık Bilgileri* (İstanbul: Çağdaş, 1989), 14.

[25] Oran, *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği*, 159.

[26] Turgay Uzun, *Türk Milliyetçiliği*, 236.

avoided having a political image. One of the famous Turkists of the period was Nihal Atsız, who was a pacesetter. He continued to advocate his Pan-Turkist opinions in the journal *Atsız Mecmua*. He objected to the nationalism that was defined by the official ideology. He argued for an ethnic nationalism, which is based upon racial unity and aims a political unification among all Turks. Beginning from the mid the 1930s, especially during the World War II, Turkists have tried to develop a nationalistic ideology that differs from the Kemalist nationalism.[27]

3.3 Turkism During and Following the World War II

During the World War II, Turkist movement was used as a diplomatic means of maneuver by the state in order to prevent Turkey's participation to the war. The Turkist-Turanist movement, which involved German propaganda, was supported by the government against the pressure from Germany. However, it was sometimes repressed for balancing the relationships with the Soviets. Therefore, within the complicated ebbs and flows of the war trajectory, Turkist movement has also followed a similar course. However, this was generally a period in which the Turkist/Turanist movement have found the opportunity to flourish. Especially in 1941, when Nazis attacked the Soviets, Turkist publications increased in number and they became more aggressive as well. Turkists expected Turkey to participate in the war on the side of Germany and to establish a Turan state, which also covers Turks living in the Soviets.[28]

During the war, Turkist ideology got into a process of organization and structuring. A large number of Turkist journals and newspapers began to be published.[29] Actually, the Turkist movement that was becoming widespread in this period

---

[27] Ibid, 234, 240-241.

[28] Ibid, 251.

[29] For information about the publications, see İlhan E Darendelioğlu, *Türkiye'de Milliyetçi Hareketler* (Ankara: Toker. 1968). Besides, there were writings supporting Nazism in the newspapers, which were close to the government; such as Cumhuriyet and Tasvir-i Efkâr. See Günay Göksu Özdoğan, *"Turan"dan "Bozkurt'a"*,147.

revealed a multipartite structure within itself.[30] There existed opinions that differ only very slightly from each other. At this point, two names can be mentioned, who had their influences on Turkist-Turanist thought as well as on MHP later on. One of these names is Nihal Atsız, who was also influential in the 1930s. According to him (1973),[31] innate inequalities among human beings also exist among peoples/races. Turkish race is superior. Turanism is the political goal of Turkism for the near future. Turk's original duty is the Turkification of the world. Atsız was against civic nationalism. He considered ethnic groups that are not Turkish as foreigners even if they spoke Turkish. Another influential name, who had given shape to the Turkist-Turanist perspective, is Reha Oğuz Türkkan. According to Türkkan, being governed by "foreign blood" and the racial intermingling lead to the erosion of nations. Degeneration of national consciousness, over individualism and cosmopolitism lead a nation to destruction as well. Also for Türkkan, Turkish race is superior to all the other races. Turkism means the Turkification of Turkey. One should continually proceed to reach the Great Turkish Union.[32] As can be understood, Turanist nationalism differs from Kemalist nationalism also in terms of its notion of citizenship.

An important characteristic of the Turkist-Turanist movement of the 1930s and the 1940s was its opposition to the policies of CHP especially in the fields of culture and education. In this regard, the Turkist-Turanist movement involved a reaction to the Westernization policy. It was functioning as an anti-modernization platform. For example, there were Turkists who criticized the official standpoint's refusal of the

---

[30] Landau specifies 5 groups of Turkist trends that had flourished in line with various publications: The first group was organized around Zeki Veli Togan. It is based upon the struggle of independence of external Turks. The second group was organized around Rıza Nur. Rıza Nur had attempted to form the philophy of Turkist trend. The other group had gathered with the leadership of Reha Oğuz Türkkan. Its aim was to form a cultural and political unity covering the Turks inside and outside Turkey. It had made an emphasis on anti-communism. This group had defined itself as "*bozkurtçu*". The fourth Turkist group was organized around Orhan Seyfi Orhon and Yusuf Ziya Ortaç. This group had adopted Gökalp's line of thought. It had rather a cultural understanding of nationalism. The fifth group was organized around Nihal Atsız, whose ideas were mentioned above. See: Jacop M. Landau, *Pan Turkism.*

[31] Nihal Atsız, "Türkçülük". *Orhun*, no: 10 (1973 October) (Ankara: Türk Ülküsü, Ayyıldız Matbaası)

[32] Özdoğan, *"Turan"dan "Bozkurt'a"*, 213.

Ottoman/Seljuq period. CHP and the elitist rulers were blamed for imitating the West without comprehending the real foundations of civilization and also for being degenerated. As mentioned above, the Turkist movement was also functioning as an oppositional platform against the nationalism defined by the official/ Kemalist view.[33] Despite the opposition, the government, at times, overlooked the Turkist movement due to the war conditions. Furthermore, the Şükrü Saraçoğlu government, which took charge in 1942, had some sympathy for a racial kind of nationalism. However, the tolerant attitude towards the Turkists soon ceased as Germany's defeat and atrocities became evident. Towards the end of the war, Turkey had started to support the Soviets. At a speech in 1944, İsmet İnönü expressed that, Turanism wouldn't accord with Turkish Republic's nationalism, and it is a great danger.[34] The Turkist-Turanist trend was blamed for having unconstitutional and anti-Kemalist objectives, and organizing for these objectives. A group of Turkists, including N. Atsız, R. O. Türkkan, Z. V. Togan and A. Türkeş were brought up for trial. The tribunal known as Racism-Turanism case came to a conclusion on March 3, 1947.

Following the war, CHP didn't have tolerance for nationalistic trends apart from the official/Kemalist nationalism. The disagreement between the Turkist nationalism and the Kemalist nationalism became more evident. In this period, there had been closures and purges against the Turkist publications and associations. In 1946, the passage to a multiparty system and *Demokrat Parti/DP* (Democratic Party) had been a hope for the Turkists. DP's attempt to purge leftist groups pleased Turkists. Turkists became more organized at the beginning of the multiparty period. They gained supporters from young groups. The movement started to gain political acceptance within the society. It gained support at the sympathizer and militant levels. It started to move towards an activist line. The socialist left was on the rise in Turkey in the same period. The Turkist movement gained effectiveness as a

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] Related by Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti".

reactional force against the socialist left.[35] Another reason for the rise of the Turkist movement following the war was an increased number of external Turks emigrating to Turkey. Cyprus events were also effective on this matter. Pro-Greek attitudes of the USA and the West in these events formed a basis for a strong antagonism against the West and USA.[36]

Development of the Turkist-Turanist understanding, which has been summed up to this point, was to leave both an intellectual legacy and a political/organizational cadre for MHP. However, besides this, the fast socio-cultural change in the 1950s and the 1960s had been influential on the further shaping and backing of the Turkist movement. In the 1950s, an intensive rural-urban migration was experienced in Turkey also with the influence of mechanization within agriculture. The problem of squatisation emerged. Population increase and agricultural unemployment, increasing also with the influence of mechanization, had turned out to be big problems. This change in the social life also penetrated in the cultural and political life. According to Çalık[37], this atmosphere provided a suitable condition for value crisis and conflicts, social and economical alienation, violence tendency, and authoritarian-totalitarian ideas and trends. The process of change that began in the 1950s acquired new dimensions in the 1960s. The masses were influenced by the rapid change and cultural value conflicts experienced. A disheartened, dissatisfied and unhappy mass was growing. This mass harboured in its structure aspects that are open to indoctrination and provocation. These social, psychological and cultural dilemmas had a crucial impact upon the rapid propagation of fanatic and radical trends after 1960 and the strengthening of violent actions that had risen by the end of the 1970s. The growing structure was deprived of social values. Anti-humanism was added on this. Thus, that sowed the seeds of a generation ready to resort to violence to realize their expectations.[38]

---

[35] Uzun, *Türk Milliyetçiliği*, 260-261.

[36] Çalık, *Siyasi Kültür,* 80; Turgay Uzun, *Türk Milliyetçiliği.*

[37] Çalık, *Siyasi Kültür.*

[38] Şerif Mardin, "Üç sorun Üç Çözüm", in, *1978 Yılına Girerken ve 1980'lere Doğru Görüşler Öneriler* (İstanbul: TÜSİAD Yayını, 1978), 93.

However, in spite of the intellectual accumulation and the convenience of socio-cultural conditions, the Turkists were not able to establish a unifical organization up to the end of the1960s.[39] Political representation of the immethodically developed Turkist-Turanist thought by a political party was realized with the establishment of MHP.

3.4 Foundation of the MHP[40]

The roots of MHP go back to *Millet Partisi/MP* (Nation Party). MP was established on July 20, 1948 by the parliament members most of whom had left *Demokrat Parti/DP* (The Democrat Party). MP was respecting liberalism, Republicanism and justice, and was faithful to the principle of Nationalism.[41] The party was closed on July 8, 1953. Osman Bölükbaşı, one of the founders of MP, established *Cumhuriyetçi Millet Partisi/CMP* (Republican Nation Party) on February 10, 1954. The party was a populist, conservative nationalist rural middle class party in the 1950s. Previously established *Türkiye Köylü Partisi* (Peasants' Party of Turkey) (May 19, 1952) joined to CMP on October 16, 1958. Name of the party was changed *to Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi/CKMP* (Republican Peasants' Nation Party). Its president Bölükbaşı resigned from CKMP in 1962, and once more established MP. Meanwhile, Colonel Alparslan Türkeş, who had been purged after a while later than May 27, 1960 coup d'état and deported from the country with a foreign service, returned to Turkey in 1963. Türkeş and his circle joined to CKMP. An organization had been formed around Türkeş in a short while. Türkeş's team gained strength gradually and they had an extraordinary assembly meeting held. At the assembly meeting held between July 31 - August 1, 1965, Alparslan Türkeş was

---

[39] According to Arslan, ultranationalists weren't able to mobilize the masses in this period because of reasons such as, their elitism, their distance from religion and disorganized condition of the Turkists (Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti", 304).

[40] Information related to the establishment of the party was derived from the following sources: Çalık, *Siyasi Kültür*; Tanıl Bora & Kemal Can, *Devlet ve Kuzgun: 1990'lardan 2000'lere MHP* (2nd ed. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004).

[41] C. Güngör, "Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi", in, *27 Mayıs ve Partileşme Sorunu*, ed. C. Güngör (Ankara: Nurol, 1992), 73.

elected president. CKMP, under the administration of Türkeş and his friends, started a political conflict and ideological propaganda that was especially concentrated on young students.[42] At the assembly meeting of CMKP held on February 8-9, 1969, the name of the party was changed to *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi/MHP* (Nationalist Action Party). There had been a regulation that considerably increased Türkeş's power on the organization. The party logo was determined as three crescents on red ground, and the logo of the youth branches was designed as a grey wolf with a crescent.

Following the leadership of Türkeş, the conservative discourse took a back seat and the ultranationalist discourse loomed large in the party's ideology.[43] At this point, I should note that, there is a difficulty in naming MHP's ideological stand and its nationalism. Poulton[44] suggests that MHP was a fascist party in the 1970s, with its paramilitary organizations and other manifestations. Keyder[45], like M. A. Ağaoğulları[46] claims that MHP created a fascist movement in Turkey as a Turkish 'ultranationalist' party. According to Landau[47], MHP is a kind of radical rightist party standing in the right wing of extremism.[48] He suggests that CMKP/MHP had an idea of a fascist regime, because it attempted to keep all social classes and economic activities under the control of the state aiming a totalitarian development. Bora[49] points out that, although there are overlapping points between MHP's ideology and fascist movements, MHP is not just any fascist movement. That is, idealist movement has a specific nature.[50] However, Türkeş frequently expressed, in

---

[42] Çalık, *Siyasi Kültür.*

[43] Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti", 307.

[44] Hugh Poulton, *Top Hat, Grey Wolf and Crescent* (London: Hurst Company, 1997), 164-165.

[45] Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1995), 284.

[46] Mehmet Ali Ağaoğulları, "The Ultranationalist Right", 177.

[47] J. M. Landau, Radical Politics in Modern Turkey (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 205-232.

[48] Muzaffer Sencer, Az Gelişmişliğin Yapısı: Türkiye'de Siyasal Partilerin Sosyal Temelleri (İstanbul: Geçiş, 1975), 354-8.

[49] Bora & Can, Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh, 43-45.

[50] Türkeş had expressed that MHP isn't a fascist party, in his different speeches. See. Muhiddin Nalbantoğlu, *Alparslan Türkeş ile Tarihi Aydınlatan Sohbetler* (İstanbul: Hamle, 1994).

his various speech, that MHP was not a fascist party.[51] In this study, the term "radical nationalist" preferred for MHP instead of the term "fascist". In this conception, the ideas of H. G. Betzand H. Kitschelt and A. McGann are taken as quides. H. Kitschelt and McGann[52] explain the differences between classical fascist parties and these ones. Classical fascism is usually follows the anti-capitalist and corporatist way. But these ones maintain the free market economy. Classical fascism is militaristic. The dominant ideology of these parties is foreigner hostility and racism. Their hierarchical structure the symphaty of charismatic leader may be similar as the classical. But they also give their competition in democratic system. Elites and well-educated ones are important for success of these parties according to Bertz.[53] For Bertz, rightist parties interrogate the social-economical system without being against democracy. Refuse individual and social equalities. They are anti-elitists. The integration of foreigners and immigrants to society is not good for them. They assume anti-semitic, anti-foreigner and racialist speeches. They use the worries in society about these developments. They believe that the true owners of the state are the main individuals of society.

3.5 *Dokuz Işık* (Nine Lights) Doctrine

At the November 1967 assembly meeting of the CMKP, *Dokuz Işık* (Nine Lights) Doctrine was adopted with the suggestion of Alparslan Türkeş. Nine principles have shaped MHP's ideology. In the MHP's party program, it's indicated that the party's understanding of Turkish Nationalism builds up on these principles. *Dokuz Işık* (Nine Lights) is defined as "the basis of thinking and action plan proposed for viewing and solving problems".[54] These principals are *milliyetçilik* (nationalism), *ülkücülük* (idealism), *ahlâkçılık* (moralism), *toplumculuk* (social mindedness), *ilimcilik* (scientific attitude), *köylücülük* (support for the peasant), *hürriyetçilik* and

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] Herbert Kitschelt & Anthony McGann, *the Radical Right in Western Europe* (Michigan: Michigan University Press. 1997).

[53] Hans Georg Betz, "The Growing" Threat of the Radical Right", in *Right Wing Extremism in the Twenty-first Century*, eds. Peter Merki & Leonard Weinberg (London: Routledge, 2003), 74-93.

[54] http://www.mhp.org.tr/program/programgiris.php (accessed 17 May, 2007).

şahsiyetçilik (support for the personal freedom), *gelişmecilik ve halkçılık* (support for development and populism) and *endüstricilik ve teknikçilik* (industrialisation and technology).

Milliyetçilik (nationalism) is seen as the most important 'light'. "It is the driving force and the intellectual basis for the Turkish Nation to be one of the powerful, respected and strong societies of this era, and to take its place in the forefront of the family of nations." According to Türkeş[55], nationalist consciousness is what enables a nation to have prosperity, protects it and maintains its continuity in the competition among nations. This principle has the uppermost importance for the rise of Turkish nation and for its protection from dangers. Turkish nation is a community which "has a common history, and has the consciousness of a common history, belongs to the same religion, is moulded by the same culture, had established and maintained the same state and today also is the owner of that state and lives under its flag. Everyone who has this feeling and this consciousness is Turkish. Turkish nationalism cares about Turks wherever they are in the world" (Chapter 2). Emphasizing not the Turkish citizenship but the Turkishness renders the MHP's nationalism closer to ethnic nationalism. Besides, not feeling a longing for and an attraction towards a foreign nation is uttered by Türkeş as a requirement of being Turkish. His definition of nation as the people living within the same frontiers resembles the Kemalist/official definition of nation. However, considering the external Turks within the Turkish nation reveals the transfrontier nature of the MHP nationalism. Türkeş expresses that they added the word 'Turkism' to nationalism. He defines Turkism as "Prioritizing the aim, the idea that everything the Turkish nation does at every stage of their lives should be compatible with the Turkish spirit and Turkish tradition and beneficial to the Turks." According to Sakallıoğlu[56], there are conflicting points between MHP's nationalism and Kemalist nationalism. Most important of these is related to the issue of westernization.

---

[55] Alparslan Türkeş, *Dokuz Işık ve Türkiye* (İstanbul: Hamle, 1994) For online access to the book: http://www.selahattindogan.com/modules.php?name=dokuzisikturkiye (accessed January 10, 2008).

[56] Related by: Ü. C. Sakallıoğlu & Janvier-Mai. "The Ideology and Politics of the Nationalist Party of Turkey" in C.E.M.O.T.I. (v. 13, 1992), 144-153.

Westernization has been one of the most important aims of the Kemalist project, whereas MHP is against all the foreign ideologies, and its anti-communism had been shaped together with an anti-Western discourse.[57] Therefore, MHP had kept its distance from the Westernist and modernist aspect of the Kemalist nationalism. With its conservative nationalism, it differed from the Kemalist nationalism. But at the same time, it took the racial aspect in Kemalist nationalism to the extreme end.[58]

The second principle, *ülkücülük* (idealism) "means working hard with the love of duty towards the state and the nation and altruism". *Ahlâkçılık* (moralism) is based upon "protection of the highly qualified character of the Turkish Nation and its transference to the future". *İlimcilik* (scientific attitude) "proposes the use of scientific data, and advocates an unprejudiced and methodological reasoning while examining issues". *Toplumculuk* (social mindedness) is based on the idea of "eliminating the imbalance between different income groups in the society and the differences of development among the regions". It means the establishment of the social peace and grounding of the state's existence on the nation. *Köylücülük* (support for the peasant) aims at developed villages, which had overcome poverty and have been utilizing the potentials of civilization. The principle of *hürriyetçilik ve şahsiyetçilik* (support for the personal freedom) assumes guaranteeing the fundamental rights and freedoms and the rule of law as the state's major duty. *Gelişmecilik ve halkçılık* (support for development and populism) is the driving force for the society's will to improve. It is based on the idea that, throughout history, the improvement of societies and civilizations stemmed from the desire to look for the better and to reach perfection. *Endüstricilik ve teknikçilik* (industrialisation and technology) means catching the era in science and technology,

---

[57] According to Sakallıoğlu, except the understanding of Westernization, another point of divergence between the two nationalisms is the issue of Islam. Islam's influence has started to rise in MHP beginning from 1970s. Kemalist nationalism represents the coalition of various social classes such as bureaucrats and the bourgeoisie. However, MHP nationalism is the representative of the petit bourgeoisie. The fourth point of conflict is their democracy understandings. MHP perceived nationalism as the basis of democracy with the concept of 'national democracy'. And finally, the nationalism of the MHP differs from that of Kemalism in terms of its identification with the military. See Ü. C. Sakallıoğlu & Janvier-Mai, "The Ideology…"

[58] Merdan Yanardağ, "MHP'nin Geleceği: Sonuçlar ve Olasılıklar" in *Milliyetçilik, Faşizm ve MHP*, ed. Seyfi Öngider (İstanbul: Aykırı Güncel, 2002), 22.

and with the fact of globalization, making production in the international competitive market while considering the specific conditions of our country[59], rapid transformation of production into economic and social benefit, and an industrialization that will enable increasing the general welfare level. Türkeş underlines the necessity of implementing all the improvements and developments "in accordance with our national spirit and national traditions".

3.6 MHP until the 1980s

Between the years 1963-1966, the party adopted a corporatist, developmentalist-modernist, and Kemalist restorationist discourse. Türkeş made an intensive emphasis on secularism in the election program in 1965. Between the years 1965-1969, the Turkist and fanatic anti-communist discourses stepped forward. Towards the end of the 1960s, Islam has started to be expressed as an integral part of the Turkish history. However, the principal thing was again Turkishness; and Islam was perceived as a secondary element which consolidates the national identity.[60] In the meanwhile, Nihal Atsız and his circle were disturbed from the appreciation of religious communitarianism even if this was used instrumentally. These racial Turkists had been purged by the mid-1970s. Anti-capitalist and anti-masonic discourses were downgraded as well. At the assembly meeting of CMKP, held in November 1967, *"Dokuz Işık"* ("Nine Lights") Doctrine was adopted. In 1968, *Ülkü Ocaks* were established in order to increase the effectiveness of the party in all the faculties. In the same year, commando camps were founded. The party started to raise anti-communist cadres. In February 1969, MHP's cadres were named as "grey wolves". In this period, it developed that MHP's idea/mission "to claim the state/to be the real owner of the state". Arslan[61], states that, the emphasis of being the real owner of the state is the major policy of ultranationalism. He also names the

---

[59] The statement related to globalization is in the current party program. Türkeş's statements include the issue of atom, nuclear and space age.

[60] See: Tanıl Bora & Kemal Can, *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh,* 1st chapter.

[61] Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti", 307.

ideological nature of MHP as ultranationalism. According to Bora,[62] in this period, the party acquired the mission of being "the civilian power by the state" (2004: 59). Also the rising revolutionary wave had its influence on this. The party had followed a strategy directed to seize the 'control of the street'. "MHP, having emerged as a reactionary movement, has risen out of an antagonistic and conflictual political culture and practice, which constitutes its own identity by its opposite.[63]

1971 Memorandum is one of the turning points in the MHP's discourse. Following the Memorandum, *Ülkü Ocaks* were closed together with the leftist organisations. This showed the fact that the state hadn't wanted an assistant.[64] The mission of anti-communism had been undertaken by the state and military in a sense. MHP's organizational and ideological area of diffusion had been narrowed down under these conditions. The party turned its face towards its growing traditional and conservative voters. It started to highlight Islamic elements in its discourse. In the 1977 elections, held in an environment of violence, the party took place in the coalition government (*İkinci Milliyetçi Cephe Hükümeti: Milli Selamet Partisi/MSP* and *Adalet Partisi/AP*: the Second Nationalist Front Government: National Salvation Party and Justice Party). Türkeş had been a State Minister and Vice Prime Minister. The chaos and violence had climbed up in the country until the coup d'état of September 12, 1980. In the meanwhile, the government had been brought down.

3.7 MHP Following the Coup d'état of September 12, 1980

The Coup d'état of September 12, 1980 was another turning point in MHP's discourse. As mentioned above, in the 1970s, MHP espoused the mission of advocating the flag, the nation and the country together with the state authorities. Thus, it hadn't expected to be seen as an 'opponent' in a military intervention. However, with the coup d'état, MHP was closed (like the other parties). Türkeş and

---

[62] Bora & Can, *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh,* 59.

[63] Yanardağ, "MHP'nin Geleceği…", 31.

[64] Uzun, *Türk Milliyetçiliği*, 279.

many party administrators were brought up for trial. Some were sentenced. Some idealists were executed, and many were tortured. Therefore, the coup d'état had been a 'shocking' experience for MHP.[65] Being treated by the state in the same way as leftists/communists were treated started a period of questioning for the MHP voters. An anti-system discourse has emerged in patches. An organizational lacunae and disintegration was experienced in that period.

A recovery began in 1983 with the lifting of the prohibition of political parties. The *Muhafazakâr Parti/MP* (Conservative Party) was founded on July 7, 1983 as the continuation of MHP. The party's name became *Milliyetçi Çalışma Partisi/MÇP* (Nationalist Working Party) in 1985. However, this party could not gather the voters of MHP. In the assembly meeting of October 1987, Türkeş was elected the president of the party. This assembly meeting is a turning point in the discourse and image of MÇP/MHP. Academicians such as Devlet Bahçeli and Ali Güngör started to be influential in this period. In this direction, qualified cadres, a 'scientific' discourse instead of agitative discourse, and determination of the policies more professionally were considered important. In the MÇP's party programme of 1988, historical framework was brought to forefront instead of defining an organic nation. Democracy, human rights, and the rule of law were brought to forefront. As an alternative to all the imitation systems, the "home product" was brought up.[66] Although the process of change had started, anti-Westernism was still an important issue of the 1980s.

Poulton[67] expresses that MHP's fascist characteristic has become indistinct in the post-1980 period:

---

[65] The fact that the Coup d'état was an important turning point for MHP is emphasized by Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti…", Bora and Can (*Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh*) Uzun (*Türk Milliyetçiliği*) and Arıkan ("Türkeş'ten Bahçeli'ye MHP: Değişim Nereye Kadar?" in *Milliyetçilik, Faşizm ve MHP*, ed. Seyfi Öngider (İstanbul: Aykırı Güncel, 2002)).

[66] Burak Arıkan ("Türkeş'ten Bahçeli'ye MHP: Değişim Nereye Kadar?" in *Milliyetçilik, Faşizm ve MHP*, ed. Seyfi Öngider (İstanbul: Aykırı Güncel, 2002).

[67] Poulton, *Top Hat,* 165.

Since the 1980s coup, the radical right's activities have been severely curtailed, and perhaps can no longer be seen as truly fascist ... .the radical right is destined to remain a peripheral force in Turkish politics for the near future at least –despite the openings in Central Asia which has seen 'cultural Turanism' become official policy.

Also the issue of idealist mafia, which became a current issue in the process of disintegration and caused a loss of reputation for MHP, had an influence on the renewal need of the party.[68] There existed differentiations within MHP also in this period. There was a disagreement between the ones in favour of making more emphasis on Islam and the ones emphasizing Turkism. As stated, in the 1970s, Islam started to be highlighted in MHP but it was seen more as an instrument. Then, after 1980, a genuine process of Islamization started. While the focus was on Turkishness in the Turkish-Islamic Synthesis, it is more on Islam in the emergent view named "Turkish-Islamic idealism". The party administration was close to the official understanding that considers Islam as a "motive". Therefore, the discrepancy between the party administration and Turkish-Islamic idealists, who had an Islamic discourse, grew wider. The party was divided. Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu established the *Büyük Birlik Partisi/BBP* (Great Union Party) in 1992.[69] In this way, the party was substantially purified from the Islamist group. This paved the way for re-Turkisization of MHP in the 1990s. In the meanwhile, name of the MÇP was again changed to MHP in 1993.

3.8. The 1990s and MHP

In the 1990s, both the nationalist wave has risen and the MHP's change that began at the end of the 1980s has become evident. Developments in the world, and both Turkey's and the party's internal dynamics had been influential on this.

Globalization had brought about a new structuring in the world's economic and political life. Global and regional powers and equilibriums had rapidly changed.

---

[68] Uzun, *Türk Milliyetçiliği*, 297-98; Bora & Can, *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh*, 276.

[69] Bora & Can, *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh,* chapters 6 and 7.

The gap between the prosperous states of the "North" and the third world countries of the "South" has been deepening. Turkey was taking its place between the North and the South in economic, cultural and social terms. Within this crystallizing hierarchy, countries -including Turkey- were concerned about acquiring a prominent position for themselves. According to Bora[70], this atmosphere was paving the way for the rise of radical nationalism since it was enabling the support for views, which involve "militant" discourses directed at positioning the country at the higher ranks. At the same time, the trends focusing on the national interests and producing radical solutions were gaining supporters. MHP was already covering such discourses. As mentioned above, it has seen the history as a struggle among nations. It had a discourse focusing on the upper/superior position of Turkey within this hierarchy all along.

Disintegration of the Soviets is another crucial development of the 1990s, which affected the nationalist wave in Turkey and in the world. Ideological polarization has lost its rigidity with this development. The West's superiority over the Communist Russia was then recognized. This situation can be said to have refreshed MHP's self-confidence. As explained above, anti-communism had been a crucial subject in the MHP's discourse (especially in the 1970s). It has been also stated that the issue of "External Turks", especially the "captive Turks" in the Soviets, had been a focus. With the collapse of communism, the party started to express that it was right in its years-long struggle, and that its thesis of the collapse of communism had been affirmed. Anti-communist mission of the MHP was completed. Therefore, it had been certified that Turanism is not a dream. The nationalist movements rising in the Turkic communities separated from the Soviet Russia provided MHP with extra credit. MHP headed towards gaining influence over that geography. Turkist motives started to get popular and to be highlighted more at the symbolic level.[71]

---

[70] Tanıl Bora & Kemal Can, *Devlet ve Kuzgun: 1990'lardan 2000'lere MHP* (2nd ed. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004), 495-497.

[71] Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti…"; Bora & Can, *Devlet ve Kuzgun*, especially chapter 9.

On the other hand, the disintegration of the Soviets gave rise to a revival of MHP's anti-Western discourse. As mentioned, MHP was expressing its anti-Westernism by means of its anti-communist discourse. Ending of the threat of communism created a gap in the MHP's discourse. However, the Turkism/MHP had always defined itself by an existing or imagined enemy or 'the other'. The aforementioned reactionary nature of Turkism had actually required this. Therefore, instead of anti-Sovietism, already existing anti-Westernism started to be sharpened once more.[72] This situation was overlapping with the rising anti-Westernism among the masses. As a matter of fact, growing inequity of income and the cumulative reaction among the wide masses, who had been devastated by globalization, leaded to a result that has also generated hostility against the West.[73]

On the other hand, following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, MHP needed to keep up with the changing conjuncture. In their program before 1990, liberalism, communism, Westernism and 'imitation' were all unacceptable systems since they weren't in conformity with the Turkish history and tradition. With a corporatist approach, Turkish nation was seen as a whole. However, in the new era, this understanding was backward and outdated in a world of liberal-capitalist systems. Thus the party started to advocate neo-liberal economy in its 1993 party program. MHP had been shaped in interaction with the foreign developments on the one hand. On the other hand, the 1990s was a period in which Turkey was undergoing some transformations; and the domestic atmosphere was also influential on the party's change. Turkey was facing a new 'wave of modernization' in this period. Democracy was the dominant political theme. According to this fact, these themes started to be emphasized especially with the 1994 Kayseri Erciyes congress of the party. 1994 Assembly Meeting crystallized the image renewal of the party. After this Assembly Meeting, MHP highlighted the Westernist nationalism in its discourse. According to Yanardağ[74] Westernist Turkish nationalism is based on the

---

[72] Arıkan, "Türkeş'ten Bahçeli'ye.."; Uzun, *Türk Milliyetçiliği.*

[73] Yanardağ, "MHP'nin Geleceği.."

[74] Ibid, 19.

assertion that 200-year complex of "backwardness" is now overcome. It potentially has the idea or feeling of growing over its boundaries and imperialism. It emphasizes a Turkey rising within its own territory.

One of the factors that are influential in the rise of the nationalist wave and in the prominence of MHP's Turkist discourse in Turkey was the increase in terrorist events. A popular nationalism was pumped into the society with the rising PKK terror.[75] MHP had overstated loyalty to the military and state in this period. It reproduced its unique mission of power, which advocates the indivisible unity of the country and the nation, on the basis of Kurdish problem.[76]

After the middle of the 1990s, the support for MHP grew gradually stronger. The party raised its votes significantly in the 1999 elections. It took place in the government as a coalition partner. Various factors in the rise of the party are being discussed in addition to the developments mentioned above.[77] According to Arslan, specific crises in the dominant ideologies in Turkey had been experienced during the 1990s.[78] Kemalism was exposed to some confrontations in this period. Islamist wing that had grown quite strong at the beginning of the 1990s had also in a period of recession. Neo-liberal ideology has started to be emphasized less as well with the decline of centre right parties. As to MHP, it adopted a discourse involving Kemalism, the new right and Islam. The nationalism that was popularized and predominated the general atmosphere has brought MHP in. MHP headed towards being a mass party.[79] From the beginning of the 1990s, it was already started to be highlighted that, MHP is not a marginal but a centre party.[80]

---

[75] Arıkan, "Türkeş'ten Bahçeli'ye…"

[76] Yanardağ, "MHP'nin Geleceği…", 25.

[77] For the reasons of MHP's rise in 1999 elections under the leadership of Bahçeli see: Metin Heper, "'Başkalaşmadan' Değişen Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi," *Türkiye Günlüğü* (March-April 1999), 12-22.

[78] Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti…", 315, 319.

[79] Arıkan, "Türkeş'ten Bahçeli'ye..."

[80] Türkeş had started to appear in the media with an experienced, peaceful, reconciliatory, moderate and fatherly image. There was an effort to release MHP from the aggresive and combative image which it acquired in 1970s, and from the mafia-like image which it acquired in 1980s. This became

However, it can be said that, the 'moderation' in question added a completely contradictory, complicated and indecisive characteristic to the party's discourse. As can be seen, the traditional Turanist ideals, a racist understanding, the nervousness felt from 'the other' and a sharpened anti-Westernism were intertwined with the 1990s' conformity to the changing conditions, articulation to the process of globalization as a leader country, and an emphasis on the Westernist values such as democracy and human rights. This renders it hard to analyse MHP. [81] In the following chapters, the extent to which the party's discourse on the EU coincides with the picture introduced above, will be analysed.

---

even more evident following the death of Türkeş in 1997. For example Bahçeli adopted a style of organization which diminished *Ülkü Ocaks*, an actor in the violent events. See. Arıkan, Burak. 2002. "Türkeş'ten Bahçeli'ye…; Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti…". However, MHP states that, it hasn't changed but only developed according to current conditions; and its nationalist style continues just as it was before. See: Devlet Bahçeli, *18 Nisan 1999 Seçimlerinin Ardından* (Ankara: MHP, 1999).

[81] For example, on the one hand it can be said that, resignation of the political Islamists from the party made the re-Turkisization of the party easier. From the beginning of 1990s, Türkeş had adopted an attitude in favour of the Kemalist/official understanding (against the rising political Islam). On the other hand, one can't easily say that the party excluded Islam. In a similar manner, as Yanardağ ("MHP'nin Geleceği…") also emphasizes, the conservative nationalism was withdrawn, and the Westernist nationalism was emphasized in the party's vision. However, the conservative nationalism was the one which is actually effective. That is, it is widely accepted that the MHP had underwent a process of change in 1990s, but there are numerous debates as to whether this is a change in the showcase/an image engineering or a real experience.

CHAPTER 4

EU IN THE MHP'S DISCOURSE: NATIONAL VALUES AND THREATENING CHALLENGES

It is considerably hard to provide a conceptual clarification for the terms 'West' and 'Europe'. The term Europe [that is, the West] have had varying meanings in time.[1] On the one hand, it has been the name of a geographical region with blurred boundaries; and on the other hand, it has been the expression of a culture-civilization and a political identity.

The terms 'West' and 'Europe', with their general polysemy and ambiguity, had acquired a specific character and uncertainty in the specific historical and social conditions of the Ottoman/Turkish history, and in the mindset in this territory. The Ottoman Empire's relations with Europe and its 'position' in these relations had varied throughout history. Therefore, the Ottoman's perception and characterization of the Europe/West had also varied. However, considering that, the Ottoman state organization was based on religion/Islam, and that, religion was also a powerful factor in shaping the mindset of the society; one can say that, the perception of the West in this territory had been religion-oriented for a long while.

Especially the Crusades and wars that the Ottoman Empire fought with the West for spreading Islam are imprinted on the social memory as the confrontations between Islamic and Christian worlds. This can be said to have consolidated the religious perception of the West by the Ottoman Empire. However, the perception in question began to change with the start of the decline of the Ottoman Empire.

---

[1] Yalçıner, "Varoluşsal Öz Bilinçten Meşruiyet Krizine Avrupa İdeali, Kendilik ve Ötekiliğin Demokratik Diyalektiğini Siyasal Bir İnşa Projesi Üzerinden Yorumlamak", *Siyaset ve Toplum*, Winter: 2005, n. 1, 73.

Military defeats and huge territorial losses against the West added a new and different dimension to the Ottoman Empire's view of the West. Yeğen states that "the beginning of the eighteenth century witness[ed] to the formation of a fracture and a dissolution in the mentality shaping the Ottoman administration". In this period of history:

> Self confidences of the founders and bearers of the prevailing mentality in the Ottoman administration related to the 'validity' of the Ottoman style administration started to be eroded with the growth of the comprehension that the relations between the Ottoman State and the 'West' are turning against the Ottoman State. The most evident signal of this self confidence 'crisis' was the 'starting' of a great self-questioning, which was to broaden into a 'civilization' debate spreading over a few centuries; in other words, it was the 'beginning' of a suspicion related to the 'validity' of the Ottoman style administration. In short, the most distinctive first-consequence of the mentioned questioning was the emergence of the idea of 'reforming' four hundred year old classical Ottoman system. The fact that the Ottoman-Western relations started to turn against the former was confirmed; and this was what gave rise to the idea of 'reform'. In other words, it wouldn't take a long time to find the remedy following the consolidation of this new mentality. According to this remedy, the Ottoman Empire would get over the depression through reformation in the Western sense, by being like the West.[2]

Hanioğlu[3] points out that, the idea of reshaping the Ottoman State in accordance with the West is the most critical point in the Ottoman/Turkish history of thought. Because "the erosion of self confidence" emerging with the fracture that Yeğen highlighted is the most crucial point that will shape the perception of the West in the Ottoman/Turkish social thought. As a matter of fact, the formulation "being like the West", which was firstly seen as "the remedy for getting over the crisis" and as a technical/military issue, had started to surround social and cultural living spaces.[4]

---

[2] Mesut Yeğen, *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu* (2nd ed., İstanbul: İletişim, 2003), 41-42 (Translation is mine).

[3] Şükrü Hanioğlu, *Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti ve Jön Türklük*, Cilt: 1 (1989-1902), (İstanbul, İletişim, 1989), 16.

[4] After acceptance of the ascendency of West in Ottoman first in military field afterwards in education, politics etc. in every field it was attempted a reform movements. As it is out of our subject matter, it will not talked about those reforms. It would be looked at the sources like Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*. Çev. Yasemin Soner Gönen, İstanbul: İletişim, 1999.; Lewis B. *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991; Mardin, Şerif. *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1996; Berkes, Niyazi *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul:

"Acquiescence" of the West's domination and penetration of this understanding into different living spaces generated a critical tension over time: What to take from the West, and which way to follow for being like the West. Here the important thing is the acceptance of the ideas that, the West is improved, it has desirable and long-awaited characteristics, and the Ottoman Empire is lacking and backward compared to it. This paved the way for a kind of complex, which will be handed over to the Republic and be imprinted on the Ottoman/Turkish society's mindset. The superiority of the "West" was accepted, and this referred sometimes to a geographical matter, and sometimes to a cultural or civilizational difference. However, on the other hand, there was a different concern behind the questions and debates on what to take from the West. The idea of adopting the technological developments but not the cultural values of the West points to the nervousness about the damaging influences of Western culture on the local culture. Consequently, the West is a subject 'that involves corrupting influences within its differences'; and thus, it should be approached with deliberation.

As stated above, the West was taken as the fundamental reference in the Ottoman self-questioning; and from the 19th century forward, it was imprinted on the Ottoman memory as an other to be emulated and approached with deliberation. This kind of a perception of the West has also been very effective following the establishment of the Republic. The new state was observed to have a hesitant attitude towards the West in its early period. This period's texts, in which one can most clearly see the traces of a varying perception of the West, are the Turkish History Thesis[5] (the historical construction of the new state) and the Sun Language

YKY, 2002. See for a source that analyses the process in that the transformation of social structure and relations: Karpat, Kemal. *Osmanlı Modernleşmesi: Toplum, Kuramsal Değişim ve Nüfus*, Ankara: İmge, 2002.

[5] Turkish History Thesis was pronounced in 1932 to related entourage with sixteen communiques (manifesto) in 1st History Congress . Congress met to make the new history conception clear for teachers. The communiques that were presented in congress were mostly about the racial features of Turkish, the homeland position of Middle Asia, the ancientness of Turkish name, the Turkish core of important cizilizations and the conditions of Turkish throughout Ottoman. According to thesis, Turks are the white race who have been existed since B.C. twelve thousand, who established great civilizations, establised powerful and egalitarian political unions in the Middle Asia, who entered to iron age firstly, who domesticated animals and who learned agriculture and mining. The drought in Middle Asia forced Turks to immigrate; the communities whom separated from main body with

Theory.[6] In these texts, the effort to overcome the above mentioned "self confidence crisis" stands out. These theses were adopted as if they would radically erase a complex that a society tired of staying behind hadn't been able to overcome for two centuries. However, they have rapidly lost their influence that they had at the beginning.

What should be highlighted here is the fact that, these texts are constructed in part for the purpose of proving the adequacy to the West. According to Copeaux[7], addressees of the thesis were not only the public and students but also the Westerners, who admired the Hellenic world. Every Turk was responsible from learning the culture of these Westerners and introducing her/his own culture to them. Therefore, these theses tried to underline that, Turkish world is equal to and even superior to the West, which *is superior* according to the accepted view. In this period and in these texts, also some new elements were added to the perception of the West. The west is a subject which acts in an unfair manner to Turks, whom it describes as a second class race. As a matter of fact, in the Congress where the Turkish History Thesis was presented, the West's unfair accusations against Turks

---

spreading to world became the founder ancestors of China, India, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Iran, Anatolian, Greek and Italian civilizations. The human types in Africa, in Nort Asia and in Europe are dolichocephalic and because of the feature of topography they couldn't enter to Middle Asia. For the communiques that the informations above are collected: *I. Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları*, 1932, İstanbul: BTTK. Consequently, Turk who is 'exceptionally brekisefal' remained pure, although where he immigrate get mixed, he protected his features (A Afetinan, *Atatürk ve Tarih Tezi* (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1939), 245-246).

[6] For language studies, it is established in 1932 Turkish Language Study Society (later Turkish Language Institution) coordinate Language Congress at the same year. In Congress Turkish as the ancestors of other languages which is taken shape with history thesis in a large proportion was repeated. Accordingly, Turkish linguists who saw the word that cannot be explained etymologically in languages remain mystery for linguists, claimed that the origins of these words exist in Turk's – the oldest race – language. According to theory, first Turks worshiped to Sun and first voices and words were formed from Sun's brightness and power with drawing inspiration from Turk's bewilderment in front of it. Both Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory had influence till to mids of the1940s.

[7] Copeaux. E. 2003. "Türk Milliyetçiliği: Sözcükler, İşaretler, Tarihler" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce-Milliyetçilik*, v.: 4, 2nd ed., İstanbul: İletişim, 49 Besides this is seen at the beginning of the history studies which discorse the theses. Afet Inan in 1928 saw that "in one of the French geography books, Turks belong to yellow race and for European mentality it is a sort of secondary 'secondaire' human type" is accepted. She asks to Ataturk whether it is true or not. The replied anwer is "No, it cant be, be occupied with it. You engaged with it" (See A. Afetinan, *Atatürk,* 244).

were often emphasized beginning from the opening speech of Esat Bey.[8] At the same time, the West was constructed as an *evil-minded* party, misleading Turkish historians with its indifference and its inaccurate works.[9] On the other hand, however, the West was, after all, considered as a very important source for strengthening studies. Numerous Western texts was resorted in the statements for supporting the views. In a sense, approval of the *knowing and advanced* West was considered necessary for the theses. In the statements, *the image of evil-minded West aiming to defame Turks* was at times changed in shape. Claims of Western studies, that were used to support the thesis, were presented as the reliable statements of a *scientifically advanced civilization*. This is the expression of both a diffident attitude and an uncertainty towards the West.

The points above for pointing out the general 'ambiguity' and 'variability' of the image of West in the Ottoman/Turkish mindset was focused. These 'ambiguity' and 'variability' had emerged in the Ottoman Empire, and the Republic established a

---

[8] "Hitherto most of the book that you read are translation and the quated original copies.... make the reality and existence of Turkish nation and personality and his services to world civilization for any reason are far away to become clear" ["Şimdiye kadar okumuş olduğumuz kitaplardan hemen hemen birçoğu tercüme ve iktibas edilmiş olan asılları ise ... hakikati ve Türk milletinin varlığını ve benliğini ve cihan medeniyetine olan hizmetlerini tebarüz ettirmekten, herhangi bir sebeple uzak bulunmuş idi] (Esat Bey. "I. Türk Tarih Kongresi Açış Konuşması", in, *I. Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları* (İstanbul: BTTK, 1932), 5.)

[9] As you remember, up to not far away times the distinguished historians that is considered as most skilful for example Naima, didn't refrain from to use insulted words about Turks like 'A community lack of intelligence'….We saw such writers that who consider to present the abominate and the bolt marks when it is talked about Turks as talent…..I wonder if Naima and her equals are treacherous? God forbid ! Never… However these are crushed and offended under bad tempered views and effects. [Hatırlarsınız ki pek uzak olmayan zamanlara kadar en muktedir addettiğimiz benam tarihçilerimiz bile meselâ Naima, Türk hakkında "etraki bi idrak" gibi tahkiramiz cümleler kullanmaktan çekinmezlerdi.....Öyle muharrirler gördük ki, Türkler'den bahsedilirken irkinmek ve iğrenmek alâmetleri göstermeyi marifet addederlerdi....Acaba Naima ve emsali Türk haini midirler? Haşa! Fakat bunlar.....bedhah telâkkilerin ve tesirlerin altında ezilmiş, kırılmıştı] (Ağaoğlu Ahmet. "İpitidaî Türk Aile Hukuku ile İptidaî Hindo-Avrupaî Aile Hukuku Arasında Mukayese" , in *I. Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları* (İstanbul: BTTK, 1932), 261-262).

One of the most important reasons that have mislead us hitherto is western Orientalists' ideas about Turkish name that only emerged in seventh century with GökTurks. The ideas that are inherited from European works to our books are totally wrong. [Bizi şimdiye kadar yanıltan çok mühim sebeplerden biri de garp müsteşriklerinin Türk adının ancak yedinci asırda gök Türklerle meydana çıkmış olmasına ait fikirleridir. Avrupa eserlerinden bizim kitaplarımıza intikal eden bu fikir külliyen yanlıştır] (Samih Rıfat, "Türkçe ve diğer Lisanlar arasında İrtibatlar", in, *I. Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları* (İstanbul: BTTK, 1932), 77-78).

ground that consolidated this situation. The fundamental focus is the 'existence' of this uncertain and contradictory situation and its ingrainedness in the basis of the Republic of Turkey's founding mindset. For this reason, the examples won't be diversified within a historical sequence.[10] As a matter of fact, in the Turkish social mindset, the West has been addressed with different emphases in every period. However, these different perceptions were substantially involved in a framework covering the above mentioned subjects.

4.1 West and EU in MHP's Discourse in the 1970s

As expressed before, the European Union is a new phase in Turkey's relations with the West and its Westernization adventure. As is known, Turkey's relations with the European Union have a history of almost fifty years. This process, which can be considered long, has witnessed different perceptions of the European Union. The EU has acquired different meanings in the framework of different approaches as well as within the same approach in the course of time. The way that the EU is constructed by the MHP, the subject of this study, in its perception of and discourse on the EU, has varied in the course of time. In addition to this, also within the same period of time, contradictory aspects coexisted in the discourse in question.

As mentioned before, Türkeş joined the CKMP in 1963, and took the administration of the party soon after. In 1969, he changed the name of the party to the *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*, which has become one of the prominent actors in the Turkish politics from the 1970s onward. In the 1970s, ""Turkism", coming into prominence in the MHP's ideology, has targeted Western influence and "Westernist" approaches inside the country; and it adopted a "turn to yourself" discourse against Westernization policies starting with the *Tanzimat* (Reform) Era of the Ottoman

---

[10] However here with connection to the subject, it is beneficial to open parenthesis. According to Özdoğan, the subject matter of the topic that is *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*'s ideology Turkism, in the single party period function as the platform against modernity [by implication West-ŞK], it approached to politics of Westernization reactional. See Özdoğan, *"Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a,* 17 etc.

Empire".[11] In the same period, MHP's discourse on the European Union (its name was the European Economic Community at that time) had a similar character.

In this period MHP has defined the EU as "an economic organization". However, the EU, appearing in the party's discourse as an economic organization which can be joined, was turning out to be a dangerous structure when the cultural and political components were considered (1973; 1977). Türkeş expresses this clearly in the *"Milliyetçi Hareketin El Kitabı" Dış Politika, Dış Ekonomik Münasebetler ve Yabancı Sermaye"* ("Foreign Policy, Foreign Economic Relations and Foreign Capital" chapter of the "Manual of Nationalist Movement"), which was first published in 1973, then again in 1977 by the party:

> Since the only alternative not contrasting the national ideals is not feasible in the short term, the MHP commits itself to against the use of regional economic organizations as a means of social, cultural and political integration going beyond the economics.[12]

This statement asserts that, the EU can be approached as long as it is a 'mere' economic formation; but otherwise the doors would be shut. In the statement it can be also seen that, the EU was discussed in two different axes, namely, material/technological/economic and spiritual/cultural/civilizational. This is a division referred quite often in debates on the West.

Perceiving 'the West as a corrupting civilization' was the fundamental reason of the harm that Türkeş saw in 'social and cultural' integration. As a matter of fact, while saying that "We, as the *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*, are not against economic organizations"[13] Türkeş also added:

> MHP is openly and absolutely against the Common Market because it will cause an indirect implementation of the *Treaty of Sevrès* by allowing

---

[11] Ibid, 10.

[12] "Milli ülkülere ters düşmeyen tek alternatifin, kısa dönemde uygulama kabiliyeti olmadığı için Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi, bölgesel ekonomik teşkilâtların ekonomiyi aşarak sosyal, kültürel ve siyasal bütünleşme aracı olarak kullanılmasına karşı açıkça caziyet almayı görev sayar".

[13] "Milliyetçi Hareketin el Kitabı" –"Dış Politika, Dış Ekonomik Münasebetler ve Yabancı Sermaye" (Ankara: MHP, 1973, 1977), 43.

foreigners to acquire land and opportunities in any part of the country and as much as they want; *it will lead to cultural and social deformation; and it will prevent the development of national industry* [emphasis added].[14]

Türkeş's worries on political integration materialize in his comprehension of the EU as a structure that 'will cause an indirect implementation of the Treaty of Sevrès'. Here it should be noted that, the EU was constructed as 'an obvious enemy, secretly aiming to destroy Turkey's territorial integrity' through discussing the relations with EU in a framework referring to the Treaty of Sevrès.[15] As a matter of fact, the Ottoman Empire and the Allied Powers with whom it had fought for a long while were the parties to the Treaty of Sevrès. In this context, the EU was seen as a continuation of the Allied Powers that had tried to seize lands of the Ottoman Empire, rather than an economic organization undertaking the regulation of some political and social elements. Furthermore, the relationship between Turkey and the West was perceived from within the dichotomies of master-slave, oppressor-oppressed, seizer-submissive as indicated by Türkeş's following statement: "We believe that the good relations between Turkey and Western countries will be beneficial to the parties in economic, social, cultural and defence issues. However, we are absolutely against the *slavery* [emphasis added] of Common Market."[16]

Besides, what Türkeş said about the 'way' of indirect implementation of the Treaty of Sevrès indicates another point as well. The quotation above points to the "allowing [of] foreigners to acquire land and opportunities in any part of the

---

[14] "Yabancıların ülkenin istediği yerinde istediği ölçüde arazi ve imkân edinmelerine fırsat vererek Sevr Andlaşmasının dolaylı uygulamasına sebep olacağı, kültürel ve sosyal deformasyona yol açacağı ve milli sanayinin gelişmesini engelleyeceği için Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi, Ortak Pazar'ın açıkça ve kesinlikle karşısındadır". Ibid.

[15] Treaty of Sèvres after 1st World War (1914-1918) between Allied States and Turkey at August 10, 1920 was signed. According to Treaty in general , the whole West Thrace and large part of East Thrace that is near to Buyuk Cekmece lake were beign given to Greece. Altough Izmir and its region were staying formally under Ottoman Sovereigny, the practice of sovereignty and the right of administration were also assigned to Greece. In East Anatolia there woul be establised an independent Armanian State and autonomous Kurdish State. The vinicity of Antakya, Antep, Urfa and Mardin were left to French. The bosphoruses would be goverened by a commision which would be composed of Allied States. The last Ottoman parliament in March 18, 1920 because of occupation and pressures abolished itself. However, the parliament in Ankara from at the beginning was against the treaty. Turkey didn't approved the treaty and treaty couln't gain legal validity and didn't come into force. *AnnaBritannica*, 1990, 282.

[16] "1977 Party Programme", 49-50.

country and as much as they want" as the reason of the Treaty of Sevrès, that is the reason of territorial disintegration. The implication that, foreigners, who are present or buy property in the country, are "from them", and therefore, they share the intentions and aims of the "enemy", signifies a "fear of foreigners". This fear serves the purpose of creating others and enemies inside the country. The extreme nationalist ideology generates itself by defining itself in terms of its opposites; and it always involves a reactionary potential.[17] When this point is taken into consideration, it can be said that, the discourse by which MHP constructs EU as an enemy, supports its own ideological premises as well. Furthermore, in this discourse, MHP constructs itself as a party, disclosing the internal enemies that are extension of the external enemies.

Following these explanations, I will make a long quotation since it is like a summary covering the highlighted points about the EU's construction in the MHP's discourse during the 1970s. In an interview published with the title "Türkeş Declared the Fundamental Aims of Turkish Nationalism" in the *Ortadoğu* newspaper on February 12th, 1976, Türkeş was asked: "As a nationalist party leader how do you think the relations between Turkey and the European Common Market should be? How can having close relations with the Common Market influence our current foreign policy equilibrium?"[18] The quotation mentioned is part of Türkeş's answer to this question:

> ….. A nation can join various international relations but every decision of joining is made if it is compatible with the main development strategy of developing nations. The countries gathering under the roof of the Common Market and establishing economic collaboration are also convenient for collaboration in other fields; and they have similarities in their economic-social structures. It is also a fact that, these countries have cultural closeness among themselves. Generic institutions like language and religion are side factors making it easier for them to get closer to each other. As for Turkish and European nations, they don't have any common social and cultural aspects. Our social and cultural institutions had been neglected and retarded by incompetent and untalented administrators.

---

[17] Bora & Can, *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh*, 10.

[18] Nalbantoğlu, *Türkeş ile,* 200-201.

However, their social structures are established, cultural institutions are developed and strengthened.

Under these conditions, we, as the MHP, believe that Turkish nation should be protected from being a refugee to Western culture.
Turkish nation, instead of being an imitator and a colony of foreign cultures, aims to establish a powerful, potent and great Turkey that occupies the foremost place in the contemporary civilization.

In addition to the social, political and cultural disadvantages of joining the Common Market, its economic results have the potential of rendering Turkish economy dependent on outside sources. If we join the Common Market, current industrial establishments, especially the state economic enterprises producing strategic goods or the branches of industry that have a large capital share and the branches of industry where only large scale production can provide savings will be eliminated in the course of time. On the other hand, new industrial investments will shrink and Turkey's economic growth rate will decrease.[19]

Despite the dark picture outlined above, it's also noteworthy that MHP cannot leave EU aside completely.

Our government is a coalition government [The Second Nationalist Front Government, together with the *Adalet Partisi/AP* (Justice Party) and the *Milli Selamet Partisi/MSP* (National Salvation Party)]. In the protocol of the coalition, which is a consensus government, our opinions about the Common Market are determined. Accordingly, necessity of a regulation

---

19 "….. Bir millet çeşitli milletler arası münasebetlere katılabilir fakat her katılma kararı gelişen milletlerin ana gelişme stratejisi ile uyum halinde ise müspet karar verilir. Ortak Pazar çatısı altında bir araya gelerek ekonomik işbirliğini gerçekleştiren ülkeler, diğer alanlarda da işbirliğine müsait olup ekonomik-sosyal yapılarında benzerliklere sahiptirler. Bu ülkelerin kendi içlerinde kültürel yakınlıkları olduğu da bir gerçektir. Dil, din, gibi tür müesseseleri de aralarında yakınlaşmayı kolaylaştıran yan etkenlerdir. Türk milleti ile Avrupa milletleri arasında ise, sosyal ve kültürel hiçbir taraf yoktur. Bizim sosyal ve kültür müesseselerimiz beceriksiz, kabiliyetsiz yöneticiler elinde ihmal edilmiş, geri bırakılmıştır. Onların ise sosyal yapıları oturmuş kültür müesseseleri geliştirilmiş ve kuvvetlendirilmiştir.

Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi olarak, bu şartlar altında, Türk milletinin Batı kültürünün sığıntısı haline gelme durumundan sakınması gerektiği inancındayız.

Türk milleti yabancı kültürlerin taklitçisi ve sömürgesi olmak yerine; çağdaş medeniyetin en önüne geçmiş; kuvvetli, kudretli büyük bir Türkiye'yi kurmayı hedef olarak seçmiştir.

Ortak Pazar'a girişimizin sosyal, siyasi, kültürel sakıncaları yanında iktisadi bakımdan ortaya çıkaracağı neticeler Türk ekonomisini dışa bağımlı yapacak yöndedir. Ortak Pazar'a girişimizle mevcut sanayi tesisi, bilhassa stratejik mamuller imal eden kamu iktisadi teşekkülleri veya sermaye payı yüksek sanayi kolları ile ancak geniş çapta üretimin tasarruf sağladığı sanayi kolları zamanla tasfiye olacaktır. Diğer yandan yeni sanayi yatırımları azalacak ve Türkiye'nin iktisadi gelişme hızı düşecektir."

and reform based on mutual interests, particularly Turkey's industrialization matter, was manifested. Today our governments are also working for this.[20]

On the one hand, the MHP emphasizes its opposition to the Common Market in a clear and straight manner, and 'enemizes' the organization. On the other hand however, ways of improving the relations together are searched. In the protocol of the coalition that is mentioned in the above quotation and signed by Türkeş too, it is stated that "Activities attempted for harmonizing our relations with the European Economic Community to the new conditions will be continued with resolution and determination". Furthermore, it is also expressed in the Protocol that, it is natural to require that the EU relations will speed up Turkey's economic development and will bring its industry in foreign competitive capacity.[21]

> We consider it imperative to address and reorganize our relations with the European Economic Community in a manner that will serve the development and build-up of our national industry, will create a market for our export products, and will protect our national interests.[22]

As discussed in the previous chapter, the year 1978 witnessed the beginning of an uncertain period in terms of Turkey-European Union relations. Turkey demanded to be released from its obligations in 1978. Following the Coup D'état of September 12th, 1980, the relations were suspended. Atmosphere of the military intervention and the following interruption in the relations removed the EU from the agenda. Turkey applied for membership on April 14th 1987 but this application was rejected in 1989. The relations, passing through a period of stagnation until the year 1995, revived with the enactment of the Customs Union Treaty in 1996. However, they were interrupted again after the Luxembourg Summit in 1997.

---

[20] "Hükümetimiz, bir koalisyon [2. Milliyetçi Cephe Hükümeti, Adalet Partisi-AP ve Milli Selamet Partisi-MSP ile birlikte] hükümetidir. Bir uzlaşma hükümeti olan koalisyonun protokolunda Ortak Pazar'la ilgili görüşlerimiz tespit edilmiştir. Buna göre, Türkiye'nin sanayileşme davası başta olmak üzere karşılıklı menfaatlerimizi esas alan düzenleme ve ıslahatın zarureti belirtilmiştir. Bugün hükûmetlerimiz de bu çalışmalar içerisinde bulunmaktadır." Ibid.

[21] "5 Haziran 1977 V. Demirel Hükümeti Koalisyon Protokolü (AP-MSP-MHP)", http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/KP41.htm (accessed Septernber 2, 2007).

[22] "Avrupa ekonomik topluluğuyla aramızdaki münasebetleri, milli sanayiimizin geliştirilmesi ve güçlenmesine hizmet edecek, ihracatımıza pazar sağlayacak, milli menfaatlerimizi koruyacak biçimde ele alıp yeniden düzenlemeyi zaruri görüyoruz" Ibid.

According to the MHP, which was the government party when the Customs Union Treaty was signed between Turkey and the EU, from this date onwards the EU has become an "unfair" party by blocking the required financial aid to Turkey. Besides, the EU enlargement was decided at the Luxembourg Summit in 1997; and the accession of eleven countries that had applied much later than Turkey was accepted. Therefore, the EU is a party "excluding Turkey from the process" and "discriminating" against Turkey, and "set[ting] it a secondary position which is not in the United Europe but keeps it along its trajectory."[23]

4.2 EU in MHP's Discourse after the Helsinki Summit

At the EU Summit that was held in Helsinki in December 1999, when the MHP was also a partner in the coalition government, the Union accepted Turkey's candidature. This development led to a period in which the government partner MHP's discourse on the EU was swayed toward different points and it resorted to new narratives. The MHP started to avoid explicitly highlighting the image of "enemy" while mentioning the EU. On the contrary, the EU (having accepted Turkey's candidature) turns out to be a subject "accepting gradually increasing international reputation and power of our country", "rediscovering its geopolitical and geoeconomic importance that was underestimated in the post Cold War period", and "needing Turkey for desired stability in the Caucasus, the Balkans and the Middle East".[24] Besides, the EU offers Turkey a "route map" which is "free from prejudices and additional conditions to a certain extent compared to the past". There exist not "impositions" but "disturbing" points related to some issues.[25] In a sense, the EU is portrayed as a party acknowledging its mistake and accepting the facts related to Turkey. However, the EU has still continued to be a 'suspicious' subject in the MHP's discourse, as it will be discussed.

---

[23] Devlet Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında Türkiye'nin AB Üyeliği ve Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi – Temel Yaklaşım Biçimimiz ve Görüşlerimiz* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, July 2002), 16-19.

[24] Devlet Bahçeli, "14 December 1999 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=14121999 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[25] Ibid.

It is pointed out that, new narratives were added to the MHP's discourse on the EU after 1999. In this period, the EU is "addressed as a party" from whom an "amicable" approach, "good will", "sincereness" and "tolerance" are expected. In the Assembly Group Meeting held in June 29ᵗʰ, 2000, Bahçeli expressed that the relation with the EU was not a simple interest relationship but rather "a strategic and economic association" [cultural association was not mentioned –ŞK]. In the same speech, he emphasized the necessity of "prevalence of an amicable approach protecting the balance of boon - burden". Bahçeli states that, it is wrong "to expect steps to be taken by one side in an atmosphere where there is a need to meet the statement 'Turkey needs Europe, Europe needs Turkey'", and that "this would be unsuitable with the *principles of amity* and *equity*" [emphasis added].

It can also be observed that the EU is sometimes mentioned as a community involving European countries that should be caught up:

> Our country doesn't ask for much from the European Union Administration. Turkey expects the Union Administration to pursue a convincing membership policy, which is based on *good will*[26] [emphasis added].
>
> …
>
> …the physical and human resources need to be improved in order to be able to catch up with the countries in the European Union of which we aim to be a member, and to be able to cope with the difficulties of the 21ˢᵗ century.[27]

In another speech, Bahçeli states again that there is a need for "the good will, sincereness and mutual collaboration of our European addressees" in the EU

---

process.[28] Besides, the EU is a community composed of countries which shouldn't underestimate Turkey's sensitivities.[29]

In the MHP's narration, the EU transpires as a subject whose "ulterior motive" becomes apparent from time to time although an "amicable" approach, "good will", "sincereness", "tolerance" and "showing its degree of sincereness" were expected from it. The EU is characterized like this quite often:

> In the days following the 8th of November [November 8th, 2000 Accession Partnership Document], assessments and comments made on almost every sensitive issue of Turkey showed not only the confusion of the European Union Administration but also the fact that it is *not freed from ulterior motives*[30] [emphasis added].

The emphasis on the EU's 'being not freed from' ulterior motive can be said to imply that the roots of this ulterior motive date back to the past; that is, the current ulterior motive is a continuation of the previous ones. It can also be said that, the "stalling attitude", which is another characteristic attributed to the EU in the MHP's discourse, is perceived in a continuity. While expressing his opinions on the issue of ethnic identity that had appeared in the Accession Partnership Document on November 8th, 2000, Bahçeli pointed out that the continuing *stalling tactics* and *double standarded approaches* were by no means *amicable* and understandable for Turkey.[31] [emphasis added] The EU, which has the ulterior motive in question and mentioned negativities in the context of the discourse constituting the subject matter, also has an approach towards Turkey which throws justice to the wind and blocks Turkey's way. Bahçeli draws attention to the Accession Partnership

---

28 Devlet Bahçeli. 5 December 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05122000 (accessed July 1, 2007).

29 Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

30 "8 Kasım tarihini takip eden günlerde [8 Kasım 200 Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi] Türkiye'nin hassas olduğu hemen her konuda yapılan değerlendirme ve açıklamalar, Avrupa Birliği yönetiminin sadece kafa karışıklığını değil, *art niyetlerden kurtulamadığını* göstermiştir." "Devlet Bahçeli'nin 28 Kasım 2000 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", in *Siyasette İlke Ekonomide Kararlılık* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi), 94.

31 Ibid

Document declared on November 8th, 2000 as an example of the EU's "one sided and unjust" approach. He expresses that the Union sets de facto barriers as Turkey efforts honestly to join the Union. Additionally, it confronts Turkey with an evident injustice in the process of shaping of some issues that are also related to Turkey[32]

> ..for us, there is not any coherent and moral explanation of first sending invitation for accession of Turkey to the European Union, and then trying to lay mines on this way. Because it is impossible to explain in another way the prejudiced and one sided decisions made in the days following the 8th of November.[33]

The EU, having been enemized more explicitly in the 1970s, was portrayed more as a partner having some negative characteristics at the end of the 1990s and right at the beginning of the 2000s. A "complaining" tone is more dominant in the discourse that involves above mentioned negative characteristics often repeated in the speeches and texts. In this narrative, the EU's negative characteristics were presented in the form of defects such as "not being freed from prejudices" and "being confused" rather than hostility. Only MHP complains about the fact that Turkey's neighbours and allies, with whom it gets ready to form a historical and humanitarian association, sometimes "extend a friendly hand and other times want to overwhelm it with problems". Again only MHP considers this "puzzling".[34]

In this period, it can be occasionally encountered the placement of the EU in a very aggressive discourse through defining it as an "examining" and "patronizing" actor (this will be encountered very often in the following periods):

---

32 Devlet Bahçeli, "5 November 2000 MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

33 "..bizim açımızdan, Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne girişi için önce davetiye gönderilip daha sonra bu yolun üzerine mayınlar döşenmeye çalışılmasının hiçbir tutarlı ve ahlâki açıklaması yoktur. Çünkü, 8 Kasım'ı takip eden günlerde alınan önyargılı ve tek taraflı kararları başka türlü izah etmek imkânsızdır" "Devlet Bahçeli'nin 28 Kasım 2000 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", in *Siyasette İlke Ekonomide Kararlılık* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi), 94.

34 Devlet Bahçeli, "13 February 2001 TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2001/index.php?page=13022001 (accessed June 19, 2007).

Instead of the Union administrators, who had expressed that 'Turkey needs Europe, and Europe needs Turkey', an understanding trying to impose one sided and unacceptable conditions on our country started to be dominant.

....

…The European Parliament, which had rejected the claims of so-called Armenian genocide as recently as yesterday, has changed its mind all of a sudden and attempted to call Turkish nation and state to account. [35]

"Disappointment" is one of the prominent themes in the MHP's discourse on the EU. A crystallization of this theme of "disappointment" especially in the texts emerging right before the November 2002 elections can be observed:

Within the last two years, a great effort and labour have been spent to improve our relations with the EU. Unfortunately, all these cordial and *honest efforts* were not reciprocated in the same way by the European Union Administration. The European Union has continuously *undervalued* all the steps taken and refused by saying that things that are done are not sufficient. In other words, in spite of all these efforts, it wasn't possible to overcome *deep-rooted prejudices* formed against Turkey. The European Union didn't give up its *exclusionist and offending* attitudes that are not in accordance with the partnership law. Turkey has been continuously confronted with new demands and new impositions. Unfortunately, this is the hurtful truth that we face when we look at the last two years in our relations with the European Union. Turkey has been confronted with a treatment which it *didn't deserve* at all"[36] [emphasis in the original].

Thus, the EU is defined in the context of an emotional narrative. Within this narrative, it is portrayed as a subject, who is approached cordially but still/just as always who hasn't been freed from prejudices, has "undervalued" and "offended"

---

[35] Devlet Bahçeli, "5 November 2000 MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[36] Son iki yıl içinde AB ile ilişkilerimizin geliştirilmesi için yoğun bir çaba ve mesai harcanmıştır. Bütün bu iyi niyetli ve *samimi çabalar*, ne yazık ki Avrupa Birliği yönetiminden *aynı karşılığı* görmemiştir. Avrupa Birliği, atılan bütün adımları sürekli *küçümsemiş* ve yapılanların yeterli olmadığını söyleyerek sürekli ayak diremiştir. Diğer bir deyişle, bütün bu çabalara rağmen, Türkiye'ye karşı oluşan *köklü önyargıların* aşılması mümkün olamamıştır. Avrupa Birliği, ortaklık hukukuyla bağdaşmayan ayrımcı, *dışlayıcı ve incitici* tavırlarını terk etmemiştir. Türkiye'nin karşısına sürekli olarak yeni taleplerle ve yeni dayatmalarla çıkılmıştır. Avrupa Birliği ile ilişkilerimizin son iki yılına bakıldığında, karşımıza çıkan *acı* gerçek maalesef budur. Türkiye hiç *hak etmediği* bir muameleyle karşı karşıya bırakılmıştır." Devlet Bahçeli, 11 June 2002. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=11062002 (accessed June 19, 2007).

Turkey, and therefore caused a disappointment. Two functions of the theme of disappointment can be pointed out. First of all, this theme of disappointment indicates that, what is required was accomplished in the period when the MHP was a coalition partner. This means that, the party had no responsibility for the stagnation in the relations; and all the responsibility belongs to the EU, which couldn't get rid of its "ulterior motive". Secondly, the theme of disappointment can be said to mean a 'transition' within the process leading to the MHP's construction of a completely negative image of the EU in the future. Because the EU, disappointing and "offending" Turkey at the beginning, will gradually have an image as if it is deliberately working against Turkey.

4.3 EU in MHP's discourse after November 2002

It can be said that a discourse directed at a "complete enemization" of the EU was developed, whereas particularly following 1999; the EU had been constructed with both positive and negative characteristics discussed above. This holds true especially for the period after November 2002, when the MHP didn't have any seat in the parliament. One point should be highlighted here for avoiding a misunderstanding. As mentioned above, in the MHP's discourse, the EU was a "suspicious", "prejudiced", "inconsistent" and "patronizing" "party", "applying double standards" and "causing hesitation about its real motives" also before November 2002. After all, however, when considered together with the mentioned "complaining" tone, some moderation in the discourse can be seen. For example, Bahçeli could still have used the expression "our European associates" in July 2002.[37] However, in the MHP's texts by the year 2003, it can be observed that, the EU is constructed through an image of "enemy" in an unassailable manner.

As mentioned before the EU was perceived as the continuation of the Allied Powers in the 1970s. This time it is again identified with a historical enemy, who was fought with for a long while in the Ottoman/Turkish history and mind: Byzantine

---

[37] "Devlet Bahçeli'nin 28 Kasım 2000 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", in *Siyasette İlke Ekonomide Kararlılık* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2000).

Empire. In this perception, the EU is "the ones who want to realize the dreams of Byzantine Empire."[38]

The EU is a party "detecting and using the weaknesses of the government very well", having "demands that will demolish our national unity and belief system", causing unrepairable harms, "directing criticisms and offences to Turkish military and to our national sensitivities by means of its institutions and authorities", as well as never considering Turkey as a future partner "stalling and deceiving Turkish nation continuously", having a *special strategy* related to Turkey [emphasis in the original], intriguing against Turkey.[39] The EU, whose "hostility" is based on the history, and whose opposition against Turkey is almost considered natural, is also seen as an "opportunity wasted" in the hands of the government party.[40]

In the MHP's discourse, in addition to constructing EU as the enemy, there is also an increasing elaboration of the enemy's characteristics. The EU is a compelling and even "examining" formation that imposes conditions on Turkey. Furthermore, it has both transparent and ulterior motives; it wants Turkey "to pay a price", approaches Turkey with "double standards and exclusion", aims "to control Turkey", and wants "to conquer" Turkey.[41] In the booklet prepared after the acceptance of the Negotiating Framework Document on October 3rd, 2005, it is stated that the Document rendered some "traps" even more difficult with the hard conditions and impositions it involves. According to MHP, this document (and thus the EU) "imposes" on Turkey the abandonment of nation-state, Lausanne Agreement, the straits and the Cyprus issue; the acknowledgement of new minorities, the opening of clergy school, the acknowledgement of Armenian

---

[38] "Devlet Bahçeli'nin 7 Aralık 2003 İl-İlçe Başkanları Toplantısının Açılış Konuşması", in *AKP İktidarının Bir Yıllık İcraatı* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003). For online access: http://www.mhp.org.tr/dokumanlar/kitap/AKP_6_ay.pdf (accessed June 19, 2007).

[39] Devlet Bahçeli, *6. Ayında AKP İktidarı – Gelişmeler, Gerçekler, Uyarılar* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003), 7, 28, 29, 32. For online access: http://www.mhp.org.tr/dokumanlar/kitap/AKP_6_ay.pdf (accessed June 19, 2007).

[40] Ibid, 32.

[41] 2004, 2005 and 2006 EU Assessment Reports, Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi; "AKP'nin Teslimiyet Belgeleri – AB Türkiye İlerleme Raporu-Tavsiyeler" (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 6 October 2004).

genocide law, the recognition of the patriarch's ecumenical status, the abandonment of national foreign policy and national defence. This means that it leads Turkey to catastrophe and a "blind alley" (in collaboration with the country's government). It expects Turkey to enter into "a way whose end and length is uncertain", it orders that Turkey "meets the instructions in all the reports", it "*extracts compromises* from Turkey", and implies that "there is no return from these compromises". That is, it attempts directly at *Turkey's independence and its integrity*. While commenting on this document, the MHP lists the articles first of all, and then it lists the truths behind the articles; that is, in the booklet, it lists what the document had actually meant to say. If it is used the term as it is written in the booklet, the MHP lists the "essence" of the articles. According to MHP, the document covers the EU's demands from Turkey in the form of imperative sentences; and these imperative sentences show the real intentions of the document. Accordingly, the EU is portrayed as *bossing over* Turkey, threatening it by giving an account at the Hague Tribunal unless the instructions are carried out, presenting itself as the reference point to determine the limit of sovereignty, and having an *authoritarian* manner. According to this, the EU "dictates" Turkey to modify all its international agreements in favour of Europe, to accept second class partnership, double standards and Europe's visa requirements. According to the MHP, the EU intends to mean Turkey: "doom the villagers to hunger and migration", "don't have an imperfect service", "be ready to be inspected at any time", "inform me continuously, and let me know what you do", "get used to give an account", "I can control Turkey in any issue", "I set up the rules, and you can only obey them".[42] The EU perfectly aims to harm Turkey and to create "a separate consciousness of national allegiance in Turkey in the course of time". It is a formation which expects Turkey to change "the indivisible unitary structure of the country" in a radical manner."[43]

---

[42] "İşte AKP'nin Avrupa Birliği Yol Haritası – Çıkmaz Sokak" (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi-AR-GE, 2006).

[43] "2005 Yılı İlerleme Raporu ve Katılım Ortaklığı Belgeleri Siyasi Kriterler Çerçevesinde: Talep ve Dayatmalar-AB'nin Türkiye Hakkında Dikkat Çeken Tespitleri"   (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi AR-GE,   November   2005).   For   online   access:

In the MHP's assessment report about the 2006 Turkey Progress Report and Strategy Document released by the EU on the 8th of November, the EU appears as "an imaginary goal" and a "lie"[44] In the same text, it is stated that the EU's "exclusionist perspective was observed not to change" once again.

The EU "wants to make it free to insult Turkishness, Turkish state and Turkish nation"; and it is among the "circle" who consider "defamation and prejudgment of Turkey's glorious history, despisal and contempt against Turkish nation, and insulation to Turkey's national and moral values" "as crucial as air and water". Therefore it is not only the enemy. As can be understood from the expressions above, besides being the enemy, the EU also appears as a "master" in the MHP's discourse. The EU is entirely defined as a *commanding authorit***y**, who writes "prescriptions" for some of Turkey's domestic affairs; and more than this, it gives "homework."[45] The EU is "one of the foreign mentors of separatism in Turkey"[46]; and it tries to place its impositions between the lines of new Constitution text, which began to be discussed before the public in Turkey. Therefore, it carries out "a sneaky operation."[47]

As can be seen, up to this day, the EU is perceived through various characterizations in the MHP's discourse. In the 1970s, it is perceived as an economic structure. In this period, if it was taken as a cultural unity, its corrupting influence was feared from. In the year 1991, following the dissolution of Soviet Russia, the MHP hoped to be influential in the Turkic Republics but it was

http://www.mhp.org.tr/raporlar/avrupabirligi/2005ilerlemedegerlendirmemhp.pdf (accessed June 19, 2007).

[44] "2006 Yılı İlerleme Raporu ve Strateji Belgesi Siyasi Kriterler Çerçevesinde: Talep ve Dayatmalar- AB'nin Türkiye Hakkında Olumsuz Tespitleri ve Beklentileri" (Ankara: MHP AR-GE, 2006). For online access: http://www.mhp.org.tr/raporlar/abrapor.php (accessed July 21, 2007).

[45] Ibid.

[46] Devlet Bahçeli, "20 November 2007 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=20112007 (accessed December 12, 2007).

[47] Devlet Bahçeli, "2 October 2007 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=02102007 (accessed December 12, 2007).

disappointed in terms of this goal.[48] It emphasized that Turkey was not yet ready for the Customs Union Treaty signed in 1995. Therefore, it demanded presentation of the decision to the public opinion; and besides, suggested the establishment of a "Turkish Common Market" as an alternative.[49] However, this is not an opposition in terms of principles. Integration with the EU after the establishment of Turkish Common Market is approached in a positive manner. Türkeş expressed that Turkey should be close to the EU, as it is a centre where decisions that are closely related to Turkey are made.[50] This occasional closeness towards the EU has given rise to variations in the MHP's discourse on the EU. As stated, in the year 1999, one could observe some moderate and positive characteristics in the EU discourse of the MHP, which was a coalition government partner at the time. Or rather it can be said that, although the EU is mentioned negatively to a large extent despite the moderation; this negativity has a different 'degree' and 'tone'. A completely negative construction of the EU as an enemy in the MHP's discourse has been crystallized to a sensible degree following the November 2002 elections. In this period, the highly increasing negativity predominating over the whole discourse can be observed. In the current situation, the EU in the MHP's discourse is an enemy-subject, who aims at against the independent presence of Turkey, plans this consciously and makes it happen step by step. Bora and Can[51] point out that, a powerful perception of threat and related concern of survival takes an important place in the identity construction of Turkish nationalism and in the creation of excitement/enthusiasm. They state that, this understanding brings different 'enemies' of Turkey to the forefront in different periods; and they also express, Turkish nationalism involves a conception that, despite being an official ally and pretending 'to be benevolent', the West doesn't want Turkey's growing stronger, and it pursues an eternal strategic plan directed to divide and disintegrate Turkey, and to expel it from Anatolia if possible. The Turkish History Thesis and the Sun Language Theory can be seen as the texts affirming the interpretation in question.

---

[48] Bora & Can. *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh,* part 11; Bora & - Can, *Devlet ve Kuzgun*, part 9.

[49] *AB-GB ve Türkiye* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 1995).

[50] Bora & Can, *Devlet ve Kuzgun*, 197-198.

[51] Ibid, 84.

It should be noted that, whether the MHP is against or for the Turkey's accession to the EU is not questioned here. It is neither questioned its points of objection. Of course, it cannot be merely talked about confusion in terms of the MHP's convergence to and divergence from the EU. It should be stated that, intricate dynamics of the domestic policy play an important role in the MHP's approach towards the EU, and in the variation of this approach in the course of time. What wanted to do in this chapter is to deal with how the EU was characterized in the MHP's discourse regardless of MHP's being against or for the EU. We try to see what kind of a discourse was formed related to the EU. The concepts that have been used while discussing the EU and the type of subject identity attributed to it are tried to be understood. Because comprehending this point is meaningful in terms of tracing the footprints of Ottoman/Turkish perception of the West in the context of the EU. Besides, analysing how the EU is constructed in the MHP's discourse helps us see the MHP's possible points of objection to the Turkey's accession process, and its possible points of emphasis as well as how it will construct its objection narrative.

CHAPTER 5

CONTESTED NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE AS A RESULT OF THE EU INTEGRATION PROCESS

I have mentioned that the approach of MHP towards EU and the way it constructs EU in its discourse varies both in time and also in the same time period. While MHP in the 1990s was leaving the marginal language and assuming[1] a more moderate outlook, there was occurred breaks in its approach towards EU. As it is touched upon in previous chapters, in the 1970s in the MHP's narration membership to EU was expressed as "slavery". However, in the 1990s, it began to mention that it should stand close to EU due to strategic reasons. In general, it is indicated that EU is constructed as an enemy-subject. Nevertheless, it is emphasized that the existence of some diversities of the party's language towards EU. The mentioned diversities and breaks were intensified in 1999, (in accordance with the decisions taken after Helsinki Summit) when the party was in power has been said Consequently, according to this more positive discourse, EU was the subject who understands its mistakes in the past and from whom an amicable attitude is expected. The similarities of the swinging regarding its perceptions of EU in the MHP's discourse are seen in its perception of 'EU-Turkey' relationship and in its characterization of this relationship. At the end of the 1960s Türkeş stated that the relationship of Turkey and West was a relationship of the one who copied and the one whom was copied[2], which means that the passive position of Turkey has been emphasized. Indeed, as it will be seen, on the one hand the way that MHP characterizes the Turkey-EU relations in its discourse changes. On the other hand, the expressions as regards Turkey's position in this picture change. Therefore

---

[1] Arslan, "Faşizmin Siyaseti…", 299-322.

[2] Abdi İpekçi, *Liderler Diyor ki* (İstanbul: Ant Yayınları, 1969), 291-312.

handling the perception regarding the nature and history of relationship would also clarify the way of the construction of Turkey. What intend to do in this chapter is fundamentally dwelling upon two points: firstly, briefly and in general terms, describe how MHP constructs Turkey-EU relation in its language. Secondly, in context of this relation, as what kind of a subject Turkey takes place in this narration. In this respect it should be indicated that while examining the characterization of Turkey in these relations it will be set out the formation of Turkey as an independent state and the analysis will be made by taking into account the subject matters of "national sovereignty", "nation-state structure" and "territorial integrity".

As mentioned in the second chapter, MHP which stressed opposition to the West throughout the 1970s, adopted a rhetoric of opposition to the West (or USA and Western imperialism)[3] also in the 1980s.This point of view would be seen clearly in the expressions which came into prominence in the local elections of 1989. MHP "especially by setting out the issue of entering European Community which was in agenda, discoursed the target of 'protecting the national and moral identity' against Westernization".[4] As it is mentioned before, the changes of MHP's rhetoric in the 1990s will not be detailed but will be recalled.

The year 1999 signifies a quite critical year in the MHP's perception of EU-Turkey relations. It is possible to see this situation in Bahçeli's speech of 2002 evaluating the historical course of the relations. According to Bahçeli, in the period from 1959 to the 2000s, the *relations followed a course with ups and downs*, ceased periodically and by passing the *tough periods* it has been arrived to the beginning of the 2000s when Turkey's candidate status was accepted"[5] [emphasis added]:

---

[3] Bora & Can, *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh,* 48-49.

[4] Ibid, 438.

[5] "*ilişkiler inişli ve çıkışlı bir seyir* izlemiş, dönemsel olarak kesintiye uğramış ve *güç dönemlerden* geçilerek Türkiye'nin adaylık statüsünün kabul edildiği 2000'li yılların başlarına gelinmiştir". Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 14-21.

Turkey applied to membership to strengthen the bonds with the Western world with which it shares common ideals and values. In this process, a series of *disappointment and distressed periods* have been faced. [This application of Turkey was rejected in 1989]. …in between 1990-1995, Turkey-EC relations experienced a *stagnant period*. In the year 1995, in which the Customs Union between Turkey and European Community was established, the conditions were as such. Turkey has been the sole country who joined the Customs Union before being a member of EU. Besides, it did this without taking any financial support from European Community and by making *sacrifices* from its own resources. … Although Turkey is one of the countries which have established partnership with European Economic Community initially, unfortunately this is the point where the relations between Turkey and the Community have come after 30 years … Also in the period after the Customs Union the Turkey-EU relations *could not be accelerated and the prejudiced attitude towards Turkey could not be overcome*. … In this period, the future of our relations was pushed to an *uneven and crisis* atmosphere under the shadow of Cyprus and Aegean mortgage imposed by Greece with its blackmail policy to EU…. [With December, 1997 Luxembourg Summit] a secondary status which is *not inside the united Europe but on the orbit of EU* was given to Turkey having a 35-year-partnership with EU and lastly joined to Customs Union. … Even the development of relations in a limited structure within the framework of European strategy which is proposed to Turkey has been desired to be tied up to *some political preconditions that would break down Turkey's vital interest like Cyprus and Aegean and affect Turkey's state structure and social configuration*. … Turkey .. stop(ped) its political dialogue with EU[6] [emphasis added].

As is seen, the relations of Turkey and EU within the period from its beginning to 1997 Luxembourg Summit, are presented in a negative narration. Accordingly,

---

[6] "Türkiye ortak ideal ve değerleri paylaştığı Batı dünyası ile bağlarını daha da güçlendirmek için ortaklık başvurusunda bulunmuştur. Bu süreçte bir dizi *hayal kırıklığı ve sıkıntılı dönemler* yaşanmıştır. [Türkiye'nin bu başvurusu 1989'da reddedilmişti]. ... 90-95 yıllarında Türkiye-AT ilişkilerinde yeni bir *durgunluk dönemi* yaşanmıştır. Türkiye ile Avrupa Topluluğu arasında Gümrük Birliği'nin kurulduğu 1995 yılına bu şartlarda gelinmiştir. Türkiye AB üyesi olmadan Gümrük Birliği kuran tek ülke olmuştur. Üstelik bunu Avrupa Topluluğu'ndan mali yardım almadan kendi kaynaklarından *fedakarlık* ederek yapmıştır. ... Avrupa Ekonomik Topluluğu ile ilk ortaklık ilişkisi kuran ülkelerden biri olmasına rağmen Türkiye ile Topluluk arasındaki ilişkilerin aradan geçen 30 küsur yıl sonra geldiği nokta maalesef bu olmuştur. ... Gümrük Birliği sonrası dönemde de Türkiye Avrupa Birliği ilişkilerine *ivme kazandırılamamış, Türkiye'ye karşı önyargılı tutum aşılamamıştır*. ... Bu dönemde ilişkilerimizin geleceği, Yunanistan'ın şantaj siyasetiyle AB'ye kabul ettirdiği Kıbrıs ve Ege ipoteği gölgesinde bir *kriz* ve *belirsizlik* ortamına itilmiştir. .... [1997 Aralık Lüksemburg Zirvesi ile] AB ile 35 yıllık ortaklık ilişkisi bulunan ve son olarak Gümrük Birliği'ni gerçekleştiren Türkiye'ye birleşik Avrupa'nın içinde değil, *yörüngesinde kalmasını sağlayan tali bir konum biçilmiştir*. ... Türkiye için önerilen Avrupa stratejisi çerçevesinde ilişkilerin *sınırlı* bir yapı içinde geliştirilmesi bile, *Türkiye'nin devlet yapısını ve sosyal dokusunu etkileyecek ve Kıbrıs ve Ege gibi hayati çıkarlarını haleldar edecek siyasi nitelikli ön şartlara bağlanmak istenmiştir***. ...** Türkiye .. AB ile siyasi diyalogu kesmiştir." Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 14-21.

relations are "bumpy", "distressed" and full of "disappointment". "Stagnation", "unevenness" and "breaks" are the other features of this period. In this duration, a significant "acceleration" could not be brought in to the relations. Besides, Turkey is the party who makes sacrifices. It has been given a secondary position to Turkey on the EU's orbit. The negation in this narration, basically, serves to underline the progress which was emphasized to be realized in 1999. Indeed, according to telling of MHP, in the negative process; in 1999 a destiny change was realized. This turning point signifies "A New Period in Relations"[7].

> ["1999 Helsinki Summit and New Period in Relations"] in the EU Summit which was held in December 10-11, 1999 in Helsinki *the mistake made in Luxembourg was corrected* and the full candidacy of Turkey to EU was recorded. Thereby, in our relations which has a long and distresses history with European Union a new page has been opened and a new period has begun. …. At the end of 35-year efforts, by getting over all negative conditions on the way of Turkey's EU membership a new phase has begun. … With the aim of aligning with EU acquis and fulfilling the Copenhagen Criteria, the 57th government[8] prepared the National Programme scheduling its forward steps, on March 19th, 2001. The National Programme was accepted by coalition parties after a long preparation and assessment period.[9] [emphasis added]

The beginnings of the 2000s at the same time is the period that Bahçeli indicates that Turkey needs to take part in the global scale formations: Turkey should not close into itself, should not be outside the process of globalization; "Turkey should

---

[7] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 14-21.

[8] The 57th government was established with head of Bülent Ecevit who is general president of the *Demokratik Sol Parti/DSP* (Democratic Left Party) at the date of May 28, 1999. In the government DSP, MHP and *Anavatan Partisi/ANAP* (Motherland Party) took part. Devlet Bahçeli became the misiter of state and deputy prime minister. Thus, after twenty one years the MHP took part in the government http://www.belgenet.com/hukumet/57h.html (accessed October 13, 2007)

[9] "*1999 Helsinki Zirvesi ve İlişkilerde Yeni Dönem:* 10-11 Aralık 1999 tarihlerinde Helsinki'de yapılan AB Zirvesinde Lüksemburg'daki *hata düzeltilmiş* ve Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne tam üye adaylığı tescil edilmiştir. Böylece Avrupa Birliği ile uzun ve sıkıntılı bir geçmişi olan ilişkilerimizde *yeni bir sayfa açılmış,* *yeni bir döneme girilmiştir* ..... 35 yıl süren çabalar sonunda, Türkiye'nin AB üyeliği yolunda tüm olumsuz şartlar aşılarak bu yeni aşamaya gelinmiştir .... 57. Hükümet, AB müktesebatına uyum sağlamak ve Kopenhag Kriterleri'ni yerine getirmek amacıyla atacağı adımları bir takvime bağlayan Ulusal Programı 19 Mart 2001 tarihinde hazırlamıştır. Ulusal Program koalisyon partileri arasındaki uzun bir hazırlık ve değerlendirme süreci sonrasında kabul edilmiştir."

neither break off from West nor should be dependent to the West" [10] In this regard, the relations with EU is seen as a *tool* for Turkey to catch up with the global developments. It can be said that the relations is instrumentalized from another point also. Indeed, the relations established with EU shall enable that Turkey will activate its own potential in the existing cultural structures [11]. In such a definition of relation, it is seen that Turkey is positioned as an active subject. Forasmuch as in this relation Turkey is 'the country which will contribute to the world's transformation into an inhabitable place in all respects'.[12]

In this period, another point in the regard of MHP to EU-Turkey relations is remarkable. It is emphasized that the EU-Turkey relations will be carried out *alongside* Turkey's relations with Eastern geography. Bahçeli asserted that "Turkey's relations with EU would not prevent Turkey to develop relations with other countries" and indicated that "Turkey located at a point where Europe and Asia unite, will continue to develop its relations with the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle Asian Turkish Republics to which it is connected with historical, cultural and economic bonds."[13] In this emphasis, it can be said that there lies the concern of a party, who has built its rhetoric for a long time on the opposition to West/EU and approximation to Turkic Republics, trying not to frighten its base. In a sense, it is emphasized that MHP approves approximation to EU due to the reasons based on strategic-national interests, whereas the Party maintains its traditional line.

However, the 'affirmative' regard towards the structure of EU-Turkey relations in MHP's rhetoric is not prolonged. The negative atmosphere that is used for the period before Helsinki is ended up with the discourse of "A New Period". However, immediately from 2003 onwards, the rhetoric again acquired a negative character. In the process from that day to today, however, it is seen that the qualifications of

---

[10] "Türkiye ne Batı'dan kopmalıdır ne de Batı'ya mahkûm olmalıdır." Bahçeli, "TBMM'de 2000 Yılı Bütçe Görüşmelerinde…", 23.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

the negation have been diversified. The style regarding the character of the relations has increasingly hardened. Bahçeli emphasizes that the membership of EU that transformed to a state policy is not examined in every phase and the process cannot go beyond the "*one sided dependency relation*"[14]. In his evaluation about EU Progress Report that was declared in 2004, Bahçeli says: "The past of our relations with EU and the development process until now, actually, became *a disappointment story* for Turkey."[15] Besides, "the past of Turkey-EU relations exceeding 40 years, fundamentally, is the aggregate of *the disappointments*, *crisis* and *confidence crisis*." [16] Consequently, while the retroactive/historical evaluation of relations is made, actually a continuity and naturalness has been brought in to the negativeness.

As from the middle of the 2000s in the MHP's discourse it is emphasised in patches that EU-Turkey relation essentially is a "*dependency-satellite relation*"[17]**.** Besides, the relations are characterized as "*a very dangerous submission process*" ("**çok tehlikeli bir teslimiyet süreci**")[18] and as "*the story of inability and submission*" ("*aczin ve teslimiyetin hikâyesi*")[19] Moreover, it has been stated that the relations are transformed to "*deception-distraction process*" ("*aldatma-oyalama süreci***")** and even to "*buffoonery*" ("*maskaralık*")[20]. It is stated that in all these problems the relations do not have any future and it is emphasized that the relations have come

---

14 Devlet Bahçeli, *AKP İktidarının 90 Günü ve Son Gelişmeler* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003), 26.

15 "Bahçeli'nin 7 Ekim 2004 Tarihli Basın Açıklaması" in *MHP Haklı Çıkmıştır*, ed. Merzifonluoğlu, Davut (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2004)*,* 46.

16 Devlet Bahçeli, "15 December 2006 AB Zirve Kararları Sonrası Türkiye-AB İlişkilerinde Gelinen Nokta Hakkındaki Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=15122006 (accessed July 13, 2007)

17 "İşte AKP'nin…", 3, 41.

18 Devlet Bahçeli, "8 December 2006 Avrupa Birliği ile Kıbrıs Pazarlığı Hakkındaki Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=08122006 (accessed June 24, 2007).

19 Devlet Bahçeli, "15 December 2006 AB Zirve Kararları Sonrası Türkiye-AB İlişkilerinde Gelinen Nokta Hakkındaki Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=15122006 (accessed June 24, 2007).

20 Ibid.

up to a 'turnout/ junction[21]. Bahçeli, in is speech evaluating the decisions taken in the European Union Foreign Affairs Ministers Council Meeting held on December 11, 2006 and the Summit Meeting held on December 14-15, clearly made an emphasis of stagnation: "… The results of the Council Meetings have abolished the virtual ground of relations between Turkey and European Union and *announced the persistent vegetative state before biological dead*." [22] As it is seen, the EU-Turkey relations that are characterized with various features in MHP's rhetoric are based upon "an end":

> .. It is understood better with each passing day that Turkey and the European Union relations do not have any future. *The virtual negotiation process*, in which the full membership is not the ultimate end anymore, does not carry any meaning more than an instrument to save the appearance for both sides. The attitude of European Union in December 2007 Portugal Summit has showed that *the unhealthy structure of the relations has turned out to be necrosis*. It has been recorded by the decisions of the Summit that the period which is choked up with impositions related to Cyprus entered into vegetative state that cannot be revitalized by even artificial respiration[23] [emphasis added].

Thus, in the relations which came to a deadlock "destiny moment that everyone will face the realities has come" and "the inevitable point of break has been seen on the horizon."[24]

The evolution in the characterization of EU-Turkey relations on the one hand correspond to the evolution of the characterization of Turkey. As it is seen above, in the discourses where the relations are affirmed, an active subject identity has been

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] "...Konsey toplantıları sonuçları, Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği arasındaki ilişkilerin sanal zeminini de ortadan kaldırmış ve *biyolojik ölüm öncesi bitkisel hayat dönemini ilan etmiştir*." Ibid.

[23] ..Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği ilişkilerinin geleceği olmadığı her geçen gün daha iyi anlaşılmaktadır. Tam üyeliğin nihai hedef olmaktan çıkarıldığı *sanal müzakere süreci*, her iki taraf için de görüntüyü kurtarmak amacına hizmet eden bir vasıta olmaktan öte bir anlam taşımamaktadır. Avrupa Birliği'nin Aralık 2007 Portekiz zirvesinde ortaya koyduğu tutum, *ilişkilerin hastalıklı yapısının kangrene dönüştüğünü göstermiştir*. Kıbrıs dayatmaları nedeniyle tıkanan sürecin *suni teneffüsle de canlandırılamayacak şekilde bitkisel hayata girdiği* zirve kararlarıyla tescil edilmiştir." Devlet Bahçeli, "25 December 2007 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25122007 (accessed December 29, 2007).

[24] "2006 Yılı İlerleme Raporu…"

attributed to Turkey. In the emphases pointing out that the relations change structurally (dependency-satellite) it is seen that Turkey increasingly becomes passive. Arslan indicates that ultra-nationalisms[25] see history as the struggle of nations. According to Bora and Can in the foundation of fascism[26] there is an understanding which makes inequality absolute and sees it as natural-divine law. Accordingly, among people, there exists quality and merit differences from genesis. Among races and nations there are degrees of superiority coming from genesis and history. According to this view, "...a nation which is rendered as the owner of the merits coming from genesis, and the race (namely 'our nation, our race') which become the most powerful....mean that 'goodness' would master the world" [27] Türkeş says in his statement, in the *Case of Racism, Turanism (Irkçılık Turancılık Davası)* [28] in 1944 "... I have faith in that Turkish nation has a unique genesis on the earth and in heroism there is no more ascendant nation than this nation."[29] The understanding that Turkey/Turkish people have superior features is one of the critical/fundamental themes in the MHP's rhetoric. In 1970, Türkeş stressed the same point in one of his speeches published in a journal: "Our opinion on the subject that theTurkish nation is a race who raises great talents, is based on a robust and deep-rooted belief....Among the nations living on earth Turkish nation is the one whose future is the most brilliant. Because we possess a glorious and honorable

---

[25] Arslan in his article where he examines MHP, prefers to use "ultra-nationalism" as an equivalent term for the party's ideology. As it is indicated at the first chapter of our study, there has been a considerable conceptual diversity in nationalism literature. Arslan, Emre "Faşizmin Siyaseti..", 300.

[26] Bora & Can (*Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh*) too in their study upon MHP emphasized the elements belong to Fascism in the ideological ground of Party. They express their ideas indicated above again in the context of MHP. So, it is the reason why the quotation is taken here although it mentions about a feature of "fascism".

[27] Bora & Can. *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh,* 20-21.

[28] *Irkçılık Turancılık Davası* started officially at May 18, 1944. The case began with a government decree. With the order of Istanbul Martial Law Commander more than forty people were taken into custody and twenty three people were tried. Among the people who were tried, there was Alparslan Turkes too. Those people were tried with the accusation of spreading a destructive ideology and establishing an organization for this. The case finished at May 31, 1947. Türkeş, was sent up to 9 months 10 days. However, his duration in prison taken into account and he was evacuated. Later the decision was appealed by Military Supreme Court and Turkes was acquitted. See Özdoğan, *"Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a,* 89-105.

[29] "..ben Türk milletinin yeryüzünde eşsiz bir yaradılışa sahip olduğuna ve kahramanlıkta bu milletten üstün bir millet bulunmadığına iman ediyorum" "3 Mayıs Türkçüler Günü Antolojisi". (Ankara: Türkiye Milliyetçiler Birliği Ankara Ocağı Yayınları, Öğretmenler Matbaası, 1967), 55-59.

history which will give us enthusiasm and speed." [30] Moreover, Türkeş associates such an understanding with Turkey's continuation. Thus, "the reason why we want to develop the Turkish nation, to give the idea of greatness to Turkish nation and that Turkish nation shows activity with the mentality of greatness, is to guarantee the *livelihood* of Turkish nation" [31] [emphasis added]. In the 1989 party program of MHP (in that period Nationalist Work Party) the main target is expressed as follows: "to make our nation one of the mighty, creditable, developed and pioneer nations of the age, to make our nation eternal in the stage of history." [32] In July 1990 the Head Office of MHP/MÇP (Milliyetçi Çalışma Partisi – Nationalist Work Party, by then) prepared a report. In the mentioned report it is asserted that the fact that "the world history is the struggle of nations" has proven and the principle of "the right belongs to rightful" has abandoned its place to the principle "the right belongs to powerful". [33] As is seen, to be superior among nations is perceived as the requirement of world order and a vital point.

In the narration of the MHP, the relations with EU are handled in the framework of the 'situation that Turkey falls into/or is thrown into'. The emphasis of the superior and advanced country in the perception of MHP and its telling regarding Turkey's position in its relation with EU expose a tension. In the language of the MHP, in general, along the relation with EU, Turkey is discussed as dupe, detained, and be wronged and subject to the double standard.

However, the transition from 1999 to 2000 has prepared a suitable ground for MHP's narration concerning Turkey who would become the "leader country". The

---

[30] "Türk milletinin büyük kabiliyetler yetiştiren bir soy olduğu hususundaki kanaatimiz sağlam ve köklü bir inanca dayanmaktadır. ….. Yeryüzünde yaşayan milletler arasında geleceği en parlak olan Türk milletidir. Çünkü bize şevk ve hız verecek şanlı şerefli bir tarihe malikiz." Nalbantoğlu, M., *Alparslan Türkeş ile,* 53, 54.

[31] "Türk milletini büyütmek, Türk milletine büyük olma düşüncesini vermek ve Türk milletinin büyük olma zihniyetiyle faaliyet göstermesini istememizin sebebi, Türk milletinin *yaşamasını* teminat altına almaktır". "Alparslan Türkeş ile Kıbrıs Konusunda Bir konuşma", *Devlet*, 5 August 1974, no: 248, quoted from: Nalbantoğlu, M. *Alparslan Türkeş ile…,* 73-74.

[32] "Milletimizi çağın kudretli, itibarlı, gelişmiş ve önder toplumlarından yapmak, devlet ve milletimizi tarih sahnesinde ebedi kılmak." "1989 MÇP Parti Programı".

[33] "Dünyada Yeni Dengeler, Türk Dünyasının ve Türkiye'nin Meseleleri" (Ankara: MÇP Genel Merkezi, 1990).

year 2000 is characterized as the "closure of an age" [34], "a historical turning point, the beginning of a new era and an era change" [35] In his speech of May 3, 1999 Bahçeli says "while living the last months of the 20th century, while world is getting prepared for a new age, it is obvious that Turkey needs renovating in many aspects." [36]. Again, he emphasizes that a new start to the 21st century should be made. [37] Bahçeli places the expectation concerning Turkey's situation from 21st century into a perspective as follows: Turkey could not be developed in the last two centuries and had the heavy problems of underdevelopment. Turkish nation could not catch up with the industrial age and could not maintain one of the biggest empires of the world. However, at the end of the 20th century some efforts towards social and economic changes are seen. These renewal efforts are of great importance. Turkish nation which could not catch up with the industrial age, will find its place that it deserves again by fulfilling the requirements of new age[39]:

> We are in the necessity of understanding this new age which is named as 'information age' and 'informatics age' that began before 20th century ends before everything and everyone. If we cannot grasp the understanding of science and the mentality of the age we may be obliged to live outside this new age just like how we lost the industrial age… while entering a new age Turkey needs to prepare itself to the international developments of the world, to the new events and processes emerging in global scale as well as the social and economic problems.[38]

---

34 Bahçeli, "TBMM'de 2000 Yılı Bütçe Görüşmelerinde…"

35 Devlet Bahçeli, "Yeni Yıl Mesajı", in *Yeniçağın Eşiğinde Türkiye ve Dünya* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2000).

36 "20. yüzyılın son aylarını yaşarken, dünya yeni bir çağa hazırlanırken, Türkiye'nin birçok açıdan yenilenmeye ihtiyacı olduğu açıktır" Devlet Bahçeli, 3 May 1999. "Milliyetçiler Günü Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=03051999 (accessed November 19, 2007).

37 Devlet Bahçeli, 11 May 1999. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları* (Ankara: MHP), 48.

38 "20. yüzyıl bitmeden başlayan ve 'bilgi çağı' ve 'enformatik çağ' diye adlandırılan bu yeni dönemi her şeyden ve herkesten önce anlamak ve kavramak zorunluluğu içindeyiz. Çağın bilim anlayışını ve zihniyet dünyasını kavrayamazsak endüstri çağını kaybettiğimiz gibi, bu yeni çağın da dışında yaşamak durumunda kalabiliriz.... Yeni bir yüzyıla girerken sosyal ve ekonomik sorunların yanında Türkiye'nin dünyada yaşanan uluslar arası gelişmeleri, küresel ölçekte ortaya çıkan yeni olay ve süreçlere de kendisini hazırlaması lazımdır." Devlet Bahçeli, "2000 Yılı Vesilesiyle Milliyet Gazetesi'nde Yayımlanan Değerlendirme Yazısı", in *Yeniçağın Eşiğinde Türkiye ve Dünya* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2000), 56.

Bahçeli indicates that Turkey "is of the power to reproduce the historical and cultural dynamics and to achieve social and economic transformations at the beginning of a new age"[39]. In these narrations Turkey emerges as a country that takes its power from its history and will carry this power to the new age. Bahçeli states that the MHP's target of *being leader country* is "to construct a *strong and active* Turkey that has been opened to the world by protecting its national identity and honour"[40]. Besides, he indicates that their target "as MHP, is to compromise by protecting the diversities in politics, to reach the level of modern industrial nations in economy, briefly to say, to carry Turkey to a level in line with its historical accumulation and its economic and cultural potential in the new age." [41]. And at the same time the ideal of being leader country is stated as "one of the strategic targets" that Turkey needs to reach.[42] This ideal is associated with "the shining of Turkey, the 21st century's leader country, in the Eurasian geography."[43] Besides, Turkey is a country in front of which there lies a new century, a new period and future and which cannot tolerate anything that would block it. [44] In all this narration Turkey is presented as a country which "does not need West" when it is thought within the framework of relations with the West:

> Today, the point that Turkey has come in its relations with the West signifies a situation that cannot be underestimated. It should not be forgotten that if Turkey had not borne a potential of development and dynamism, if Turkish-Islamic geography had not had accumulation and mission of development, it would not have been possible to talk about the importance that West would give to Turkey in today's sense. Above all,

---

[39] Devlet Bahçeli, "Yeni Yıl Mesajı", in *Yeniçağın Eşiğinde Türkiye ve Dünya* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2000).

[40] Devlet Bahçeli, 1 May 1999. "Sürmeli Oteli MKK, MYK ve Milletvekilleri Toplantısı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=01051999 (accessed August 2, 2007).

[41] Devlet Bahçeli, 23 May 1999. "TBMM Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları*, (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi), 75.

[42] Bahçeli, "Yeni Yıl Mesajı".

[43] Devlet Bahçeli, 3 May 1999. "Milliyetçiler Günü Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=03051999 (accessed November 19, 2007.

[44] Bahçeli, "2000 Yılı Vesilesiyle…"

West is a field of cooperation and development for our country. It is neither an obligation, nor source of fear, nor a factor that would remove the other possibilities of cooperation and development. [45]

If turned back to the context of EU, the Helsinki Summit held in December 1999, points out an explicit progress in the position of Turkey in MHP's discourse. Thus, Bahçeli, in this summit, states that Turkey is accepted as a candidate of EU with unanimity and *under the same conditions with the other candidate countries*.[46] Besides, he indicates that Turkey, like other candidate countries, will benefit from the Community programmes and will be incorporated to the meetings that will be held between the European Union and the other candidate countries. Bahçeli, in the continuation of his speech, emphasizes that other than Copenhagen Criteria there is no other official precondition for Turkey's candidacy. Thus, MHP wants to underline that the ideal of being leader country will not be damaged by Turkey's candidature to EU. In other words, the MHP suggests that 'to be ascendant nation' which is the one of the most important components of the MHP's rhetoric, does not represent a contradiction with Turkey's candidacy to EU in the period when it is a part of the coalition government. In one of his speeches in May, 1999, Bahçeli expressed that he found the question of whether the MHP had changed meaningless: "like every living organism, our party too, produces new answers and solutions to new questions, to new demands and follows developments in the world closely." [47] While the MHP indicates that it is in line with the developments required by the new age, it also emphasizes that it has not drawn apart from the traditional goals: "our love for our country and nation which feeds, shapes and creates our nationalism; our understanding of protecting our national culture and

---

[45] "Bugün, Türkiye'nin Batı ile ilişkilerinde geldiği nokta küçümsenemeyecek bir durumu ifade etmektedir. Şurası unutulmamalıdır ki, Türkiye bir büyüme potansiyeli ve dinamizmi taşımasaydı, Türk-İslâm coğrafyası gelişme birikimine ve misyonuna sahip olmasaydı, Türkiye'ye Batı'nın vereceği önemden söz etmek bugünkü anlamıyla pek mümkün olmayabilirdi. Ülkemiz için Batı, her şeyden önce bir işbirliği ve gelişme sahasıdır. Ne bir mecburiyet, ne korku kaynağı, ne de diğer iş birliği ve gelişme imkânlarını ortadan kaldıracak bir faktördür." Bahçeli, "2000 Yılı Vesilesiyle..."

[46] Bahçeli, "TBMM'de 2000 Yılı Bütçe Görüşmelerinde…"

[47] "her canlı organizma gibi partimiz de yeni ihtiyaçlara, yeni sorunlara, yeni cevaplar ve çözümler üretmekte, dünyadaki gelişmeleri yakından takip etmektedir." Devlet Bahçeli, 1 May 1999. "Sürmeli Oteli MKK, MYK ve Milletvekilleri Toplantısı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=01051999 (accessed August 2, 2007.

values; *our target to become an effective and esteemed country* in the world have not changed." [48] [emphasis added].

As is indicated above, in MHP's discourse the 1999 Helsinki Summit was presented as a new period in the relations. In terms of Turkey's status, it was a turn that enables the country to be under equal conditions with the others in its relations with EU. When the two mentioned cases are considered with the emphasis made upon the 21st century, it may be said that: the MHP stresses a coincidence between the beginning of 21st century and new phase with the relation of EU, Turkey's active position and the MHP's partnership in the government.

However, in the rhetoric of the MHP, the construction of Turkey in its relations with EU, the emphasis began to become more explicit and detailed in the concept of "independence and sovereignty" in time. As mentioned before, the trans-national formations are the structures that create uneasiness in the nationalist approaches. Especially, the narrowing of the sovereignty fields of the nation-state and the binding nature of the trans-nations cause resistance to such structures. And also, in the MHP's rhetoric, Turkey is presented as the subject losing its independence in this process of relations. However, this narration of the MHP contains the trouble of 'an honour concern' rather than a fear of authority delegation. In other words, each and every point limiting the national sovereignty is presented as an honour problem in an emotional manner. Besides, what is emphasized in the Party's narration is not Turkey which is bound with trans-national laws. But a country which is face to face with an existence-nonexistence problem. Especially with the year 2003, the seriousness of the Turkey's status in its relations with EU is begun to be presented obviously. In the MHP's rhetoric Turkey which has entered to a new age with resurrection, renewal and with the idea of being leader country, has become the country whose sovereignty was weakened in its relations with EU. Indeed Bahçeli expresses that "our achievements obtained as a result of struggles for years in the

---

[48] "[M]lliyetçiliğimizi besleyen, şekillendiren ve var eden vatan ve millet sevgimiz, milli kültürümüzü ve değerlerimizi koruma anlayışımız, dünyada *etkin ve saygın bir ülke olma hedefimiz* değişmemiştir." Ibid.

foreign policy and our national policies were desisted in a trice".[49] At the continuation of his speech he expresses that the government has made all sort of concessions and **"***made Turkish Grand National Assembly worked as if an EU notary***"**. In an analogous context, Bahçeli says that "the greatest power and might is the determination, belief and will of our valuable nation to determine and govern its own future"[50]

The MHP emphasizes that Turkey will become a country whose initiative in deciding its interior and foreign policies is restricted with the harmonisation with the EU policies. Especially with the Negotiation Framework which was accepted in October 3, 2005 "Turkey's rights and decisions in international institutions were mortgaged. In this way, Turkey's foreign policy is tied to the EU decisions…. Turkey's initiative to define policies and attitudes that are appropriate to its benefit is constrained." [51] Besides, Turkey will lose its military intervention and guarantor right over Cyprus. The fundamental principles of EU, not of Turkey, have already become dominant in the solution of the problem with the intervention of the UN and EU has gained strength. [52] Moreover, Turkey will lose its strength within the NATO concerning the decisions to be taken appropriate to its benefits. It will be unsuccessful to prevent the Cypriot Greeks to enter NATO.

The MHP underlines that Turkey not only in its foreign policies but also in some fields inside its borders will incur sovereignty losses. According to Bahçeli, again with the October 3, 2005 Negotiation Framework, the right entitled to Turkey with

---

[49] Devlet Bahçeli, 2003. "7 Aralık 2003 İl-İlçe Başkanları Toplantısının Açılış Konuşması", in *AKP İktidarının Bir Yıllık İcraatı*, Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi.

[50] "[E]n büyük güç ve kudret aziz miletimizin kendi geleceğini belirleme ve yönetme, azim, inanç ve iradesidir." Devlet Bahçeli, 15 April 2007. " 6. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı-Kayseri konuşması" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15042007 (accessed November 13, 2007).

[51] "Türkiye'nin içinde bulunduğu uluslararası kuruluşlardaki haklarına ve kararlarına ipotek konulmaktadır. Böylece Türkiye'nin dış politikası AB'nin kararlarına bağlanmaktadır …. Türkiye'nin kendi menfaatine uygun politika ve tutum belirlemesi inisiyatifi sınırlandırılmaktadır." "İşte AKP'nin…", 12.

[52] Ibid, 10

Montreux Treaty[53] (July 20, 1923) over Bosphorus will be able to be invalidated. Thus, "there will emerge circumstances that are against our 'benefits' by annihilation of Turkey's control and inspection rights." [54] Besides, "the sovereignty of Turkey over usage of nuclear technology will also come to an end."[55] "Some particular arrangements will be made for Turkey, permanent restrictions will be actualized in the fields like structural policies and agriculture." [56] At the same time Turkey will abandon its national currency and accept Euro as national currency." [57]

According to the MHP, Turkey emerging from EU Parliament decisions in various dates, EU Commission recommendations, Negotiation Framework document and assessments of progress reports is a country which does not possess control in its hands, which is ineffective and passive, which lost its all sovereignty rights, became slave and cannot defend its national interests. Besides, it is a country which is under the continuous control of EU inspectors and which is tried to be kept down and a country that is inspected in the process. Moreover, it is stated that Turkey will be a country which fulfils its duty to EU perfectly, gives an account of everything and a country which is demanded to inform EU continuously. The other points that MHP emphasises are as follows: EU will define the progress and the end of negotiations. The progress of process and the degree of concession will always be open to inspection. The process will not end with full membership. Privileged partnership will be accepted. The Union's digestion of Turkey will be waited. The membership process will be held under control continuously. And even the result is negative,

---

[53] The arrangement made on the Bosphorus through Montreux Treaty is generally as follows: The control of the Bosphorus will be under the authority of Turkey. Commercial ships will be able to pass through the Bosphorus during peace time. In a war where Turkey is a party, the pass of the warships will be under the control of Turkey. In a war where Turkey is not a party, the pass of the warships may be limited by Turkey. *AnaBritannica* v. 16, 1990, 216.

[54] "Türkiye'nin denetim ve denetleme hakkı yok sayılarak 'menfaatlerimize' aykırı durumlar ortaya çıkacaktır." "İşte AKP'nin…", 19.

[55] Ibid, 23.

[56] "Türkiye için özel düzenlemeler yapılacak, yapısal politikalar ve tarım gibi alanlarda kalıcı kısıtlamalar gerçekleşecek" Ibid, 21

[57] Ibid, 22.

Turkey will be kept on the orbit of EU. The indivisible integrity of the state will be discussed. The nation-state structure will be appalled. The unitary state structure will be opened to the discussion. The structure of the State of Turkish Republic will be changed with the new constitution. The national foreign policy will be given up and Turkey will align with the EU foreign policies. If international problems are not solved, the International Court of Justice will intervene. Turkey will prove its obedience to EU foreign policies. All treaties including Lausanne (July 24, 1924) will be re-scanned. The control/status of Bosphorus will be discussed. There will be concession from the sovereignty of Bosphorus. The defense will be in conformity with EU, not with national interests and security. Our water resources will be opened to international control and administration. The protection of the national interests will be put an end. Consequently, EU will determine the borders of sovereignty. According to MHP, EU sets up the rules and Turkey is obliged to follow:[58]

> The understanding which is put forward with the Negotiation Framework Document will bring the result of the transfer of Turkey's all policies, decisions, shortly all administration to EU control in time. A Turkey that EU inspectors and EU missionaries govern, is aimed. This situation will be the *DUYUN-U UMUMI[59] IDARESI.* [60]

In the narration of the MHP it is meaningful to remind *Düyun-u Umumi İdaresi*, Lausanne and Montreux Treaties. *Düyun-u Umumi* terminated the independence of Ottoman Empire. The expressions of Lausanne and Montreux Treaties emphasize

---

[58] "Avrupa Komisyonu'nun Türkiye İlerleme Raporu, Etki Raporu ve Tavsiyeleri Genel Değerlendirme Raporu". 2004. Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi; "AKP'nin Teslimiyet Belgeleri – AB Türkiye İlerleme Raporu-Tavsiyeler" (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 6 November 2004); "İşte AKP'nin…", 8, 15, 26, 27, 28, 31-37.

[59] It should be reminded briefly: *Düyun-u Umumiye* is an institution established to pay the foreign debts of Ottoman Empire in Tanzimat Period. Its duty was managing the state incomes assigned to foreign debts according to the interests of the creditors. In the institution's administration there were German (as the representative of British and Dutch creditors), Austrian, French, Italian, Ottoman representatives. European capital groups were aiming to dominate over Ottoman economy through this institution AnaBritannica, v. 7, 1990, 578.

[60] "Müzakere Çerçeve Belgesi ile ortaya konulan yaklaşım, Türkiye'nin zaman içinde tüm politikalarının, kararlarının, kısacası tüm yönetiminin AB'nin kontrolüne devredilmesi sonucunu getirecektir. AB müfettişleri ve Türkiye'deki AB misyonerlerinin yöneteceği bir Türkiye hedef-lenmektedir.. Bu durum GENEL DUYUN-U UMUMİ[60] İDARESİ olacaktır." "İşte AKP'nin…", 29.

the loss out what was gained with the Independence War. Thus, the sovereignty which is gained against the enemy has been lost with the process of membership to EU. The achievements are given back. The reference made to the Independence War enables that the sovereignty loss of Turkey become more evident. This matter facilitates that MHP establishes an emotional narration given the importance of the Independence War on Turkish social memory.

When comes the year 2007, the MHP starts to express directly that the future of Turkey is speculated from foreign centres.[61] According to Bahçeli, the national sovereignty is used as a tool for the political interests in the framework of the relations with EU.[62] The national interests are made a tool of "cheap accounts" [63] Turkey is face to face with the threats aimed at its national continuation:[64]

> …the picture in front of us shows that Turkey is face to face with the most serious threat of its history. The problem in front of Turkey is the problem of existence and continuation. Today there are two countries in the world whose national unity, territorial integrity and state structure are being discussed both inside and outside. One of them is Iraq which is under military invasion and in a civil war. The second country is Turkey which is blockaded with hostility from every front and exposed to serious provocations to activate the inner conflict and partition process. [65]

---

[61] Devlet Bahçeli, 19 May 2007. "19 Mayıs Atatürk'ü Anma Gençlik ve Spor Bayramı Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=19052007 accesed 12 December 2007.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Devlet Bahçeli, 12 March 2007. "İstiklal Marşı'nın Kabulünün Yıldönümü Mesajı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=12032007 (accessed June 12, 2007).

[64] Ibid.

[65] "...önümüzdeki tablo Türkiye'nin yakın tarihinin en ağır tehdidiyle karşı karşıya bulunduğunu göstermektedir. Türkiye'nin önündeki sorun, bir varlık ve beka sorunudur. Bugün dünyada milli birliği, toprak bütünlüğü ve devlet yapısı hem içerde hem dışarıda tartışılan iki ülke bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan birisi, askeri işgal altında olan ve iç savaş yaşayan Irak'tır. İkinci ülke ise, her cepheden husumet ablukası altına alınan, iç çatışma ve bölünme sürecinin harekete geçirilmesi için ağır tahriklere maruz bırakılan Türkiye'dir." Devlet Bahçeli, 15 March 2007. "Türkiye'de Giderek Ağırlaşan Ortam ve Son Siyasi Gelişmeler Hakkındaki Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15032007 (accessed 12 June, 2007).

As it is seen, in the narration of the MHP, Turkey encounters with the threats related to its national sovereignty in the process of membership to EU. The national sovereignty problem, however, points out the independence and existence problem. In the MHP's narration one of the subjects which cause sovereignty loss is EU and the other one is the government. Indeed, Bahçeli states that the political party in power, namely *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi/AKP* (Justice and Development Party), "left its own political future to the external powers' decision and reason." [66] Accordingly, the conditions required to make national decisions and apply them are totally disappeared even AKP wants to make these… [this] is a similar spiral in which the Ottoman governments also entered by submitting themselves to Sevres and by signing the Mondros." [67] As is seen, the MHP frequently uses the examples which are retroactive in its telling. The establishment of similarities between the collapse period of the Ottoman and the developments in the process of EU enlarges the threat and danger perception. It is meaningful that the MHP always emphasizes the extent of threat and danger. In this wise, the MHP, in addition to EU (even rather than EU), takes the AKP which follows proponent policy in support of EU as target. However, the MHP's position towards interior political actors via EU will be touched upon later.

According to the MHP, Turkey is not only losing its sovereignty. At the EU process, the unitary state structure is also under serious threat. In 1999, Bahçeli stated that the 57th Government (in this government the MHP is the coalition partner) would pay attention to enable the stability of the country by protecting the unitary structure of the state. [68] Among the subject matters what the MHP indicates as "national sensitivity", the unitary structure of the state is emphasized frequently. The fundamental principles that the MHP sees compulsory to be compromised with

---

[66] Devlet Bahçeli, 3 March 2007. "Ankara Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=03032007 (accessed August 5, 2007.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Devlet Bahçeli, 1 June 1999. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları*, (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi), 81.

EU are listed as follows: The unquestionable democratic republic, the social state of law, the official language and the flag, the secular state understanding, the unitary political structure and the borders. However, it is indicated that the 2004 Regular Progress Report of European Commission "imposes a new state and nation structure in accordance with EU decisions" to Turkey. [69] Bahçeli states that the fundamental structure/principles of the state was questioned in this report. [70] EU proposed that the 2005 Negotiation Framework be exercised at the regional level. Bahçeli emphasizes that this recommendation prepares a ground for "federal political structure":[71]

> The ultimate goal of this front which is in a cooperation of force and action is to open *the nation state character and unitary structure of Turkish Republic to the debate and to reorganize it*. At the end of this, a state consisting of artificial nations and whose new definition is "*federal*" is intended to be established. [emphasis added]

Bahçeli in his speech of May 6, 2007 again refers to the Independence War and reminds the following words of those who gathered in Erzurum in July 23, 1919: "country is a whole and cannot be divided". Bahçeli states that just like that day the MHP also says "nation state, unitary structure, and indivisible integrity" today. Bahçeli indicates that the expressions of the MHP are in line with words of the people who carried out the Independence War and adds: "At that time, the nationalists said that 'the mandate and the patronage' could not be accepted… Today also the Nationalist Movement says 'full independence, national economy and nationalism.'"

---

69 "AKP'nin Teslimiyet Belgeleri", 18.

70 "2004 Avrupa Komisyonu'nun Türkiye İlerleme Raporu, Etki Raporu ve Tavsiyeleri-Genel Değerlendirme Raporu". 2004. Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi; "AKP'nin Teslimiyet Belgeleri", 7, 8.

71 "İşte AKP'nin", 24.

72
    "Türkiye'ye karşı güç ve eylem birliği içinde olan bu cephenin nihai amacı, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin *milli devlet niteliğini ve üniter yapısını tartışmaya açmak ve yeniden tanzim etmektir*. Bunun sonunda, yapay milletlerden oluşan ve yeni tanımı **"*federal*"** olan farklı bir devlet kurulmak istenmektedir." Devlet Bahçeli, 3 March 2007. "Ankara Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=03032007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

In the narration of the MHP, the continuous increase in the emphasis regarding that the unitary state structure is under threat is closely related with the minorities and Kurdish issue. As it will be discussed in the following chapter, in the MHP's discourse the minority rights, the changing state structure and territorial division are the subjects that telescope. As it is told above, in the rhetoric of the Party, Turkey is the country which is under the threat of losing its territorial integrity in the EU process. The very first step of this is the sovereignty losses in the interior and foreign policies. The process moves along from unitary state structure to federal state structure. This, however, points out a Turkey which "is dragged to national suicide". [73] EU expects from Turkey to change radically all of its regulations with respect to the national security and indivisible integrity of the country.[74] Besides, EU demands from Turkey to compromise with the PKK.[75] Indeed, "with EU…. harmonization packages concessions have been given to the terrorists and these applications encouraging terrorists …have contributed to politization process of the PKK."[76] The MHP emphasizes the connection of EU and the PKK: "What EU demands from Turkey persistently in the name of the alignment with the Copenhagen political criteria and the claims of the PKK/KADEK overlap." [77] Therefore, the threats towards Turkey in the EU process are underlined once again.

There exists another point about the perception of the MHP regarding division of Turkey's territory. In the narration of the MHP, the geographical location of Turkey is glorified notably: "… one of the most problematic and favourite regions of the

---

[73] Devlet Bahçeli, *AKP İktidarının 90 Günü ve Son Gelişmeler* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003), 33.

[74] "2005 Yılı İlerleme Raporu Ve Katılım Ortaklığı Belgeleri Siyasi Kriterler Çerçevesinde: Talep ve Dayatmalar-AB'nin Türkiye Hakkında Dikkat Çeken Tespitleri" November 2005. Ankara: MHP AR-GE.

[75] "İşte AKP'nin…"

[76] "AB .... uyum paketleri ile teröristlere tavizler verilmiş ve teröristleri cesaretlendiren bu uygulamalar ... PKK'nın siyasallaşma sürecine katkı sağlamıştır." Devlet Bahçeli, "7 Aralık 2003 İl-İlçe Başkanları Toplantısının Açılış Konuşması", in *AKP İktidarının Bir Yıllık İcraatı* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003).

[77] "Avrupa Birliği'nin Kopenhag siyasi kriterlerine uyum adına ... Türkiye'den ısrarla talep ettiği hususlar ile PKK/KADEK'in … istekleri örtüşmektedir." Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 51, 52.

world is Eurasia and Turkey takes part in the triangulation point of Eurasia." [78] It is emphasized frequently that Turkey is the most important country and the centre of the most complicated geography of the earth.

The emphasis on the geostrategic location of Turkey bears the allusion that its territories are desired by "others". In fact this glorification refers to the existence of the enemies who seek to break territories into pieces and intensifies the magnitude of related threat.

This intensification on the other hand, paves the way for another point to come into prominence. According to Smith[79], in the nationalist narration, the glorification of the territory with all its features emphasizes the idea of the belongingness and serves to resurgence of the 'myth of the rebirth'. This rebirth myth originates from a perception as follows: in the nationalist narration the idea of linear development is common. According to such a development idea the societies in the nature are born, develop, maturate, regress and are reborn. However regression periods do not occur naturally. It occurs with dissolutions and sovereignty losses coming from outside (by taking under thumb) or with betrayals from inside. This is outside the natural course, not the natural one.[80]

As will be remembered, in the telling of the MHP, the EU period before 1999 Helsinki Summit is presented as uneasy and stable. However, the Helsinki Summit and the MHP which came into power in this period introduced a new stage to Turkey. Turkey entered into a new age to become "Leader Country" (with the leadership of the MHP). Nevertheless, the EU process which the MHP presented as an important opportunity became a big disappointment. The EU membership (besides its negative features) was mentioned with its positive characteristics at the beginning of the 2000s. As it is told above, at the end, Turkey was pushed into a

---

[78] "…dünyanın en sancılı ve gözde bölgelerinden biri Avrasya'dır ve Avrasya'nın nirengi noktasında da Türkiye yer almaktadır." Bahçeli, *Siyasette İlke Ekonomide Kararlılık*, 26.

[79] Smith, *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni*, 243.

[80] Ibid, 244.

process of losing its independence in EU process with the AKP government which took over at the end of 2002.

Also Turkey emerges as the country "with whose honour is played" in this narration. In this process "our national honour and sensitiveness were not disregarded, our national claims were not abandoned in any period as such during *AKP government*…. [Turkey's] national reflex has been atrophied….eventually it is Turkey and Turkish nation which is despised…. Turkey is face to face with criticisms and insults directed to its national sensitiveness by EU" [81] [emphases are original] With the words of Bahçeli: "…it is impossible to find another country whose nation, state and history is exposed to such an injustice." [82]

If turned back to the point that Smith signifies, Turkey is in a dark period in terms of its relations with EU. While the MHP portrays Turkey's position even more seriously, in fact it emphasizes the need of rebirth that Smith points out much more. Besides, in the nationalist telling that Smith indicates the outsiders and the traitors from inside who are seen as the reason for regression can be found easily in the EU process according to the MHP. Outsiders are the countries having eyes on Turkey's territories including EU countries. The traitors from inside, however, are the governments which do not fulfil their responsibilities. Bahçeli says: "…in all countries of the world the governments are primarily responsible and liable of protecting and advocating their national honour and interests." [83] Moreover, Bahçeli says that Turkish history consists of event chains that repeat themselves. "Even the place and time, the interfering elements and enemies change, the desires are the same …the collaborators are familiar."[84] Bahçeli asserts that this chain is full of heroism for nationalists. The Independence War is also one example of this

---

[81] Devlet Bahçeli, *AKP İktidarının 90 Günü,* 9, 11, 28.

[82] Ibid, 26.

[83] Devlet Bahçeli, *6. Ayında AKP İktidarı – Gelişmeler, Gerçekler, Uyarılar* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003), 13.

[84] Devlet Bahçeli, 18 March 2007. "Bursa Ülkü Ocakları Çanakkale Zaferini Anma Şöleni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=18032007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

heroism. Within this framework, in the rhetoric of the MHP the references to the Independence War are aimed at reminding the rebirth. Especially, it is conspicuous that Independence War is one of the most reminded events in the speeches of Bahçeli for Election 2007. The Independence War points out the birth of the Turkish Republic. Turkish people gained their independence in a period when they are faced with the danger of losing their sovereignty. In the rhetoric of the MHP, Turkey is face to face with new sovereignty/independence problem this time. Thus, it needs a new rebirth struggle. In this narration, before Election 2007 the MHP again revives the ideal of being "Leader Country". Namely, the country will resurge and become leader (of course with the leadership of the MHP). Bahçeli says that the July 2007 Election will recompense the destruction of the lost years for our country and will determine the parliamentary cadre which will actualize advances that will make Turkey "Leader Country" in 2023 (in the 100th anniversary of the Republic)[85]. He also points out that it will be the MHP which will realize these advances and save the honour of the country. In the EU narration of the MHP, with which features it characterizes itself will be touched upon in the following chapters.

In this chapter, how Turkey-EU relations are established in the MHP's discourse and with what kind of characteristics Turkey is constituted as a subject has been examined. To sum up, a pessimistic picture in MHP's discourse for the relations in the period before 1999 Helsinki is seen. The MHP says that with the Helsinki Summit which happened in the period that the MHP is in power, the relations have gained an egalitarian structure. The new period began in the relations with the new government have been transformed to one sided dependency relationship. Turkey is in danger of losing its sovereignty and its unitary state structure in the EU process. The sovereignty loss originates from the narrowing of Turkey's authority. As

---

[85] Devlet Bahçeli, 25 February 2007. "1. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25022007 (accessed August 5, 2007; Devlet Bahçeli, 6 May 2007. "8. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-Erzurum", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=06052007 (accessed August 5, 2007; Devlet Bahçeli, 19 May 2007. "19 Mayıs Atatürk'ü Anma Gençlik ve Spor Bayramı Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=19052007 (accessed August 5, 2007); Devlet Bahçeli, "6. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-Kayseri", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15042007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

always, Turkey's territories having a strategic importance are wanted to be broken into pieces by those who desire it. However, Turkey is the country that needs to be leader. Like in the Independence War, Turkey will struggle and protect its independence and state structure with the leadership of the MHP. At the same time this means that it will rescue its honour which is damaged in the EU process.

In the following chapter, how the reflection of EU process to the atmosphere within the country is explained in the MHP's discourse will be discussed.

CHAPTER 6

DOMESTIC CHALLENGE

It would be remembered that in the discourse of MHP in general, EU is constructed as an enemy-subject. However, it has been seen that as unexpected EU was mentioned positively the December, 1999 Helsinki Submit in the discourse of the MHP. According to MHP, was also good for the EU-Turkey relationships. Turkey in the Helsinki Summit is seen as equal with other countries in the Union. In the discourse of MHP, the Summit opened a new period in the relationships. In the period that MHP was in power, it was underlined that Turkey would be a effective country in its relations with EU. However, in the course of time the relations with EU turned into a one-sided dependency relationship. In this case, Turkey is a submissive country in the relations . At the same time, Turkey will lose its sovereignty in its decisions about domestic and foreign affairs and the use of resources to a great extent in the EU process. The country is also confronted with a restriction of its sovereignty over the Bosporus. On the other hand, the country's unitary state structure and its territorial integrity have been threatened. The geo-strategic importance of the country increases the threat of the separation of country. As a result of this, in the discourse of MHP, the derision with the honour of Turkey in the process of the EU membership appears as one of the theme that it is come upon. As it is seen, in the discourse of MHP various threats against Turkey in the membership process were expressed intensively.

In this chapter, within the threat perception that is mentioned, it shall be examined how the domestic atmosphere in the discourse of MHP is established . In other words, how the effect of the changes which is stimulated by the membership process on the country's internal dynamics/social structure occurs in the Party's discourse shall be analysed.

6.1 National Unity

As was touched upon in the previous chapters, in the discourse of MHP, the states which have desires on Turkey's territories and the foreign enemies are the subject matters that are emphasized frequently. As it would be remembered, EU also from time to time is presented as the continuation of the Allied Countries of World War I and of the Byzantine. It is expressed that the EU intends of establishing *Düyun-u Umumi administration*. Actually, although the source of the threat would change, the aim is all the same: which is to break Turkey into pieces. Indeed, Türkeş explains the tension which was experienced in the 1970s (the period before the September 12) with a similar perception: "the target is by dragging Turkey to 'destabilization' namely to disorder, dividing it under *small states which are based upon race*, and by admitting it to a Marxist administration recapturing it."[1] [emphasis added]. The threat of disintegration, leads to an emphasis on national unity and integrity as a solution.

> We as Turkish citizens, the people of the country are members of the same nation. Among us there would be dissidence, but all of us are members of this nation, thus to protect each other in any case is the citizenship necessity. It is humanness necessity, Turkishness necessity. Shame on those who do not feel that necessity.[2]

Türkeş, indicates that in its thoughts and acts, the MHP pays attention to only one social value. He says that this value is the Turkish nation. In this framework, "national integrity is the unity and integration of the people who live on the same country with the consciousness of belonging to the same nation regarding political, economic and cultural aspects".[3] Türkeş explains the MHP's nationality understanding as "the merciless enemy of the all manner of class based, sectarian

---

[1] Nalbantoğlu, *Alparslan Türkeş ile…,* 11.

[2] "Biz Türk vatandaşları olarak, aynı memleketin insanları, aynı milletin mensuplarıyız. Aramızda görüş ayrılığı, düşünce farkı olabilir, ama hepimiz bu millete mensubuz, birbirimize her halükarda sahip çıkmak, bir vatandaşlık icabıdır. İnsanlık icabıdır. Türklük icabıdır. Bu icabı duymayanlara yazıklar olsun." Türkeş, *Konuşmalar*, 17.

[3] Nalbantoğlu, *Alparslan Türkeş ile…,* 143.

and racist systems which is divisive of the integrity of the country and the nation."[4] As it was told in chapter 2, the 1970s are the years that the MHP defines itself on the axis of the opponent of communism. Consequently it is presented that the cause, which threats the national unity, is the divisive ideas that communism disperses:

> [t]oday our country is under attack of foreign ideologies. Among these foreign ideologies the one that is the very first, the most detrimental and dangerous is the ideology of communism. Communism accepted to provoke the divisiveness, regionalism and sectarian differences as a method for its achievements. …. The one of the other separatist activity that they apply is to do ethnic racism; with holding ethnic racism to attempt certain provocations that depends upon this; to make regionalism. Especially, they stress upon the eastern region. [5]

As it is seen in the quotation, the method which is used to break down the country's integrity is to incite the 'ethnic racism'/ 'regionalism' and 'sectarian differences'. What Türkeş mean by ethnic racism is the Kurdish question; sectarian difference is the Sunni-Alevi tension. According to Türkeş, those who emphasize the Kurdish identity are the ones who want to remove the Turkish power and to break down its integrity. Those persons by doing provocations want to divide Turkey and give it to the hands of the colonists. They try to chain the Turkish nation to slavery. They are enemies of the Turks.[6] Türkeş indicates that the Turkish nation's unity and integrity result from the fact that the all members of it are *brothers/sisters* of each other.

> Our citizens who live at East also are true children of Turkish nation. The Easterners are also our true brothers and sisters. The Easter people are our respectable, brave, religious and decent people…. For about 900 years the easterner and westerner with embracing one another have been created this country. They protected this state….. To provoke that this will separate, this will be a separate country is directly the betrayal to the country. We

---

[4] Ibid, 141.

[5] "[b]ugün yurdumuz yabancı ideolojilerin saldırısına uğramış durumdadır. Bu yabancı ideolojilerin başında gelen, en zararlısı ve tehlikelisi komünizm ideolojisidir. Komünizm, bölücülüğü, bölgeciliği ve mezhep ayrılıklarını kışkırtmayı kendi başarısı için bir yöntem olarak kabul etmiştir. .... Başvurdukları diğer ayırıcı faaliyetlerden birisi de etnik ırkçılık yapmaktır. Etnik ırkçılığı ele alarak, buna dayanan birtakım kışkırtmalara girişmektir. Bölgecilik yapmaktır. Bilhassa doğu bölgesi üzerinde durmaktadırlar." Ibid, 172.

[6] Türkeş, *Konuşmalar*, 44.

see this as a great danger and a great betrayal for our state. [7]

In Turkey which is formed by one nation who are brothers and sisters of each other, according to Türkeş, those who say that there are several nations are the 'agents', 'servants' of the colonist states, 'the enemies of Turkish nation', and 'the traitors of Turkey'.

> To attempt to divide 40 million Turks who live within our national boundaries as 'Turkish people', with this slogan to try to collapse the Turkish Nation is an insulation which is beyond the treason. …. With respect to our country's social structure and constitution also the term "people" is invalid…..To separate the Turkish nation to ethnic groups or to show as it is already separated is the necessity of the Marxist understanding. This is also the extension of an exterior ideology which aimed to divide our nation.[8]

According to Türkeş, there exist only one nation in Turkey and that is the Turkish nation. The whole nation is "brothers and sisters of each other, all belongs to the same religion; all are the community of the same almighty prophet, possessor of the same sacred book, and the same flag, children of the same country, the people of the same state." With these characteristics "our nation is a sacred whole who does not accept division." [9]

> For us, the people of our country each one are the sacred custody that God created….All of our citizens, without any discrimination, as the persons who compose the Turkish Nation in our eyes, carry grand values. We accepted as the

---

[7] "Doğu'da yaşayan vatandaşlarımız da Türk milletinin özbeöz evlatlarıdır. Bu topraklar üzerinde yaşayan bütün insanlar birbirlerinin öz kardeşleridir. Doğulular da bizim öz kardeşlerimizdir. Doğu insanı, temiz, mert, vatansever, namuslu, dindar ahlaklı insanlarımızdır ….900 senedir doğulusu batılısı birbiriyle kucaklaşarak bu vatanı yaratmışlardır. Bu devleti korumuşlardır ..... bu ayrılacak, ayrı devlet olacak diye kışkırtmak doğrudan doğruya vatan ihanetidir. Biz bunu devletimiz için büyük bir tehlike ve büyük ihanet görüyoruz" Nalbantoğlu, *Alparslan Türkeş ile,* 175.

[8] "Milli sınırlarımız içerisinde yaşayan 40 milyon Türkü "Türkiye halkları" diye bölmeye kalkmak, bu sloganla Türk milletini çökertmeğe yeltenmek hainliğin de ötesinde bir harekettir. .... Ülkemizin sosyal yapısı ve bünyesi itibariyle de, "halklar" deyimi geçersizdir. .... Türk milletini etnik gruplara ayırmak veya ayrıymış gibi göstermek, marksist anlayışın gereğidir. Bu da milletimizi bölmeye matuf dışardan gelen bir ideolojinin uzantılarıdır" Ibid, 143.

[9] Türkeş, *Konuşmalar*, 17.

most honourable mission to work for their rights, honours, prides and happiness.[10]

Besides, Türkeş says that MHP, independent of their sects or race, sees their "people who live in the homeland which are surrounded by the Turkish Republic boundaries as brothers and sisters and children of the Turkish nation."[11]

As it is seen, Turkish nation is seen as a whole in the discourse of the MHP. According to this, to mention about the existence of any ethnic or sectarian difference inside the country is understood as a danger for the unity of the country. Consequently, the problem which is defined on the ethnic base in the discourse of the Party, is not associated with the ethnic groups. The problem is characterized as an incitement of the foreign focuses that incline the unity of the country.

The narration above almost has not changed for years in the discourse of MHP. Bahçeli states that the MHP is the party which "causes 65 million to become firm friends".[12] In the program of the year 2000 it is indicated that the Party sees the regional and traditional differences as the wealth of our national life, of the Turkish culture and as the different colors which complete the Turkish culture. The emphasis of the 'brotherhood' of the Turkish nation comes across frequently in the discourse of the MHP: "Our people who live in the Anatolian territories for thousand years are mixed in the same melting pot and they improved a unique brotherhood companionship and culture."[13] Bahçeli indicates that to supply and encourage the members of the Turkish nation, whatever origin, profession and sect they belong, to live friendly altogether is both the reason of the existence and the

---

[10] "Bizim için memleketimizin insanları, Cenab-ı allah'ın yarattığı birer mukaddes emanettir. ...... her türlü vatandaşımız, hiçbir ayrım gözetilmeksizin, bizim gözümüzde Türk Milletini meydana getiren kişiler olarak, büyük değerler taşımaktadır. Hepsinin hakları için, şerefleri için, haysiyetleri için, mutlulukları için çalışmayı kendimize en şerefli görev kabul etmişizdir." Ibid, 48.

[11] Ibid, 42-43.

[12] Devlet Bahçeli, 19 June 2000. "Genel Merkez Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=19062000 (accessed February 9, 2007).

[13] Devlet Bahçeli, 9 December 2007. "Türkiye Tek Yürek Mitingi Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=09122007 (accessed January 11, 2008).

fundamental mission of a democratic regime.[14]

> The Turkish Nation which is a big family is the collective successor of an honourable history. The Turkish Nation who lived as an indivisible whole along for centuries, showed might to overcome all difficulties that it came about as one–single body by their joint efforts. The greatest wealth and the source of power of the Turkish Nation are its national unity and brotherhood, that protected and glorified it in all periods of the history.[15]

In the party's discourse, although the national unity approach and those who make incitements against national unity have changed, the expressions regarding their aims and their methods remain the same in a great proportion. It is clear that in the MHP's telling from the end of the 1990s and beginning of the 2000s onwards, the formation which threats the national unity and integrity is the EU. In the discourse of the MHP, the threat of the EU process towards Turkey's national unity takes part in the 'democratization' criteria of the Union.

Bahçeli states that the principles and values like democracy, human rights, justice, responsibility and tolerance have a vital importance. He asserts that these principles are the beacon in the country's interior world.[16] According to Bahçeli, the democratization development in Turkey has gained a new dimension and intensity in the EU process with the Helsinki Summit.[17] As the 1910s and the 1920s are the hard years of Turkey. In the 1950s there was not a atmosphere for a healthy

---

[14] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[15] "Büyük bir aile olan Türk Milleti, şerefli bir tarihin ortak varisidir. Asırlar boyu bölünmez bir bütün olarak yaşayan Türk milleti, karşısına çıkan tüm güçlükleri tek vücut olarak ortak çabalarla aşma kudretini göstermiştir. Türk milletinin en büyük zenginliği ve güç kaynağı, tarihin her döneminde koruduğu ve yücelttiği milli birliği ve kardeşliğidir." Devlet Bahçeli, 19 September 2006. "TBMM'nin Olağanüstü Toplantıya Çağırılması ve Gündemdeki Son Gelişmelerle İlgili Yazılı Basın Açıklması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=19092006, (accessed September 30, 2007).

[16] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[17] Devlet Bahçeli, 21 March 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21032000 (accessed August 9, 2007).

opposition. The 1960s-70s passed through under the hard conditions of the Cold War. Extreme polarizations were experienced . The games that were played upon our country were intensified. The 1980s was the period in which very rapid transformations were experienced. There happened rapid technological developments. After the 1980s the domestic and the foreign developments were appropriate. For this reason, there was seen an economic revival in our country. In the 1990s the tempo of the development fell down. In this period Turkey struggled with increasing terror. At the beginning of the 1990s with the collapse of USSR the balances changed. The years of the 1990s point out a stagnation and fluctuation period. In this atmosphere our democracy couldn't develop.[18] To this problem, Bahçeli indicates the requirement of "making improvements in the human rights and democratization sphere, in parallel to the international norms which are accepted in general".[19] He expresses that the democratization pains in Turkey were discussed seriously by the 57th government for the first time and solved.[20] The emphasis of "the leader Turkey in the new age" in the MHP's discourse has been mentioned. Bahçeli, while entering a new age, mentions the necessity of rebuilding Turkey as a great country. To prepare Turkey for a new future, there is a need to realize a sequence of democratization policies.[21] Related to the 21st century, one of the fundamental political targets is to improve the democratization and human rights politics.[22] Besides, one of the characteristics of this new age is "the right of life of the national and religious cultures [and]….the acceptance of democracy, which depends on the system of freedom, as the criteria of political development in

[18] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007.

[19] Devlet Bahçeli, 8 May 1999. "TBMM Basın Toplantısı", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi), 36.

[20] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 February 2002. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=05022002 (accesed January 11, 2008).

[21] Devlet Bahçeli, 26 November 1999. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=26101999 (accessed January 14, 2008).

[22] Devlet Bahçeli, 2 November 1999. "Basın Toplantısı konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=02111999 (accessed January 11 2007).

global scale."[23] Democracy already constitutes "one of the fundamental political preferences that our nation truly espoused…. It became an irreversible path for the Turkish nation."[24] As it is obvious, democratization is a tool to construct Turkey as a leader country and it is a necessity of the new age. According to Bahçeli, leaving the old, musty, status quo and oppressive-statist approaches would open the way for democratization.[25]

Bahçeli in one of his speeches that he made in September, 1999, touches on the reasons of lack-development of democracy.[26] According to Bahçeli, both the opponents of democracy and those who seems to be proponent of democracy contribute to the non-development of democracy. Those people "through mentioning continuously about human rights and democracy" overshadow the prestige of these values. But this weakens the endeavours for democratization . Bahçeli denotes that those who identify these concepts with divisiveness, terrorism and enemies of the republic harm them most. He says that if there is sincerity in the issues of human rights, democracy and national unity, the concern of Turkey will be eased.

In the discourse of the MHP, on the one hand democracy and human rights are exalted as the values which are needed to be developed. On the other hand, these values are mentioned with their potential to form a base which would lead the country to difficulties. Bahçeli declares that those values are mostly used as

---

[23] Devlet Bahçeli, 27 May 2000. "Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği 55. Genel Kurul Toplantısındaki Konuşma", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=27052000 (accesed, January 11, 2008).

[24] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[25] Devlet Bahçeli, 26 November 1999. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=26101999 (accessed January 14, 2008).

[26] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 September 1999. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=05091999 (accessed January 11, 2008).

symbols, and that under these titles other political struggles are carried out.[27] It is pointed out that this, then, is a distortion peculiar to Turkey: "It is not seen that democracy and social solidarity is developed by pointing out the ethnic identities and reviving the ethnic and religious differences in any democratic regime, nowhere on the earth."[28] In the report of the MHP, the EU process paves the way for 'detrimental' constitutions that make use of the concepts of democratization and human rights.

6.1.1 "Terror"

I has been stated that from the 2000s onwards it became clear that the EU appeared as a threatening subject. In the discourse of the party, it has been expressed that the EU has effects that breaks down the national unity and integrity. Besides, these destructive effects came to Turkey through the democratization criteria has been depicted. The narration of the usage of democracy as a tool for divisive activities has different dimensions. One of these dimensions is that the democratization criteria has the characteristic to support the PKK terrorism. In the narration of the party, the support of the EU to in the politicization process of the PKK occupies a dominant place.

In the year 2000 Bahçeli pointed out that their concern about the demands of democracy which disguise divisive aims have three basic reasons: The geopolitical and geoeconomical location of Turkey, the existence of PKK and the *Hizbullah* terrorist organizations and the developments that emerged in the EU full

---

[27] Devlet Bahçeli, 2 November 1999. "Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=02111999 (accessed January 11, 2008).

[28] Devlet Bahçeli, 19 November 2000. "Türkiye Esnaf ve Sanatkarlar Kredi ve Kefalet Kooperatifleri Birlikleri Merkez Birliği'nin "Esnaf ve Sanatkarlarımızın Sorunları ile 57. Cumhuriyet Hükümetinden Talepleri ve Türkiye Halk Bankası'nın Özelleştirilmesinden Beklentileri" Konulu Toplantıdaki Konuşma" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=19112000 (accessed January 11, 2008.; Devlet Bahçeli, 2 January 2001. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2001/index.php?page=02012001 (accessed January 13, 2008).

membership process.[29] Bahçeli indicates that after Öcalan was caught (he was caught in February 1999) the PKK began to practice a new strategy. According to this, the PKK in its new strategy towards politicization uses the democracy as a slogan. This is, then, supported by some foreign and domestic milieus. Bahçeli refers to the EU by the term of foreign milieu. According to Bahçeli, the EU's mind is confused about the concepts of human rights, terror, democracy and racism. Some of the components inside the EU cannot make a differentiation between democratization and terrorism.[30] In the MHP's discourse , the EU's usage of the concepts above that are enumerated one within the other gained weight hereafter. According to the subject that was emphasized in the party's discourse, some of the EU countries protect the terrorist organizations of the enemy of Turkey that damage the national unity. The EU shows the notion of the human rights as an excuse for this. Bahçeli says that this attitude leads to a "contamination" and "attrition" of the concepts of democracy and human rights.[31] Besides, he notes that for years the EU administrations haven't put an active struggle against terrorism, and approach Turkey in its struggle with terrorism inconsistently.[32] The terrorist organization PKK regards the EU as a rescuer.[33] At this point, the EU administrations proved this

---

[29] In this period Bahçeli's reference with the questionable development regarding the EU is the identification of Turkey visits of EU representatives with the visit to Abdullah Öcalan. Devlet Bahçeli, 24 February 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=24022000 (accessed January 16, 2008).

[30] Devlet Bahçeli, 24 February 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=24022000 (accessed January 16, 2008).

[31] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 January 2002. "Hollanda Türk Federasyonu 4. Büyük Kurultayı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=05012002 (accessed January 11, 2008).

[32] Devlet Bahçeli, 12 January 2002. "Merkez Yürütme Kurulu Toplantısı" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=12012002 (accessed January 11, 2008; Devlet Bahçeli, 20 January 2002. "Nevşehir Belediye Başkanları Toplantısı Konuşması" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=20012002 (accessed January 11, 2008; Devlet Bahçeli, 2 March 2002. "http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=02032002 (accessed January 11, 2008).

[33] Devlet Bahçeli, 19 March 2006. "Ülkemizdeki son Siyasi ve Sosyal Gelişmeleri Değerlendirdiği Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=19032006 (accessed January 13, 2008).

support by not including the PKK in the terrorists list.

> As we emphasized frequently with various occasions, it is impossible to understand not to consider the wild organizations inside the scope of the fight against terrorism, that have had huge harms to Turkish society and democracy. There haven't been a reasonable explanation of this approach so far. If the list of terrorist organizations is examined, it draws the attention that the more narrow scoped ones are included than the destructive organizations that Turkey demanded to take part in it…. Without a doubt, it is required that the European Union administration, which see our country as the candidate for full membership, should be more consistent, decisive and clear regarding war against terrorism.[34]

After the EU took the PKK to the terrorist list too[35], Bahçeli underlined that this action is an ostensible act: "The union administration has to explain immediately what it intends by including the 'fake PKK' only whose name remains, rather than the 'real PKK' whose name changed as KADEK."[36] According to Bahçeli, the terrorist organization adopted the strategy of using the EU to achieve its aims. The demands of EU and the demands of the PKK/KADEK overlap.[37] Then, PKK/KADEK identifies its own aims with the Copenhagen Criteria's[38]:

---

[34] "Çeşitli vesilelerle sık sık vurguladığımız gibi, Türk toplumuna ve demokrasisine büyük zararlar veren vahşi örgütlerin, terörle mücadele kapsamı içinde değerlendirilmemesini anlamak imkansızdır. Bugüne kadar bu yaklaşımın makûl bir izahı da yapılabilmiş değildir. Terörle mücadele listesine bakıldığında, Türkiye'nin yer almasını talep ettiği yıkıcı örgütlerden çok daha dar kapsamlı olanların listeye dahil edildiği göze çarpmaktadır....Hiç şüphe yok ki, ülkemizi tam üyeliğe aday olarak gören bir Avrupa Birliği yönetiminin, terörizmle mücadele konusunda çok daha tutarlı, kararlı ve açık olması gerekmektedir." Devlet Bahçeli, 22 January 2002. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=22012002 (accessed January 8, 2008).

[35] The decision of the EU Permanent Representatives Committe with respcet to taking the PKK and DHKP-C into the common terrorism list were promulgated in May 3, 2002 in the EU official gazette. However, the PKK changed its name as KADEK (Kürdistan Özgürlük ve Demokrasi Kongresi) in April 4, 2002. http://www.tumgazeteler.com/?a=223918 (accessed December 17, 2007)

[36] Devlet Bahçeli, 11 May 2002. "Büyük İstanbul Buluşması Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=11052002 (accessed January 13, 2008).

[37] Devlet Bahçeli, 7 June 2002. "Liderler Zirvesi Sonrası Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=07062002 (accessed January 13, 2008).

[38] Devlet Bahçeli, 11 June 2002. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=11062002 (accessed January 13, 2008).

Consequently, "the hope and the support of divisive terror and of its supporters outside" also become the EU.[39] The other indicator of the EU support for the PKK is related to the capital punishment. Bahçeli understands the demands of the EU from Turkey regarding the annulment of the capital punishment in the sense of developing human rights in this framework.[40] He indicates that the process of the re-trial[41] of the DEP deputies in 2003 also points out the EU support to the terrorists.

> The EU administration lastly, protected a party which was closed down by the Constitutional Court because of its organic ties with divisive terrorist elements. On the one hand their support for the cutthroat terrorist head, and on the other hand their protection to this party became an exemplary development concerning the *observation of the real intention and the democracy perception* of the Union administration.[42] [emphasis added]
> ………..

---

[39] Devlet Bahçeli, 27 July 2005. "Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=27072005, (accessed January 13, 2008).

[40] Devlet Bahçeli, 22 January 2002. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=22012002 (accessed January 15, 2008).

[41] Ankara State Security Court (SSC) No:1 in the case which is known in the public as 'DEP case' , found the former Diyarbakır deputies of DEP ,that was closed down, Hatip Dicle and Leyla Zana and the former Sirnak deputies Orhan Dogan and Selim Sadak as guilty and convicted to prison for 15 years in accordance with article number 168-2 of the Turkish Penal Code which regulates the act that is 'the membership of the illegal organization' and according to article 5 of the numbered 3713 of the Law of Struggle with Terrorism which regulates the 'penalty auction' as they are acting in decisive manner in accordance with the command and instruction that they take from the leader of terrorist organization of the PKK. The 9th Penal Department of the Court of Appeals approved the decision. The former DEP deputies, Zana, Dogan and Dicle were taken into custody in March 4, 1994. In March 17, 1994 they were imprisoned and put into Ankara Central Closed Prison. Sadak was taken into custody in July 1, 1994 and imprisoned in July 12, 1994. There were added a new section to the 4793 numbered Law and to the 327th article of the Law of Penal Judgement Procedures whose title is 'the Return of Judgment'. In the section in question, it was decided that 'the penal judgement was taken because of the violation of the Agreement or its addition protocols regarding the protection of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the determination of it with the final decision of the European Court of Human Rights' http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=67586 (accessed January 13, 2008).

[42] "AB yönetimi en son olarak, ülkemizde bölücü terörist unsurlarla organik bağı sebebiyle Anayasa Mahkemesi tarafından kapatılan bir partiye sahip çıkmıştır. Bir yandan terörist başı caniye arka, diğer yandan bu partiye sahip çıkmaları, Birlik *yönetiminin gerçek niyetini ve demokrasi anlayışlarını görmek bakımından* çok ibret verici bir gelişme olmuştur". Devlet Bahçeli, 17 March 2003. "Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2003/index.php?page=17032003 (accessed January 16, 2008).

The trial process of the former DEP deputies would remind us: *With the imposition of the EU* the re-trial process of those persons who were convicted of helping and harbouring the terrorist organization has begun. Eventually, the court insisted on its old decision. In the trial process of the DEP deputies, the front of the courthouse was turned into a fairground before every trial by the observers from the European Parliament.[43]

Bahçeli states that after the release of the sentenced DEP deputies by the EU pressure, there has been initiated new political formations[44] under the direction of the PKK. There are concrete steps to realize the aims of the PKK terrorism with political ways. According to Bahçeli, it is the result of the EU's perception of the democratization problem in Turkey as the "so-called Kurdish problem"[45]

In the discourse of the party, the EU on the one hand damages the national unity in the country with its open-secret support in the points above , on the other hand impedes Turkey's fight against terrorism. The EU ambassadors do not hesitate to warn regarding the operations which are carried out against the PKK terrorism. This, too, demonstrates that "the EU does not intend to give up its attitude which almost encourages the discrimination in Turkey."[46] Furthermore in the framework of the EU harmonization, the laws which have a vital importance for the fight against terrorism are being changed. Thus, to aid and to harbour terrorism is

---

[43] "Eski DEP milletvekillerinin yargılaması sürecinde yaşananlar hatırlatacaktır. *AB'nin dayatmasıyla* terör örgütüne yardım ve yataklık yapmaktan mahkum olan bu şahısların yeniden yargılanması süreci başlatılmıştır. Sonuçta mahkeme eski kararında ısrar etmiştir. DEP'lilerin yargı sürecinde, her duruşma öncesi Avrupa Parlamento'sundan gelen gözlemciler tarafından mahkeme önü bir panayıra çevrilmiştir." Devlet Bahçeli, 8 May 2004. "MYK Toplantısı Konuşması" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2004/index.php?page=08052004, (accessed January 12, 2008).

[44] The new formation that is mentioned is the 'Democratic Society Movement' which was stated in November 22, 2004 by the former DEP deputies. Leyla Zana who is the former DEP deputy explained the aim of the movement like that: "to promote the free, democratic, participatory and plural political arena that Kurdish democratic movement created, to embrace with the human wealth of Turkey and by promoting the democratic movement on this ground , to carry the people to power." http://www.voanews.com/turkish/archive/2004-10/a-2004-10-22-17-1.cfm (accessed January 12, 2008).

[45] Devlet Bahçeli, 19 November 2004. "MKY Kurulu Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2004/index.php?page=19112004 (accessed January 12, 2008).

[46] Devlet Bahçeli, 21 June 2005. "Basın Toplantısı Konuşması",

http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=21062005 (accessed

December 9, 2007).

excluded from being a crime. As a result of this, "the call for the betrayal of the state of Turkish Republic and to act against national unity and integrity of Turkey has been set free."[47] By the EU harmonization packages, a suitable place for revival of the terrorism has been constituted .

As it is seen, in the discourse of the MHP, the threat of the EU process to the national unity-integrity of Turkey is related with the Union's support for the terrorism in Turkey. However, at this point the subject matter that should be paid attention is that: As it is indicated, in the various messages given by the party, the EU support for the terrorism under the name of "democratization" and "human rights" is emphasised frequently. The MHP expresses the EU support for the terrorism/the PKK with concerning the events/matters that are touched on with the examples above. In other words, it presents the various events/matters mentioned above as evidences of the existence of the EU-PKK cooperation. The events and the subject matters that the MHP shows as evidences for this cooperation could be easily increased. However, the important thing here is not to mention the large or small events and matters. The subject that should be paid attention to is that: the pointing out of all these events has a commonality, which is expressed in the idea that democracy and human rights concepts "are used as a mask". Consequently, in the discourse of the Party these two concepts become suspicious concepts due to their characteristics of paving ground for divisive acts. Since the democratization and human rights discussions were intensified in the EU process, the destruction caused by the terror and the EU are identified with each other. Briefly, in the discourse of the party, there emerges a sort of narration that is: EU breaks the national unity and integrity with using the democratization and the human rights concepts by giving support to the terrorism.

---

[47] Devlet Bahçeli, 27 July 2005. "Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=27072005 (accessed December 9, 2007).

6.1.2 "Ethnic Separatism"

In the discourse of the MHP, there is another important dimension of the EU process in the threat of breaking down Turkey's national unity-integrity. According to this, the EU again, by using the democratization and the human rights concepts supports the ethnic discrimination.[48] The EU brings up the ethnic discrimination as the"minority question" within the framework of the two concepts in question. In the discourse of the Party, the EU support for terrorism, and the minority question are the two dimensions of breaking the national unity-integrity. However, there should be underlined that in the discourse of the Party these two dimensions (minorities and terrorism) are found as mixed to each other/into each other. Subsequently, the matters related to democratization and human rights (the minority question is also discussed under these titles) easily would be associated to terror and division.

At this point, in the Party's discourse it is frequently emphasized that EU perceives the democratization on the ground of minorities in a discriminatory way. As it would be remembered, Türkeş, in the 1970s said that the foreign ideologies to divide the country use ethnic discrimination. It would be said that, at the end of the 1990s and at the beginning of the 2000s the similar narration/discourse is located for the EU context. Again, the ethnic discrimination is being used as a tool to divide the country. The ethnic discrimination paves the ground for terrorism. This aim is concealed through the concepts of democratization and human rights.

Bahçeli mentions that the ethnic divisiveness in Turkey which is being fed by the terrorism is excused as a 'legitimate identity demand'. These are advocated as "the road map of social development and of modernization"; however, "they are the

---

[48] Bahçeli says that "It should be known that democracy and the human rights are not the tools that whomever wants to use as one wishes. The democracy and the human rigths as their discourse as their practical application signify human values and conditions that needs attention and meticulousness. Nobody has right to dilute these kind of values and conditions, especially to use them as a gun." Devlet Bahçeli, 13 February 2001. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2001/index.php?page=13022001 (accessed December 12, 2007).

projects of division and breaking of Turkey".[49] The ethnic discrimination has been placed inside the democratization projects. This is the most extensive "tramp" for the country.[50] The aim is "dragging Turkey to a new state and nation definition, and *shaping* the Turkish Republic and *our* beloved *nation….. again and artificially*."

> At the beginning, in the attitudes of some of the European Union administrators and in their introduction of the democratization question, a hesitant and prejudice perception has been felt rather than friendship and cooperation. As I indicated before with some occasions, *the identification of the democratization with the problem of the recognition of ethnic identities* constitutes the most apparent and warped one of this attitude….It is clear that introducing the politics of minority and diversity as the core of democracy is not a sincere and an amicable attitude.[51] [emphasis added]

Bahçeli points out the most evil that would be done to the country and to the democracy as: the reduction of the democratization process to the level of recognizing the rights of minorities, and the dominance of the ethnic-religious differences in the public sphere. The worry that these dangers would destroy *the social* structure is a subject that is met frequently in the discourse of the MHP. According to Bahçeli, this kind of politics destroys both the social structure and the ground of living together, also it paralyses the democratic order.[52]

As relevant to the positive presentation of the Helsinki Summit in the MHP's

---

49 Devlet Bahçeli, 20 November 2007. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=20112007 (accessed January 13, 2008.

50 Devlet Bahçeli, 29 February 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=29022000 (acessed December 12, 2007).

51 "En başta, bazı Avrupa Birliği yöneticilerinin Türkiye'ye yaklaşımlarında ve demokratikleşme meselesini takdim edişlerinde, dostluk ve işbirliği havasının yerine ikircikli ve önyargılı bir anlayış kendini hissettirmektedir. Daha önce de çeşitli vesilelerle işaret ettiğim gibi, *demokratikleşmenin etnik kimliklerin tanınması sorunuyla özdeşleştirilmesi*, bu yaklaşımların en bariz ve çarpık olanını oluşturmaktadır…. Azınlık ve farklılık politikasını demokrasinin özü olarak takdim etmenin, samimi ve dostane yaklaşım olmadığı açıktır." Devlet Bahçeli, 21 March 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21032000 (acessed December 12, 2007).

52 Devlet Bahçeli, "5 November 2000 MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

discourse, it is stated that there were established some balances related to minorities in the summit. Bahçeli says that "in the period after the Helsinki Summit, then, the issue of harmonization with the political criteria of Copenhagen composes the focus of the Turkey-EU debate. The component of those criteria that is 'the protection of and respect to the minorities' appears as the most sensitive matter."[53] According to Bahçeli, by the Accession Partnership Document in October 2000 the balances that were established in the Helsinki Summit were broken. The EU-Turkey relations began to be mentioned for the minority rights. The "warped" and "vague" statements were put to the document. The "warped" and "vague" statements that Bahçeli mentions are the "cultural rights" and "the differences regarding origin". Bahçeli says that "it is impossible for Turkey to regard the 'cultural' or 'ethnic rights' positively which would incite the ethnic clash and disintegration"[54] As these are the issues concerning Turkey's continuation, that would break the national unity and integrity, social structure, domestic peace and stable order. Especially, the right of education in the mother tongue that the EU demands from Turkey as a minority right is directed to develop a national identity and this overlaps the demands of the PKK:

> The entitling a legal statue as a cultural right to the languages and the dialects that Turkish citizens speak traditionally pave the ground for the developments that will damage the Turkey's social structure and national unity and for further demands. It should not be forget that, the right of the education at the mother tongue is demanded fundamentally as a minority right. This is the understanding of the European Union and the demand that it impose to Turkey. The intention is to creation of minority in Turkey forcibly. What we object is this point. The opening of this kind of way will serve for the political targets of the terrorist organization and of its followers which aim at the unitary state structure of Turkey and the national unity. In front of the act of the not-seeing this reality we feel bad about and we recent. As it is known, the bases of the aims of the divisive terror constitute to develop a common language for the creation of a separate national identity. With this way, it is aimed to create a separate nation identity and a state consciousness. The education and broadcasting in Kurdish are regarded as the most effective tools to alienate our Turkish

---

[53] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında*, 43.

[54] Devlet Bahçeli, 14 November 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=14112000 (accessed January 14, 2008).

citizens who have Kurdish origins and to establish the consciousness of a different national identity. When it is looked at from this perspective, with the legislation of the laws that the European Union imposed, it is taken a step to serve also for realization of this aim of the PKK. [55]

As it is seen, basically the issue of minority rights that is discussed around the Kurdish question, and the education in the mother tongue which is mentioned within these rights, take place as the "new game of the terrorist organization"[56] in the discourse of the MHP. The demand of the education in Kurdish exhibits the deceitful plan and the change in the strategies of the PKK after Öcalan's catching.[57] The PKK also aims "to use other languages apart from Turkish as a political propaganda language". This will pave way for making politics to create an ethnic minority.[58]

The plan of the PKK is supported by the EU. Because the EU prepares a ground through its impositions which is appropriate to the demands of the PKK: "by creating minorities forcibly" and by composing "a new national identity", it breaks

---

[55] "Türk vatandaşlarının geleneksel olarak konuştukları dil ve lehçelere kültürel bir hak olarak hukuki bir statü tanınması, Türkiye'nin sosyal dokusunu ve millî bütünlüğünü zedeleyecek gelişmelere ve daha ileri taleplere zemin hazırlayacaktır. Unutulmamalıdır ki, anadilde öğrenim hakkı temelde bir azınlık hakkı olarak istenmektedir. Avrupa Birliği'nin anlayışı ve Türkiye'ye dayattığı talep budur. Amaçlanan, Türkiye'de zorla azınlık yaratılmasıdır. Bizim karşı çıktığımız husus da budur. Böyle bir yolun açılması, terör örgütü ve yandaşlarının Türkiye'nin üniter devlet yapısını ve milli birliğini hedef alan siyasi amaçlarına hizmet edecektir. Bu gerçeğin görülmemesi karşısında büyük bir üzüntü ve infaal duymaktayız. Bilindiği gibi, bölücü terörün siyasi hedeflerinin temelini, ayrı bir millet şuurunun yaratılması için ortak bir dil geliştirilmesi oluşturmaktadır. Bu yolla, ayrı bir millet kimliği ve devlet bilinci yaratılması amaçlanmaktadır. Kürtçe öğrenim ve yayın, Kürt asıllı Türk vatandaşlarımızın yabancılaştırılmasının ve farklı milli kimlik şuurunun yerleşmesinin en etkili aracı olarak görülmektedir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, Avrupa Birliği'nin dayattığı yasaların çıkarılmasıyla, PKK'nın bu amacının da gerçekleşmesine hizmet edecek bir adım atılmıştır." Devlet Bahçeli, 10 August 2002. "Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=10082002 (accessed January 14, 2008).

[56] Devlet Bahçeli, 31 January 2002. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=31012002 (accessed December 13, 2007).

[57] Devlet Bahçeli, 20 January 2002, "Nevşehir Belediye Başkanları Toplantısındaki Konuşma", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=20012002 (accessed August 13, 2007).

[58] Devlet Bahçeli, 25 January 2007. "Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25012007 (accessed 14 September 2007.

the national integrity.[59] It tries to compose a new "ethnic consciousness"[60] To realize this the EU, as it is touched on above, demands two things: the first one is to allow the local radio and televisions broadcasting in Kurdish freely (without being subject to any control) in Turkey. The second one is the education in Kurdish as the mother tongue in the state schools. Because the language is seen as the most important tool "to weaken the Turkish citizens' Turkishness and national consciousness"[61]

According to Bahçeli, the demands regarding the language, on the other hand prepare a ground for the identity of *Türkiyelilik* ("Turkeyness"). The *Türkiyelilik* identity damages the sense of belonging to one nation. Indeed, by the term of **"**Türkiyelilik"[62], the way to discuss the ten thousand year of brotherhood of the Turkish Nation is opened; the concepts like "mosaic, subculture, ethnicity" leads to disintegration.[63] Each of these terminologies are a "delirium." [64]

---

59 "The MHP's reference with "the creation of minorities forcibly" apart from the minorities that were determined with the Lausanne Treaty, to give the minority status to the other groups. According to the Lausanne Treaty the Greeks, Armenians and Jews are on the minority status in Turkey. We have indicated that in the EU Turkey Progress Report dated November 8, 2006 apart from these, there are other groups needed to be considered as minority according to European standards. This situation in the MHP's discourse takes part as the "the EU's obsession of creating Muslim national minority in Turkey" Devlet Bahçeli, 11 November 2005. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=11112005 (accessed 14 September 2007; Devlet Bahçeli, 9 November 2006. "8 Kasım 2006 Günü Açıklanan Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlerleme Raporu ve Strateji Belgesi Hakkında Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=09112006 (accessed September 14, 2007).

60 Devlet Bahçeli, 15 June 2004. "Tarihî Görev Çağrısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2004/index.php?page=15062004 (accessed September 26, 2007; Devlet Bahçeli, 14 June 2006. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=14062006 (accessed September 26, 2007).

61 Devlet Bahçeli, 11 November 2005. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=11112005 (accessed September 14, 2007).

62 Devlet Bahçeli, 11 November 2005. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=11112005 (accessed September 14, 2007).

63 Devlet Bahçeli, 20 May 2006. "Tarih Yeniden Yazılacak Mitingi Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=20052006 (accessed September 27, 2007).

According to the MHP, the consept of self-determination that will cause the division is one of the impositions that is proposed to Turkey in the EU process. Besides, it is presented as a cultural right. In the 2003 Political and Civil Rights Agreement and in the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Agreement, which are mentioned as "twin agreements" , there are the expressions about "the right of determination of people's own destiny". Bahçeli states that this right is "*a very strong gun* that will be directed to *our national state structure and integrity*, in the hands of the countries and milieus which have plans concerning Turkey."[65] [emphasis added]: "The clause that 'all people would assign their own political statue freely' creates a situation that all religious and ethnic minorities would define their own political status freely." At the end, these developments according to Bahçeli create a ground for the dream of "the new corporate state of the two nations"[66]

6.1.3 "Religious-Sectarian Division"

The demands of the EU which will divide Turkey cover not only the ethnic minorities, but also the religious minorities. Therefore the division of Turkey is discussed not only on the ethnic base but also on the religion base in the discourse of the MHP in the EU process.

Bahçeli notes that the EU asserts that apart from the Sunni Islam in Turkey, other religions and sects don't have the freedom of worship. The EU says that the Syrian Orthodox religion is not recognized as a minority religion, and that they are faced

---

[64]   Devlet   Bahçeli,   30   March   2006.   "Basın   Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=30032006   (accessed November 27, 2007).

[65]   Devlet   Bahçeli,   19   June   2003.   "Basın   Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2003/index.php?page=19062003 (accessed December 23, 2007).

[66] Devlet Bahçeli, 15 March 2007. "Türkiye'de Giderek Ağırlaşan Ortam ve Son Siyasi Gelişmeler Hakkında   Yazılı   Basın   Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15032007 (accessed August 12, 2007).

with pressure in their worship. It contends that the Christian Churches have some troubles regarding new worship places and their possession. Besides, the Union requests Turkey to permit the Heybeliada clergy school to continue their activities in connection with the Greek Patriarchate of the Phanar (Fener). It demands this according to the principle of the protection of the minorities' religion and worship freedom which was recognized in the 1923 Lausanne Treaty.[67] According to Bahçeli, the EU by demanding Turkey to allow the usage of the adjective "ecumenical" for the Greek Patriarchate of Phanar (Fener), tries to prevent Turkey to intervene in the Church elections.[68] The danger that emerges through this way is the entitling the legal personality to the Armenian, Greek and Jewish communities. The members of these three communities will be entitled to have the real estate property freely. The foundations belonging to these communities will not be subject to legal supervision. There will be a new administrative regulation for the Armenian community.[69]

> The Ottoman Empire is the name of a great civilization where the people who have different ethnic origin, religion and language live all together in the atmosphere of tolerance and mutual respect and in peace. The Turkish Republic which was founded after the dissolution of the Empire also inherent this tolerance and the culture of living together of the Ottoman's. Inside the rudiments that were defined in the Lausanne Treaty the *non-Muslim religious minorities who live in Turkey were consigned to the Turkish state and to the nation's clemency and protection*. The Turkish nationalism idea that the Nationalist Action represents originate from the understanding of the conservation of this empire legacy with its all elements. *The non-Muslim minority members of the Turkish citizens* who tied their destiny and future to the Turkish nation's destiny and future, *are the honourable persons who have the same rights and responsibilities of the Turkish nation*. To look at them with foreign eyes and to exclude them is calumny which does not agree with the country moral of the Turkish nationalism.[70]

---

[67] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında*, 36.

[68] Devlet Bahçeli, 11 November 2005. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=11112005 (accessed September 14, 2007).

[69] Ibid.

[70] "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, farklı etnik kökene, din ve dile sahip bütün halkların hoşgörü ve karşılıklı saygı ortamında huzur içinde bir arada yaşadıkları büyük bir medeniyetin adıdır. İmparatorluğun dağılması sonrası kurulan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Osmanlı'nın bu hoşgörü ve bir

As can be seen, on the one hand Turkey is aimed to be separated on the basis of groups which currently have minority status. On the other hand, it is aimed to give a minority status to groups which are not in the minority status in Turkey. In another words, "efforts are done created a Muslim minority category".[71]

Therefore, it is attempted to compose a many-pieced social structure that is divided furthermore. Bahçeli says that according to the EU Parliament Turkey Report which was stated in September 5, 2006 the Alevi citizens are also accepted in the minority scope: "the demand of 'protection' of the Alevis is discussed with Greek minorities and with Yezidis."[72] Consequently, in the discourse of the MHP the method that is mentioned as "the creation of minorities forcibly" is wanted to be applied not only on the ethnic base, but also on the religious base. On the ethnic base Kurdish people; on the religious base the Alevis are tried to be termed as minorities.

In the discourse of the MHP, all elements that are mentioned above "point out the different dimensions of a project which is desired to be conducted in Turkey …… [and] we would see easily that [this project] does not overlap the people and the

---

arada yaşama kültürünü de tevarüs etmiştir. Lozan Antlaşması'nda belirlenen esaslar içinde *Türkiye'de yaşayan gayrimüslim dini azınlıklar, Türk devletinin ve milletinin şefkat ve himayesine emanet edilmişlerdir.* Milliyetçi Hareketin temsil ettiği Türk milliyetçiliği fikriyatı, bu imparatorluk mirasına bütün unsurlarıyla sahip çıkma anlayışına dayanmaktadır. Kaderini ve geleceğini, Türk milletinin kaderine ve geleceğine bağlamış olan *Türk vatandaşı gayrimüslim azınlık mensupları, Türk toplumunun eşit hak ve sorumluluklara sahip onurlu bireyleridir.* Bunlara sırf etnik kökenleri nedeniyle yabancı nazarıyla bakmak ve dışlamak, Türk milliyetçiliğinin vatan ahlakı anlayışıyla bağdaşmayan bir bühtandır." Devlet Bahçeli, 24 January 2007. http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=24012007 (accessed September 14, 2007).

[71] Devlet Bahçeli, 15 June 2004. "Tarihî Görev Çağrısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2004/index.php?page=15062004 (accessed September 26, 2007).

[72] Devlet Bahçeli, 19 September 2006. "TBMM'nin Olağanüstü Toplantıya Çağırılması ve Gündemdeki Son Gelişmelerle İlgili Yazılı Basın Açıklması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=19092006, (accessed September 30, 2007).

interests of this land."[73] The EU adventure of Turkey is finally a process "in which the treason scenarios to break down our national integrity and our unitary state structure impudently are staged"[74]: Bahçeli expresses that it has been gambled on Turkey's destiny in a very dangerous way. It is obvious that the aim of this is then "to draw Turkey into an ethnic disintegration and conflict process" [75]: Eventually, "the unity of the Turkish Nation who lives friendly altogether for ages"[76] , "our brotherhood that we improved with love along in thousand years, our peace and public order which is the foundation of our national solidarity"[77] are in danger.

> All Turkish citizens who have lived together for about a thousand year and who share a common destiny are equal and honourable children of the Turkish Nation. This steady national bond is the fundamental of the Turkish national identity and the Turkish Republic. The Turkish national identity does not mean to ignore the ethnic origins of the Turkish citizens who are the members of the Turkish Nation. No power will harm this national unity and integrity bond, [and] despite all incitements this solidarity spirit will remain standing well in the future like today and in the past. As we have said all the time, the Turkish Nation who is a big family is a flower garden that consists of different colours, different tonnage and smells. No power will manage to cause to leaf out couch-grasses in this heaven garden, by cultivating the ethnic faction. The state of Turkish Republic is unique; its country and nation are united. The ideal of one state, one nation, one flag, and language are the fundamental of our national unity and integrity and the most important guarantee of our

---

73 Devlet Bahçeli, 12 June 2001. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2001/index.php?page=12062001 (accessed January 13, 2007).

74 Devlet Bahçeli, 7 March 2007. http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=07032007 (accessed September 24, 2007).

75 Devlet Bahçeli, 19 March 2006. "Ülkemizdeki son Siyasi ve Sosyal Gelişmeleri Değerlendirdiği Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=19032006 (accessed January 13, 2008)

76 Devlet Bahçeli, 19 March 2006. "Ülkemizdeki son Siyasi ve Sosyal Gelişmeleri Değerlendirdiği Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=19032006 (accessed January 13, 2008).

77 Devlet Bahçeli, 20 May 2006. "Tarih Yeniden Yazılacak Mitingi Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=20052006 (accessed September 27, 2007).

future.[78]

As it is understood, all this narration, at the end corresponds to "the expression of collapsing the country from inside."[79] Indeed, "if the country is lost and if the nation is divided, there is no turning back of it."[80]

6.2 National Identities and Values

As it is touched on in the chapter four, the EU process is perceived as a part of the Westernization process. This means the perception that the West has threats against the Turkish national and moral values prevailed in a period within the EU context. Türkeş stated that there is no commonality in the social, cultural and political aspects between the Turkish nation and European Nations.[81] In the discourse of the party in the 1970s-1980s the idea that if the EU comprises the cultural and social integration, it would cause *a cultural and social deformation*, was dominant.[82]

In the 1990s the EU-national identity and values tension gained different dimensions for the MHP which tried to stand close to the EU . However, in these years the destructive/corruptive effects of the EU to the Turkish national-moral

---

[78] "Bin yıla yakın bir süredir beraber yaşayan ve ortak bir kaderi paylaşan bütün Türk vatandaşları, Türk Milletinin eşit ve onurlu evlatlarıdır. Bu sarsılmaz milli bağ, Türk milli kimliğinin ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti devletinin temel harcıdır. Türk milli kimliği, Türk Milletinin fertleri olan Türk vatandaşlarının etnik kökenlerini yok saymak anlamına gelmemektedir. Hiçbir güç bu milli birlik ve beraberlik bağını zedeleyemeyecek, bu dayanışma ruhu tüm tahriklere rağmen geçmişte olduğu gibi, bugün ve gelecekte de dimdik ayakta kalacaktır. Her zaman söylediğimiz gibi, büyük bir aile olan Türk Milleti, farklı renklerden, farklı ton ve kokulardan oluşan bir çiçek bahçesidir. Hiçbir güç, etnik nifak tohumları ekerek bu cennet bahçede ayrık otlarının yeşertilmesini başaramayacaktır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti devleti tektir, ülkesi ve milleti birdir. Tek devlet, tek millet, tek bayrak ve dil ülküsü milli birlik ve bütünlüğümüzün temeli ve geleceğimizin en önemli teminatıdır. Devlet Bahçeli, 13 August 2005. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=13082005 (accessed June 14, 2007).

[79] Devlet Bahçeli, 20 May 2006. "Tarih Yeniden Yazılacak Mitingi Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=20052006 (accessed September 27, 2007).

[80] Devlet Bahçeli, 9 December 2007. "Türkiye Tek Yürek Mitingi Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=09122007 (accessed January 11, 2008).

[81] *Ortadoğu,* 12 February 1976.

[82] Türkeş, "Milliyetçi Hareketin El Kitabı", 43.

values are not an emphasized theme. As it would be remembered, in 1999 when they came to power in the discourse of the party the subject about "in the process of globalization Turkey would become an active-leader country" stands in the forefront. It is regarded as a necessity for Turkey, which couldn't catch the dynamics of the Industrial Revolution, to catch the dynamics of the globalization process. However, it is also mentioned that while Turkey contributes to the globalization period, it is necessary "*to remain as itself.*"[83] This refers to the Party's perception of a 'Turkey which has a substance that is peculiar to itself.' What characteristics constitutes Turkey's "substance" in this perception come to the surface within the context of the EU-Turkey relation. As some of the threats in the EU process are against the characteristics that compose the national unity. Bahçeli says that "*our cultural, social and moral security walls* that would protect our nation from destructive influences and interventions *are on the verge of collapsing*."[84] [emphasis added] As it is obvious, it is indicated that not only the economic values of Turkey, but also the spiritual (social, cultural, and moral) resisting points are in danger in the EU process.

It is conveyed that the country should not give up being itself in the EU process. Nevertheless, in the discourse of the party in the EU process it is not explained in detail and extensively in which cultural, social and moral points Turkey would be weakened. In the Party Program 2000, it is indicated that the MHP aims to carry out the relation with the EU "in the context of respect and commitment to our national culture."[85] Bahçeli states that their aims are "to enable the Turkish nation to experience its national values that are formed in our deep history, and the developments which are the accumulation of the age together."[86] At this point, the tension of being included in the globalization process without losing the national

---

[83] Bahçeli, "2000 Yılı Vesilesiyle…", 55.

[84] Devlet Bahçeli, 9 December 2007. "Türkiye Tek Yürek Mitingi Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=09122007 (accessed January 11, 2008).

[85] "2000 Yılı Parti Programı" (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi), 98

[86] Devlet Bahçeli, *Yeni Çağa Bakış: Eleştiriler, Tespitler ve Öneriler* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 5 November 2000), 68.

values draws attention. However, in the EU context the focus of the reasons of this tension is on the point of the sovereignty lost. The existence of the threat against the national identity is being mentioned; but the problem is not explained in detail. It is contented only with touching on the issue. It could be said that the threat directed to the national identity is identified with some factors that will be touched on below.

In the discourse of the MHP, it has been mentioned that Turkey is contemplated as a passive subject whose independence is being limited in its relations with the EU. In the narration of the Party this situation consequently means that the dignity of Turkey has been destroyed. This kind of narration, on the one hand, points out the condition of Turkey as a state. However, on the other hand, it points out the threats directed to the national identity. Indeed, Bahçeli says that " As a nation, our living and development energy, the historical accumulation, devotion to our independence and honour constitute the greatest national wealth."[87] In other words, one of the characteristics that makes the Turkish nation itself is *the devotion to "independence" and "honour"*. Consequently, in the EU process, destroying the dignity of Turkey and restricting its independence means also attacking its "essence"/ "identity".

As it is indicated above, in the discourse of the MHP, in the EU process "the destruction of the social structure" is an important theme. The destruction of the social structure, on the one hand, points out the division of the country on the ethnic and religious base. However, at the same time, it is perceived as a threat towards the Turkish identity/essence which constitutes the Turkish nation. As Bahçeli states "the spirit of national brotherhood" is the most important value that characterizes the Turkish nation.[88]

In the EU process, on of the threat that is related to national identity is also related

---

[87] Ibid, 20.

[88] Devlet Bahçeli, 9 December 2007. "Türkiye Tek Yürek Mitingi Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=09122007 (accessed January 11, 2008).

to "language". Above it has been defined that the discussions on language were associated with the division of the country. However, another dimension of the discussions going around the language is related to the national identity. Bahçeli characterize the Turkish language as "the sacred part of our national identity" and "the most valuable treasure which carries Turkey from the past to the future".[89]

> The existence and the future of Turkey are directly proportional with the existence and future of the Turkish language. Turkish language beyond being a symbol and a tool of communication is *one of the fundamental values that makes us a nation*. Along with hundreds of generations, it has been shaped by the thoughts of our ancestors and by the contributions of the historical experiences.[90]

Subsequently, the restriction of the usage of the Turkish language on the one hand designates a national continuation problem. However, on the other hand, it damages the national identity which defines the Turkish nation and makes the Turkish nation itself. Therefore, in the EU process the broadcasting in the minority language, and the problem of education in the mother tongue are related with the threat of national identity. Indeed, according to Bahçeli, the education in the mother tongue which is discussed in the context of the Kurdish question and the minorities not only serves to become a multi-nations country. This will, at the same time, bring out a multi-identity structure.

As it is indicated, in the discourse of the MHP, the emphasis of the *Türkiyelilik* (Turkeyness) identity is one of the pre-phases of the division of Turkey. At the same time, it directly reflects an alternative to the identity of the Turkish nation. Thus, to become a Turkish citizen the upper identity is accepted as the fundamental principle. However, the *Türkiyelilik* debates that have come into prominence in the

---

[89] Bahçeli, "TBMM'de 2000 Yılı Bütçe Görüşmelerinde…",

[90] "Türkiye'nin varlığı ve geleceği, Türkçenin varlığı ve geleceğiyle doğru orantılıdır. Türkçemiz bir sembol ve anlaşma aracı olmanın ötesinde, *bizi millet yapan temel kıymetlerden biridir*. Yüzlerce kuşak boyunca, atalarımızın düşünceleriyle ve tarihî tecrübelerin katkılarıyla şekillenmiştir." Devlet Bahçeli, "5 November 2000 MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

EU process pave way to the sub-identities strongly. Bahçeli states that the sub-identities are important for the individuals' emotional-personal life; they could not be the criteria in administrative matters. Bahçeli lists three elements that unify the Turkish nation in one state of belongingness point: "Our shared denominator is the country, the flag and the love of nation. Our common value is to speak in Turkish. Our common point is to say "How happy is a man who says I am a Turk!"[91] However, it is expressed that the common identity that unifies the Turkish Nation at these points turns into a partite structure in the EU process.

6.3 Conclusion

In the previous chapters, the position of Turkey as a state in the EU process was discussed. Besides, again as a state its relationship with the EU in the discourse of the MHP was evaluated. In this chapter, however, the analysis has concentrated on how the country's atmosphere is established "on the national level" in the discourse of the Party in the EU process. As it is seen, the EU process threatens the national integrity and destroys the national identity. According to the MHP, the national identity, the language, the brotherhood spirit are being destroyed around the issues of the Turkeyness identity and of honour and pride. Besides, the EU process carries the danger of dragging the country into chaos and disorder by dividing the nation in Turkey. The EU prepares a ground for the division of the nation by supporting terrorism through various ways, by bringing out minorities on the ethnic and religious base. In the discourse of the Party the question of ethnic minorities is already a base for terrorism. They are not separate from each other. According to the MHP, the emphasis on the minorities (especially the ethnic ones) is a method of those who have always tried to divide Turkey. Indeed, in the 1970s a similar method was used by the supporters of the foreign ideology (Marxism). In the 2000s the similar method is being applied by using the concepts of human rights, minority rights, cultural rights and democratization. It should be declared that what I have tried to do in this chapter is not to make an in-depth analysis about the issues of

---

[91] Devlet Bahçeli, 9 December 2007. "Türkiye Tek Yürek Mitingi Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=09122007 (accessed January 11, 2008).

human rights, minority rights and the Kurdish problem in the MHP's discourse. A study of human rights, the minority and Kurdish question within the MHP's discourse is multi-dimensional. It should also be evaluated by a depth perspective from a historical point of view. Therefore, both its volume would go beyond the boundaries of this study, and it is not the aim of this study.

In the discourse of the MHP, in the EU process which is full of danger and threats, the positioning of the MHP itself, and the others apart from itself (in other words, in what kind of narration it locates) constitute the topic of the following chapter.

CHAPTER 7

MHP IN RELATION TO THE OTHERS

In the previous chapters, I discussed how the EU, the EU-Turkey relations and Turkey were established in the discourse of the MHP. Accordingly, it was seen that the periods before and after the 1999 Helsinki Summit were portrayed negatively. The EU process especially in recent years was defined as the "problem of existence/continuance". In the Party's discourse the EU process was described as a threat towards Turkey's independence, sovereignty, national integrity and national identity. In this chapter, the Party positions *itself*, in the picture which exhibits the EU-Turkey relations will be focused. In others words, it will be analysed with which characteristics the Party constructs itself as a subject in its discourse. At the same time, I will be describe how the Party constructs the other actors apart from itself.

7.1 Self-images of MHP

As it is indicated, in the discourse of the MHP the globalization on the one hand is a process that should be entered to become an active (leader) country. However, on the other hand, in the Party's discourse the tension between taking part in the process and avoiding the process draws attention. In the statements of Bahçeli in general the negations of the process could be summarized as: In the new age which is under the effect of the globalization process "an universal climate in which a barbaric competition and the cooperation endeavours, the expectation and the desperation, the chaos and the order shall separate from each other continuously with more tinny lines" will be dominant. The global enterprises emerge as "unrivalled empires". "A destruction campaign against the nation states and cultures in the brains" has been started. The problems of equality, justice and poverty have

been gaining a global dimension. The countries which have a high capacity of producing technology and know-how have been expanding the gap between themselves and the other countries. This situation impedes the stability and harmony in the international system. The negative effects of the globalization process have also a cultural dimension. The technological possibilities and the economic domination facilitates a one sided culture transfer. This situation threatens the national cultures and languages. Bahçeli says that "the dosage of the universal tension, which is observed between the progress of technologic and economic development and the plurality of civilizations and cultures will increase." In one of the researches that the AR-GE centre (the Research and Development centre) of the MHP published, it is asserted that in the globalization process "the sub-nation community identities are so politicized that they would threaten the national structure and social peace."[1] According to this research, the globalization process entered the agenda of "the nation-states which have been shaped by national sensitivities" with their complex structures. Bahçeli states that in the chaos of the globalization process the importance of nationalism in the world and in Turkey has increased:

> In the 21st century the democracy and nationalism will be the two key concepts of human plurality and solidarity. For this, those who regard nationalisms as an idea that completed its mission are the ones who behave with ideological prejudices. Nationalism together with democracy will continue to be the system of ideas and sensitiveness, whose importance will increase ever more in the new century.[2]

In the discourse of the MHP during the 1990s point out a troubled period for Turkey when the globalization process made us feel its effects. Beside the rapid

---

[1] *Türk Siyasetinde Yozlaşma ve Arayış Sürecinde Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi AR-GE, Nisan 2002), 22.

[2] "21. yüzyılda, beşeri çoğulculuğun ve dayanışmanın iki anahtar kavramı, demokrasi ve milliyetçilik olacaktır. Bunun için, milliyetçiliği, misyonunu tamamlayan bir fikir olarak görenler, ideolojik önyargılarla hareket edenlerdir. Milliyetçilik, demokrasi ile birlikte yeni yüzyılda giderek önemi artan fikirler ve duyarlılıklar sistematiği olmaya devam edecektir" Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

transformations that globalization brings, there are other developments as well. There is an international conjuncture with new balances in the world after the Cold War. In this period terrorism has increased in Turkey . According to Bahçeli due to these developments the 1990s is a period of "stagnation" and "fluctuation":[3] Besides the EU issue, the country was passing a hard period inside and outside. As it is touched on before, in the discourse of the MHP the 21st century is seen as a new but a formidable beginning. "It is a period in which Turkey and the world are experiencing important transformations."[4] In this beginning the MHP assigns itself the following mission:

> Today the very first historical task for us is to give this sacred country to the next generations spotlessly. Because this country is a treasure that is consigned to us. Therefore to give this trust with all of its beauties, with its national and moral wealth to next generations is the duty of all of us, duty of everybody. Well, *this is* the fundamental goal and basic duty of the existence of the *ülkü ocakları*. Therefore, it owns a very almighty, very honourable, very meaningful mission.[5]

Basically, the mission that the MHP assigned for itself is the continuation of the positioning style of Turkey in its history. In the discourse of the MHP, "to protect the country in a self-sacrificing way" is one of the leading themes. According to this, the hard and miserable periods of the Turkish history have been passed by the efforts of the Turkish nationalists. In the pessimistic periods of the Turkish history, the *ülkücüler* (those who support the *ülkü ocakları)* together with the country also

---

3 Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

4 Devlet Bahçeli, 27 May 2000. "Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği 55. Genel Kurul Toplantısındaki Konuşma", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=27052000 (accessed January 11, 2008).

5 "Bugün bizlere düşen ilk tarihî vazife, bu kutsal vatanı tertemiz bir şekilde gelecek nesillere teslim etmektir. Çünkü bu vatan bizlere emanet edilmiş bir hazinedir. Bu emaneti bütün güzellikleriyle, milli ve manevi zenginlikleriyle gelecek kuşaklara teslim etmek, hepimizin, herkesin boynunun borcudur. İşte *Ülkü Ocaklarının* temel varoluş gayesi de, temel vazifesi de budur. Bunun için çok ulvî, çok şerefli, çok anlamlı bir misyonun sahibidir." Devlet Bahçeli, 19 May 2000. "Ülkü Ocakları 19 Mayıs Şöleni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=19052000, (accessed January 7, 2008).

passed the examinations.[6] The MHP presents itself as the continuation of the group, who started and carried out the Independence War.[7] According to the narration of the MHP, the single-party-era also indicates a troubled period. Bahçeli indicates that especially the national-chief period along with the single-party-era has negative effects (especially on democratization). According to Bahçeli, in this period in the country there were experienced some oppressions. The Turkish nationalists in this atmosphere were the ones who actualized "the first social opposition against the oppressions."[8] Bahçeli says that Türkeş too conceived both the MHP and the Turkish nationalists "as the assurance of the Turkish state and nation and of its unity and livelihood."[9] The Turkish nationalists "advocated the unity and integrity for the Turkish nation for years, and in this direction they would never refrain from any self-sacrifice" even "they stood to the extensive costs".[10] In the MHP's discourse the Turkish nationalists are being constructed as the subjects who are "aware of their national duties and responsibilities".[11] It is emphasised that like in any period of history in the 21st century the MHP will be aware of its mission and responsibilities. Bahçeli says that "our understanding of responsibility about the national interests, national values and sensitivities of Turkey will be maintained in the forthcoming hard period."[12] In other words, the existence of the MHP is identified with the continuation of Turkey. In the party's discourse, in every danger

[6] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[7] Devlet Bahçeli, 3 May 1999. "Milliyetçiler Günü Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=03051999 (accessed November 19, 2007).

[8] Bahçeli refers 3 May 1944 Turkism Movement.

[9] Devlet Bahçeli, 4 April 2000. "MHP Yeni Genel Merkez Binası Temel Atma Töreni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=04042000_2 (accessed November 19, 2007).

[10] Devlet Bahçeli, 21 May 2000. "Erdemli Türkmen Şöleni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21052000 (accessed November 19, 2007).

[11] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[12] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 8.

that Turkey will encounter (in the context of EU, at the threat points that were mentioned) there emerges a protective MHP.

In the discourse of the MHP, it has been seen that in the EU process Turkey increasingly (2003 onwards) is presented as a country whose independence is in danger. The construction of Turkey –in an increasing way- as a country whose existence is in danger also strengthens the emphasis upon the necessity of the MHP. In this narration, while the country is losing its independence, those who will protect it are the Nationalists and the MHP. Therefore the MHP is presented as the protector of a country which is under siege from both inside and outside:

> To stop this dangerous situation and to start a national mobilization[13] collectively is a sacred mission of Turkey and of Turkish nationalists. Turkey is not desperate and abandoned. The *ülkücü* community is ready to instigate the nationalist consciousness and to say 'stop' to this situation. To broke this huge siege and to apply the new project of Turkey with a new vision is the honour debt of Turkish nationalists to its beloved nation: The Nationalist Action exists for this. As long as the Turkish nationalists exist, nobody would able to block Turkey to become a grand and a leader country. [14]

In recent years, in the discourse of the MHP the theme of 'to struggle on the point to protect country' has been intensified increasingly. It has been stated that in the MHP's discourse it is referred to the Independence War frequently. It has been also indicated that the Party presents itself as the continuation of the group who started the Independence War. It would be said that the MHP's struggle discourse regarding the EU is also established in a similar framework (the mobilization for independence). A struggle which will be carried out with the leadership of the MHP is mentioned. A call has been made to the Turkish nation:

---

[13] According to A. Smith the dea of "mobilization depends on people" points out the perception of ethnic nationalism. See. *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni,* 181.

[14] "Bu tehlikeli gidişe dur demek ve topyekun bir milli seferberlik başlatmak Türkiye ve Türk milliyetçileri için kutsal bir görevdir. Türkiye çaresiz ve sahipsiz değildir. Ülkücü camia, milli şuuru ayağa kaldırmaya ve bu gidişe dur demeye hazırdır. Bu büyük kuşatmayı kırmak ve yeni bir vizyonla, yeni bir Türkiye projesini hayata geçirmek, Türk milliyetçilerinin aziz milletine namus borcudur. Milliyetçi Hareket bunun için vardır. Türk milliyetçileri var olduğu sürece Türkiye'nin büyük ve lider ülke olmasının önünü kimse kesemeyecektir." Devlet Bahçeli, *AKP İktidarının Bir Yıllık İcraatı* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkez Yayınları, 2003), 22.

> The Nationalist Action will resist the darkening of the Turkey's future with all its conditions and with democratic ways; will do all his duties regarding the struggle to protect Turkey's unity, honour and pride; and will be the standard-bearer of this blessed struggle…. We invite all our citizens who love their country and nation to take part in this struggle.[15]

Consequently, in the MHP's discourse, the party's rhetoric regarding its own responsibility has evolved like this: the MHP while the 1990s closing is the vanguard that will make Turkey a leader country in the new age. It is a big share holder of a new period with the EU. However, the point which is reached in the relations with the EU means a disappointment for the MHP, and under this circumstances the party shoulder new responsibilities. The most important responsibility is to express 'the national sensitivities' in the EU process. With the AKP government, the Party has become a subject that struggles for the independent existence of Turkey.[16] Especially after the EU 2004 Turkey Progress Report, the MHP "was warning the Turkish nation and making a call….. It invites the Turkish nation to the mobilization of the spirit, and calls out the *ülkücü.*"[17] Finally, the Party presents itself as a vanguard of the collective defence and struggle against the EU. According to the MHP, within the negative conditions of the globalization both in the world and in Turkey the importance of nationalism have been increasing. However, beside this, in Turkey also with the conditions of the EU process, the need for the MHP/nationalists has been coming to a vital position. For the existence of the country there needs a nationalist power to protect it from the impositions of the EU. This discourse intensified at the end of 2006 when the country entered to

---

[15] "Milliyetçi Hareket, Türkiye'nin geleceğinin karartılmasına bütün imkanlarıyla ve demokratik yollarla karşı koyacak; Türkiye'nin birliğine, onuruna ve haysiyetine sahip çıkma mücadelesinde üzerine düşeni sonuna kadar yapacak; ve bu kutlu mücadelenin bayraktarı olacaktır …. Vatanını ve milletini seven tüm vatandaşlarımızı bu mücadelede saflarını almaya davet ediyoruz" Devlet Bahçeli, *AKP'nin Teslimiyet Belgeleri,* 24; Bahçeli 31 March 2007. "5. İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-Adana", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=31032007, (accessed June 17, 2007).

[16] At July 14, 2004 *"Tarihi Görev Çağrısı"* (A Historical Duty Call) that Bahceli made is an important indicator of this.

[17] Mehmet Şandır (MHP Asist. of General Chief) "Giriş" in Davut Merzifonluoğlu, *MHP Haklı Çıkmıştır* (Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2004), 1.

the election process (for the July, 2007 elections). Throughout the year 2007 this dominated the MHP's discourse. According to this, the MHP is "the guard of Turkey's national values and voice of the national conscience";[18] "The Turkish Nationalism is the most important assurance of the protection of Turkey's national unity."[19]

The MHP assign itself one more mission in the EU process : telling the truths to the nation. As in the MHP's discourse "in the EU process to conceal the truths from people" is an important theme.[20] According to Bahçeli, it is being hindered to perceive the threats sufficiently that the country is in; blackout campaigns are being performed.[21] At this point, the MHP constructs itself as a subject that realizes and shows the truths to everybody, and warns everybody as well. In this respect, it attributes itself a might.

7.2 The "self-sacrificing" MHP

In the EU context, the self-sacrificing narration of the MHP is being constructed in various ways. One of the frameworks that the self-sacrificing narration is established is the MHP's '*endurance* to being presented as the opponent of the EU while it is crying out the truths'.

As it is indicated before, the MHP's approach to the EU contains diversifications and contradictions. However, it has been indicated that the most important break within the Party's approach to the EU materialized 1990s onwards. The MHP's support of the EU membership, especially when it was in the coalition, is one of the

---

18 Devlet Bahçeli, 24 January 2007. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=24012007 (accessed June 12, 2007).

19 Devlet Bahçeli, 6 February 2007. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=06022007 (accessed November 15, 2007).

20 Devlet Bahçeli, 21 November 2000. "Basın Toplantısı, http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21112000 (accessed Septermber 28, 2007).

21 Devlet Bahçeli, *6. Ayında AKP İktidarı,*. 8; "İşte AKP'nin.."

points that take part in its discourse frequently. According to Bahçeli, the developments that are achieved during the EU process in a great portion is a result of the MHP's decisiveness. Compared to the progress that was made in 40 years in the relations with EU, more progress was made between 1999 and 2002.[22] However, on the other hand the MHP also expresses its "threats" that are pointed out before. At this point, in the discourse of the MHP, it is stated that to express the national sensitiveness leads to be perceived as a EU opponent. Therefore, the MHP presents itself frequently as the *sincere supporter* of the EU. It is stated that the Party "cares" and "takes the full membership process seriously" before everything.[23] The EU is shown as one of the basic and leading targets of Turkey and it is emphasised that the MHP supports the membership sincerely.[24] According to Bahçeli, the expressions of the MHP regarding the national sensitiveness (that are discussed in previous chapters) do not mean an opposition against the EU. "On the contrary, it is the proof of stating healthy relations with the EU and the full membership honestly and clearly."[25] The MHP explains its support for the EU with the country's interests. Bahçeli says that "they will stand behind the membership target which they believe is for the benefits of Turkey"[26]

In the discourse of the Party, the MHP is constructed as an *aggrieved* subject who is accused of being an EU opponent, although it supports the EU membership. According to Bahçeli, it was begun a dense campaign in every front and with using every possibility claiming that the MHP is an opponent of the EU. This campaign accelerated against the moral and responsible attitude of the MHP that takes the interests of Turkey before everything. This is a blackening campaign. The campaigns against the MHP are directed by some of the media, civil society

---

[22] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 144.

[23] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[24] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 1, 9, 24.

[25] Ibid, 62.

[26] Ibid, 134.

organizations and by some political milieus. The first pace of the campaign is to underestimate the sensitiveness that the MHP expresses and the second one is to guide Turkish people wrongly. The campaign is being carried out in the wrong ground . It is being created a dangerous division such as EU proponents and EU opponents. Consequently, the Turkish nation is being restricted with a preference between white and black.[27] According to Bahçeli, the relations with EU are being transformed to a simple advocacy matter.[28] Within this bilateral option:

> the EU opposition [of the MHP] by exaggerating is presented as an enmity and [the Party] is begun to be accused. Especially MHP too, is wanted to be dragged into a party position which blocks the way of a "train" that travels to EU Heaven and there created an image of there remains only a very short distance to reach its aim.[29]

According to this narration, because the MHP expresses the different sensitiveness (which are related with the national unity and integrity, the social texture, inner tranquility and order), it has been faced *unjust accusations*. The Party is tried to be presented as "an EU opponent who tries to leave Turkey behind this age".[30] According to Bahçeli, also the stagnation and the problems that occurred in the Turkey-EU relations are being charged to the MHP.[31] Besides, Bahçeli says that nationalism in our political history is an idea movement that have been exposed to the very most assault, accusation and slander.[32] Consequently, within the context of the narration of "self-sacrifice" that is indicated above, the MHP is constructed as a

---

[27] Ibid, 8-10, 124, 125; Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[28] Ibid.

[29] "[MHP'nin] AB karşıtlığı abartılarak düşmanlık gibi gösterilmiş ve [Parti] suçlanmaya başlanmıştır. Özellikle de Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi, AB Cennetine yolculuk yapan ve hedefine varması için de çok kısa mesafenin kaldığı imajı yaratılan bir "tren"in yolunu tıkayan bir parti konumuna sokulmak istenmektedir" Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 126.

[30] Ibid, 25.

[31] Devlet Bahçeli, "AKP İktidarının İlk Üç Ayının Değerlendirilmesine İlişkin Basın Toplantısı Metni" in *AKP İktidarının 90 Günü ve Son Gelişmeler* (Ankara: MHP, March 2003), 28.

[32] Devlet Bahçeli, 15 February 2007. "MKY Toplantısı Öneci Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15022007 (accessed Septermber 19, 2007).

subject who resists the accusations. In this narration the source of the power of resisting the accusations is the consideration of the country's interest. Indeed, the MHP "takes the interests of Turkey before everything."[33] Its target is "to provide the actualization of Turkey's integration with Europe by a sincere and self-respecting cooperation process, and to provide Turkey to take place in the EU which it deserves as an honourable member."[34]

As it is seen, in the MHP's discourse, the Party is tried to be shown as the opponent of EU; however on the contrary it is a party that supports the EU membership "with all its heart". The reason why the MHP is regarded as an EU opponent is, that it rejects concessions at the vital points in the EU process. This narration supplies the MHP to attribute itself a "heroism/boldness", who advocates the truths at the expense of to be presented as the EU opponent. Indeed, Bahçeli indicates that they will not get tired of discussing the Turkey politics of the EU administration, and they will not give up what they know as true with planned and malevolent campaigns.[35] Under these conditions, according to Bahçeli the MHP and the Turkish nationalists take power from their history and nation, and they are determined to defend national values and sensitiveness in every situation.[36]

It should be indicated that, this narration is more explicit in the period the Party is in power. In this period when both the negative characteristics of the EU and the positive ones are also mentioned, the MHP emphasised especially that it is not against the EU. However in the Party's discourse, parallel to the construction of the EU as an enemy-subject more clearly, this emphasis also became blurred. Moreover it is indicated that the nationalists will not let a second Sevrès in the relations with the EU. It is emphasized that there is a need of an interception of the relation process with the EU (especially after 2004 Turkey Progress Report). It is indicated

---

[33] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 124.

[34] Ibid, 10.

[35] Ibid, 132.

[36] Ibid, 142.

that there will be established "a new and proper" relationship with the EU.[37] On the one hand however, in 2007, it was referred to the EU as "the global actor that rolls to our national contexture"[38] At this point; in the MHP's discourse globalization hereafter is identified directly with the threat. The idea that the country should take part in became blur. Because, according to Bahçeli, the global impositions risk the security and well-being of the country . Indeed, everywhere in the world there are thousands of Turks and Muslims who are the victims of the imposition of globalization.[39] At this point, the MHP constructs itself as a subject who protects Turkey from the "global scenarios" that tries to split it.[40]

7.3 The "non-sensitive and betraying others"

It has been indicated that in the discourse of the MHP "the injustice that although it is a proponent of the EU, efforts are done to show it as an EU opponent" is a very important theme. In the party's discourse, there has been a focus on a systematic campaign against the MHP concerning the EU. As it is touched on above, those who carry out the campaign against the MHP are some of the media, civil society organizations and some political milieus. According to Bahçeli, the milieus mentioned try to present the right and legitimate sensitivities of the MHP as unimportant. They underestimate the MHP's EU approach with metaphors like "the Syndrome of Sevrès" "the paranoia of the division" and "the paranoia of change".[41]

> … unfortunately in our country too, it would be met with those who

---

[37] Şandır, "Giriş", 2.

[38] Devlet Bahçeli, 25 February 2007 "1. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25022007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

[39] Devlet Bahçeli, 3 March 2007. "Ankara Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=03032007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

[40] Devlet Bahçeli, 8 February 2007. "Teşkilatlara Göndermiş Olduğu Genelge", "http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=08022007 (accessed August 10, 2007).

[41] Devlet Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 25.

underestimate Turkey's national interests and honour. The existence of those who disregard the country's (where they live) history, its national sensitivities and its future is a disaster for Turkey especially in the painful periods. This mentality that is nurtured from warped and vindictive feelings is more serious than the international pressures and as natural it tries to dispraise our party too.[42]

As it is seen, in the MHP's discourse, those who object the Party's EU approach basically are the ones who object the national honour an national sensitivities. According to Bahçeli these "warped mentalities" are annoyed by the expression of "Turkey's national honour and interest" that the MHP states.[43] In other words these milieus would criticize the MHP, since they lack national sensitivity.

The mentality and meaning shifts emerge as a serious event especially at foreign politics and democracy debates. In these areas that sometimes even black and white mix each other, it draws attention that the essential minimum national sensitivity is not presented. … When it is like that, it become easy to blacken or refuse our Party's principle and politics of achieving the Turkey's unity and livelihood and its democratic and economic development together.[44]

As it is seen, in the discourse of the Party criticizing the MHP's approach to the EU is identified with disregarding the national interests. Those who criticize are then formulated like "those who are annoyed with defending a just and honourable

---

[42] "… maalesef ülkemiz içinde de, Türkiye'nin milli çıkarlarını ve onurunu küçümseyenlere rastlanmaktadır. Yaşadıkları ülkenin tarihini, milli duyarlılıklarını ve geleceğini hiçe sayanların varlığı, özellikle sancılı dönemlerde Türkiye için büyük bir talihsizliktir. Çarpık ve kinci duygulardan beslenen uluslararası baskılardan daha vahim olan bu zihniyet, tabii olarak partimizi de diline dolamaya çalışmaktadır" Devlet Bahçeli, 18 November 2000. "MYK Toplantısı Konuşması" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=18112000 (accessed June 12, 2007).

[43] Devlet Bahçeli, 21 November 2000. "Basın Toplantısı, http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21112000 (accessed Septermber 28, 2007).

[44] "Zihniyet ve anlam kaymaları, özellikle kritik dış politika ve demokrasi tartışmalarında ciddi bir vak'a olarak ortaya çıkabilmektedir. Bazen akla kara'nın dahi birbirine karıştırılabildiği bu alanlarda elzem olan asgari bir milli duyarlılığın sergilenmediği göze çarpmaktadır. …. Böyle olunca da, Partimizin Türkiye'nin birlik ve dirliği ile demokratik ve ekonomik gelişmesini bir arada başarma prensibi ve politikasını karalamaya kalkışmak ya da reddetmek kolaylaşmış olmaktadır" Ibid.

relationship with the EU." [45] Besides, in the discourse of the Party those milieus are the ones who "have problems with our cultural and moral values";[46] those who lost their national and moral sensitivities and who despise their national and historical belongingness.[47] Bahçeli mentions that in newspapers and televisions there are some people who regard their profession to be a MHP inspector.[48] Those people criticize the position of the Party randomly. Consequently, they underestimate the issue and they approximate to the issue in a one sided way and with prejudice.[49] As seen in the quotation above, the ideas of actors apart from the MHP within the country are characterized as "mentality shift", "meaning shift". Consequently, it is implied that the criticisms are too "unhealthy" to take into account.

Basically, in all this narration there exists one critical point that is denoted. In the MHP's discourse, it has been seen that the theme of "the foreign powers who plans the division of Turkey" exits. In the EU discourse of the Party too it has been seen that this subject comes into question. In the Party's discourse there takes place an insinuation that those who underestimate the MHP's sensitivities facilitate the job of foreign enemies.[50] Bahçeli says that "there has been prepared a very convenient socio-cultural, socio-economic and psychological base for the application of the historical desires that aim to split these land which is our homeland for thousand

---

[45] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

[46] Devlet Bahçeli, 21 March 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21032000 (accessed August 9, 2007).

[47] Devlet Bahçeli, 15 February 2007. "MKY Toplantısı Öneci Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15022007 (accessed Septermber 19, 2007).

[48] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 132.

[49] Devlet Bahçeli, 21 March 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21032000 (accessed August 9, 2007).

[50] Devlet Bahçeli, 15 February 2007. "MKY Toplantısı Öneci Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15022007 (accessed 19 Septermber 2007.

years ."[51] Even from time to time the insinuation that there has been conducted a cooperation with the foreign enemies becomes prominent. According to Bahçeli, some of the developments within the EU process (for instance the demand of opening the Clergy School) are the result of the "mysterious connections" of the political party in power. In the MHP's discourse those who ease the job of the enemy (especially the political party in power is mentioned) basically are presented as "the toys of those who wants to realize the dreams of Byzantine".[52] The story of the interior "traitors" who support the foreign enemy, in the narration, aggravates the country's condition even more. The emphasis made on the seriousness of the country's situation signifies the urgency for a solution. Consequently, the MHP emphasises as a protector that it is urgent for the MHP to be predominant over the situation.

It has been indicated that in the discourse of the MHP (especially 2003 onwards) the Turkey-EU relations appear increasingly as a one-sided dependency relationship. The condition Turkey and the Turkish nation fell into, is portrayed as a very dark picture. When all of these are taken into account, according to Bahçeli those who assault the MHP are sentenced in front of history and are mistaken.[53]

The emphasis on the tie between the movement that carried out the Independence War and the MHP is also functional for positioning the "others". Bahçeli defines the Turkish nationalism the MHP represents as the idea that saved the country from imperialism, constructs the country and unites the nation.[54] He says that the country is established on the axis of the nationalism and independence. Therefore according to Bahçeli "those who try to blacken and depress nationalism aim at the constituent

[51] Devlet Bahçeli, 3 March 2007. "Ankara Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=03032007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

[52] Bahçeli, *AKP İktidarın 1 yıllık İcraatı*, 19.

[53] "Bahçeli'nin AKP İktidarının İlk Üç Ayının Değerlendirilmesine İlişkin Basın Toplantısı Metni" in *AKP İktidarının 90 Gün ve Son Gelişmeler* (Ankara: MHP March 2003), 28.

[54] Devlet Bahçeli, 25 February 2007. "1. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25022007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

will of the Republic. Today the reason of the criticism on the nationalism is to split our state and corrupt our national integrity."[55] This narration identifies the criticism with "treason". Consequently, it marginalizes and invalidates the legitimacy of those who locate themselves outside the MHP.

7.4 "The submissive mentality" and the others as "West-admirers"

In the discourse of the MHP the "submissive mentality theme" which accepts the EU membership without questioning Turkey's situation/losses is used frequently. This submissive mentality causes the EU matter to be discussed on a narrow and shallow ground.[56] Therefore, it impedes to discuss the matter of the EU in a healthy environment. Consequently, it is claimed that the reason why the MHP encounters unjust accusations is this mentality.

It has been indicated that the MHP constructs itself as the actor who will protect the country in its discourse. The "submissive mentality" is located against this characteristic of the MHP. The contrariness of the MHP/nationalists who protects the country versus the submissive others is being established. Basically, in the MHP's discourse the emphasis of the submission is meaningful. The collapse of the Ottoman and the Independence War are the events/phenomenon that the MHP refers frequently when it constitutes its discourse. In my opinion, the "submissive mentality" in the MHP's discourse is employed to evoke the behaviour of the last period Ottoman governments/sultan that led the country to the collapse. Therefore, the narration of 'the submissive government versus the nationalists who carry out the independence struggle is being reproduced in the EU context. At this base, on one side of the equation there are "those who insist on the servility"[57] (*AB şakşakçılığında ısrar edenler*), on the other side there is the MHP who protects the country and its values. In this respect, there is another point that is striking. In the

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] Devlet Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında…*, 9, 25; "Bahçeli'nin AKP İktidarının İlk Üç Ayının Değerlendirilmesine İlişkin Basın Toplantısı Metni" in *AKP İktidarının 90 Gün ve Son Gelişmeler* (Ankara: MHP, March 2003) 28, 29, 30.

[57] Ibid, 29.

discourse of the MHP it is not clearly spelled out who is meant being as a representative of the submissive mentality in the period when the Party was in power. However, in the AKP period, the one who is pointed out by "the submissive mentality/milieus" is more directly the AKP government.[58] As it is touched on before EU is looked upon as damaging the honour of Turkey with some of its demands. According to Bahçeli, "the source of the courage of the EU to take the liberty of humiliating Turkey to this extent is the submissive AKP government."[59] The central office of the MHP in 2004 prepared a publication which evaluates the EU Turkey Progress Report. The name of this publication is the "*Submission Documents of the AKP*". With this name it is pointed out that: the documents of the EU related to Turkey are the concrete indicators of the submissive mentality of the AKP government. The submission in question originates from the irresponsibility about the national unity. According to Bahçeli, the AKP government in the relations with the EU is in a submissive attitude because of the concessions that are made on the subjects of our national unity and integrity.[60] According to the MHP, those who have the "submissive mentality" approach to the EU issue with self-seeking and random calculations.[61]

In the discourse of the MHP there is another point in the background of the submissive attitude that is focused on. That is the "admiration of the West". According to the MHP there is an admiration and an inferiority complex in those, who become supporters of the EU without paying attention to the critical points that are emphasized by the Party. According to Bahçeli, those who advocate the EU in this way only question and dispraise themselves; they worry about their inadequacies; they see the other side as absolutely right; they behave only with the reaction of accountability and "defence"; more than the West they are Western. In

---

[58] "Bahçeli'nin AKP İktidarının 6. Ayı Münasebetiyle Düzenlemiş Olduğu Basın Toplantısı", in *6. Ayında AKP İktidarı Gelişmeler, Gerçekler, Uyarılar* (Ankara: MHP, 1 June 2003), 8, 25, 27.

[59] "AKP'nin Teslimiyet Belgeleri..."

[60] Ibid.

[61] Devlet Bahçeli, 5 November 2000. "MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

any case they want to enter the EU; they don't approach to the issue multi-dimensionally and realistically.[62] Bahçeli says that these "circles" see Turkey at fault in every issue related to foreign politics beforehand.[63] In the period that the MHP was in power the term of "admiration of the West" referred rather to the media and to some politicians in general[64]. With the AKP government the term of West admiration too began to be employed more for the AKP.[65] Bahçeli says that "the political power attributes blessedness to the EU."[66] It would be said that while he constructs the EU discourse, via the criticisms of the EU he defines their interior enemies/opponents.

In the MHP's discourse the Western admiration "points out a mentality that has problems with national unity, national identity and with national values."[67] This is a mentality that conflicts with national values; it is to become "passion of the foreign"[68] (the MHP puts the "passion of Turkey" ("Türkiye Sevdalısı") against this)

The narration above presents that the MHP constructs itself as the only protector of the existence and unity of the country. The MHP has positioned itself against the "Western admirers". Therefore, it constructs itself as the subject who protects also

---

[62] Bahçeli, *Son Gelişmeler Işığında,* 30, 134, 139

[63] Devlet Bahçeli, 15 February 2007. "MKY Toplantısı Öneci Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15022007 (accessed September 19, 2007).

[64] Devlet Bahçeli, 6 December 1999. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=06121999 (accessed July 27, 2007).

[65] While the election date come close to, the "other" in the MHP' discourse firstly pointed out the MHP, and later the Prime Minister (Recep Tayyip Erdoğan).

[66] *6. Ayında AKP İktidarı Gelişmeler, Gerçekler, Uyarılar* (Ankara: MHP, 1 June 2003), 27

[67] Devlet Bahçeli, 15 February 2007. "MKY Toplantısı Öncesi Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15022007 (accessed September 19, 2007).

[68] Devlet Bahçeli, 25 February 2007. "1. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25022007 (accessed August 5, 2007); Devlet Bahçeli, 21 April 2007. "7. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı-Konya", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=21042007 (accessed November 16, 2007).

the "core culture" of the nation. What is emphasised is this: Beside the concrete existence of the country, the assurance of the moral values of the nation is the MHP.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

As can be seen in the previous chapters, the MHP's perception of the EU has varied in the course of time. Besides, contradictory aspects coexisted in this discourse within the same period of time as well. In the 1970s, the party characterized the EU as "an economic organization", and considered it 'harmful' in social and cultural terms. The reason of this is the worry felt due to the 'corrupting' influence of Western civilization. This way of perception had taken its place in the MHP's discourse for a long period. Following the signature of the Customs Union Treaty, the level of negativity has increased in the discourse. The EU was seen as a discriminatory and exclusionist party, intending to subjugate Turkey. This completely negative discourse had been changed in 1999. Turkey's candidacy to the EU membership was realized in 1999, when the MHP was a partner in the coalition government. For a while, the party avoided to openly emphasize the image of "enemy" while mentioning the EU. On the contrary, the EU started to be portrayed in the discourse as a party, which had become aware of Turkey's power and importance. In the 2000s, the EU's negative aspects started to be mentioned in addition to its positive aspects. However in this period, a 'complaining tone' prevailed in the discourse. The EU is a party having such defects as confusion and prejudice rather than being an enemy. The MHP has brought the theme of 'disappointment' to the forefront related to the EU before the November 2002 elections. Accordingly, it was stated that the EU had been approached with hope but it had proposed 'surprising' attitudes and conditions. It can be said that, the theme of disappointment paved the way for MHP to portray the EU as the 'enemy' again. It served to legitimize the formation of a completely negative picture of the Union with a steep turn, which had been mentioned positively in 1999. The party, which couldn't have a seat in the parliament as a result of the November 2002 elections,

adopted a very aggressive discourse related to the EU. The degree of this aggressiveness has increased gradually.

A similar course of events can be seen in the perception of EU-Turkey relations and in the perception related to Turkey's position in these relations. In the period before the 1999 Helsinki Summit (that is, the period before MHP was a government party), the MHP had stated that the relations are stagnant and negative. According to this view, there are ebbs and flows, troubles and disappointments in the relations. Stagnancy, uncertainty, crises and interruptions are the other characteristics of the period. In this period, there is no significant acceleration in the relations. The negation in this narrative actually serves to highlight the 'progress' which is claimed to take place in 1999. According to the MHP's narrative, in this negative process, a 'change in the destiny' had been achieved in the year 1999. This turning point meant a new period in the relations. It was expressed that the relations had attained an 'equitable' nature. Necessity and importance of Turkey's involvement in the globalization process were emphasized in this period. Turkey was presented with the ideal of leader country, which would be effective in this process and would shape the world. The EU was presented as being an appropriate means of catching up with the process. However, this discourse hadn't lasted for long. With the AKP government, MHP started to emphasize that the relations turned into a one sided dependency relationship. In this picture, Turkey has gradually been portrayed in a more passive position. It was underlined that Turkey is at the risk of losing its sovereignty and unitary state structure. This situation was attributed to Turkey's gradually decreasing decision making authority in the domestic and foreign politics. It was expressed that Turkey's strategically important territories are desired to be disintegrated by some powers just like it has been throughout the history. At this point, hurting Turkey's pride comes up as an important theme. It was stated that Turkey, as an independent and respectable country, is confronted with an unfair treatment. Besides, MHP had often referred to the War of Independence and thus transmitted the message that Turkey is occupied in a sense. There is the danger that such a discourse can be used as a justification ground for more aggressive

157

nationalisms. Legitimising the use of violence by the cause of 'defending country' can catalyze the aggressiveness of the masses.

MHP has also combined the influences of EU process on the domestic atmosphere with a similar theme of 'threat'. The EU process threatens two things especially: National integrity and national identity. National integrity is in danger due to rising chaos environment in the country. The EU supports this implicitly through supporting terrorism and bringing out ethnic and religious minorities. In the party's discourse, the matter of ethnic minorities is already considered as a ground for terrorism. The issues of terrorism and minorities can't be separated from each other. According to MHP, highlighting the minorities (especially the ethnic minorities) is a long standing method used by those who want to disintegrate Turkey. They indicate that, a similar method was also used in the 1970s by the supporters of a foreign ideology (Marxism). It is stated that by the 2000s, this method is applied by using concepts like human rights, minority rights, cultural rights and democratization. Therefore, these concepts are always approached with suspicion by the party. It's quite worrying that a political party that has decision making authority approaches these concepts, which are crucial in the democratization of a country, with this kind of a suspicion. The national identity (especially the spirit of language and brotherhood), which is another element threatened by the EU process, is said to be eroded around the issues like identity of being from Turkey, honour and personal dignity.

The MHP emphasized the need for a saver as much negative as it outlined the picture of the EU-Turkey relations. This saver is offered to be the MHP. The party highlighted its awareness of national sensitivities, duties and responsibilities. It identified itself as being the pioneer of the struggle of independence that was to be fought; and it called for this. The MHP portrayed also 'the ones in the counter party' with some characteristics. In the process of Turkey-EU relations, non-MHP actors have been attributed with certain characteristics. Accordingly, these actors have a tendency to surrender. They admire the West; and preventing healthy argumentation on the issue, they discuss it on a limited and superficial platform. In

this way, the MHP presents itself as the actor who protects the country on the one hand; and on the other hand, it positions itself against the "admirers of the West". In this way, it constructs itself as a subject, which also protects the "essential culture" of the nation. The emphasis is upon: The MHP is a guarantee for the nation's moral values as well as the country's concrete existence. It can be said that, the MHP suggests a reformation through a nationalist mindset under its leadership. In addition to this, the party points out the EU as the external enemy, and their 'collaborators' in the country. These collaborators are sometimes the government party, other parties, the EU supporters, and sometimes minorities even only implied.

The worries uttered by the party around the EU framework are related to the points, which were discussed in a broader framework by some thinkers (especially hyperglobalists) to be eroded through the globalization process: Transfer of the nation-state's sovereignty in the political field, and threatening of national cultures in the socio-cultural field. Similar to the discourse of skeptics, the MHP also states that, in the globalization era, nation-states and nationalism will not only remain to be important but also gain power gradually. Nationalism is seen as the best adhesive within the changing order due to globalization. It's offered as a protective thought within the chaos of the new order. The MHP's discourse on the EU points out a field where the worldwide tension between globalization and nation-state/nationalism is materialized in the context of Turkey.

The party's discourse on the EU has also been shaped by its traditional structure. The MHP's approaches such as fear of foreigners, perception of a continuous threat, claim of being the real possessor of the state, nation (and its values), which are the approaches inherent in the party's discourse throughout its history, can also be observed in the issue of EU.

There are views that the MHP has experienced some kind of 'moderation' since the 1990s. This 'change' can be traced in the context of EU. In this period, the MHP has occasionally stated that, to be included in the Union is necessary for strategic reasons. However, the actual influence of the mentioned 'change' on the discourse

159

is to render it quite complicated and contradictory. As a matter of fact, despite all the negative/fierce approach, the MHP doesn't express its opposition to Turkey's EU membership in an open and clear manner. On the contrary, it complains about appearing/being depictured as if it is against the EU. On the one hand, it complains that globalization and the EU serve to politicize the minorities. Therefore, there is a phenomenon whose influences should be avoided. On the other hand, it emphasizes the necessity of getting involved in this process as a requirement of the new era. This articulation requires 'compromise' in terms of the points that the party highlights as 'national sensitivities'. Consequently, the party's discourse exhibits an uncertain and contradictory structure due to staying in between. The MHP tries to overcome this 'crisis' by means of highlighting to be the 'leader country' in the process. There would be an involvement in the process but the 'greatness' of Turkey wouldn't be compromised. In this way, the MHP has transmitted the required message to its voters; and at the same time, it was trying to save itself from being regarded backward.

In the dark picture outlined in MHP's discourse on the EU, the year 1999 looks like a 'point'. Only the Helsinki Summit held in the period when the MHP was in power could be assessed as a positive step by the party. On the one hand, the MHP legitimizes this on the basis of keeping up with the era; and on the other hand, it explains that the National Programme, signed in the framework of adaptation to the European Union when it was a government party, involves hard conditions.

On the other hand, the party can't be said to adopt a positive discourse related to the EU during the whole period when it was a government party (between 1999 and 2002). Shortly after Turkey's becoming a candidate country, it again started to portray the EU in negative terms although not very severely. This situation can partly be said to be related to the dynamics of domestic politics. It can be said that, the MHP's anti-EU attitude aimed to oppose to the *Anavatan Partisi/ANAP* (Motherland Party), one of the coalition partners which pursued a pro-EU policy in that period. Today as well, the MHP uses the EU issue as a means of opposition to the government party. The pessimism of the picture portrayed related to the EU

creates a suitable condition in order to criticize the AKP government that pursues a pro-EU policy.

Of course, accession to the EU had been a painful process for many countries. Every country had gone through debates involving tensions and uncertainties within the framework of their domestic conditions. Turkey has been discussing the issue within the framework of its own historical, political and cultural conditions. It is also useful that the critical points uttered by the MHP have been discussed. However, a discourse focusing on 'enemy' and 'collaborationist domestic betrayers' can lead to the danger of approaching every identity demand from this perspective. Besides, the discourse in question blocks a multi-dimensional argumentation of the issue.

The study aims to analyse the MHP's official discourse. There certainly exist different views both inside and around the MHP. At the same time, a gap/difference between the MHP's administrators/centre and its voters has been mentioned. This study can be considered as the beginning of another future study related to the voters' discourse on the EU. By means of a future comparative study, important data would be obtained through looking into the overlapping and confronting points between the party's and its voters' discourses on the EU.

REFERENCES

"Alparslan Türkeş ile Kıbrıs Konusunda Bir konuşma", *Devlet*, 5 August 1974, no: 248.

Ağaoğlu Ahmet. "İpitidaî Türk Aile Hukuku ile İptidaî Hindo-Avrupaî Aile Hukuku Arasında Mukayese" , in *I. Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları.* İstanbul: BTTK, 1932.

Ağaoğulları, Mehmet Ali. "The Ultranationalist Right", in *Turkey in Transition: New Perspectives*, eds. Irwin Cemil Schick and E. Ahmet Tonak. New York: Orxford University Press, 1987.

Ahmad, Feroz. *The Making of Modern Turkey.* Kindle ed. Taylao & Francis, 2007

Akçakoca, Amanda Enlargement and neigbourhood Europe Programme, European Policy Centre, September 2004.

Akçam, Taner *Türk Ulusal Kimliği ve Ermeni Sorunu.* İstanbul: İletişim, 1995.

Akçura, Yusuf. *Türkçülük.* İstanbul: Toker, 2000.

Akçura, Yusuf. *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset.* Ankara: Lotus, 2008.

Afetinan, A. *Atatürk ve Tarih Tezi.* İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1939.

Anderson, Bendict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 1991.

Arıkan, Burak. "Türkeş'ten Bahçeli'ye MHP: Değişim Nereye Kadar?" in *Milliyetçilik, Faşizm ve MHP*, ed. Seyfi Öngider. İstanbul: Aykırı Güncel, 2002, 39-70.

Arslan, Emre. "Faşizmin Siyaseti: MHP'nin İktidar Bloğu Karşısında Değişen Strateji ve Konumları", *Praksis* (2002) (5), 302.

Atsız, Nihal "Türkçülük". *Orhun*, no: 10 (1973 October) Ankara: Türk Ülküsü, Ayyıldız Matbaası.

Bayraktutan, Yusuf. *Türk Fikir Tarihinde Modernleşme, Milliyetçilik ve Türk Ocakları*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1996.

Beck, Ulrich. *Siyasallığın İcadı.* çev. Nihat Ülner. İstanbul: İletişim, 1999.

Berkes, Niyazi *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma.* İstanbul: YKY, 2002.

Betz, Hans Georg. "The Growing" Threat of the Radical Right", in *Right Wing Extremisim in the Twenty-first Century*, eds. Peter Merki & Leonard Weinberg. London: Routledge, 2003, 74-93.

Billig, Michael, Banal Nationalism. London: Sage, 1995.

Breuilly, John *Nationalism and State.* 2nd ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Büyükuslu, A. Rıza. "Küreselleşmenin Sosyal ve Kültürel Hayata Etkisi" in ed. V. Bozkurt, *Küreselleşmenin İnsani Yüzü*, İstanbul: Alfa, 2000, 115-128.

Bora, Tanıl. "Türkiye'de Milliyetçilik Söylemleri: Melez Bir Dilin Kalın ve Düzensiz Lügati", *Birikim,* vol. 67(November 1994), 9-24.

Bora, Tanıl & Kemal Can, *Devlet ve Kuzgun: 1990'lardan 2000'lere MHP.* 2nd ed. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004.

Boztemur, Recep. "Tarihsel Açıdan Millet ve Milliyetçilik: Ulus-Devletin Kapitalist Üretim Tarzıyla Birlikte Gelişimi". *Doğu Batı*, no. 38 (2006): 161-179.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Milliyetçi Düşünce ve Sömürge Dünyası.* trans: Sami Oğuz. İstanbul: İletişim, 1996.

Copeaux. E. "Türk Milliyetçiliği: Sözcükler, İşaretler, Tarihler" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce-Milliyetçilik*, v.: 4, 2nd ed., İstanbul: İletişim, 2003, 44-52.

Çalık, Mustafa *Siyasi Kültür ve Sosyolojinin Bazı Kaynakları Açısından MHP Hareketinin Kaynakları ve Gelişimi (1965-1980).* Ankara: Cedit, 1995.

Erbaş, Hayriye. "Küreselleşme ve Ulus-devletin Aşınımı Sürecinde Toplumsal Eşitlik/Adalet", *Doğu Batı*, no: 13(2000), 213-224.

Erdoğan, Mustafa "Siyaset ve Hukuk Perspektifinden Küreselleşme" in *Siyasi, Ekonomik ve Kültürel Boyutlarıyla Küreselleşme.* İstanbul: Ufuk 2002, 25-44.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Ethnicity & Nationalism: Antropological Perspectives.* London, Boulder, Colorado, 1993.

Erkızan, Hatice Nur "Küreselleşmenin Tarihsel ve Düşünümsel Temelleri Üzerine", *Doğu Batı*, no: 18 (2002), 65-79.

Esat Bey. "I. Türk Tarih Kongresi Açış Konuşması", in, *I. Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları*. İstanbul: BTTK, 1932.

Gelekçi, Cahit *Küreselleşme ve Milli Kültür.* Ankara: Hacettepe Univ. Social Sciences Faculty, unpublished PHd thesis. 2003.

Giddens, Anthony. *Modernliğin Sonuçları.* trans. Ersin Kuşdili İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 1998.

Gellner, Ernest. *Thought and Change.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolcon, 1964.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

Georgeon, François "Yusuf Akçura" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce-4: Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2003, 505-511.

Göçek, Fatma Müge. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Oluşumu: Sosyolojik Bir Yaklaşım". *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: 4-Milliyetçilik*. 2nd. Ed. İstanbul: İletişim, 2003, 63-76.

Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak.* 4th ed. İstanbul: Toker; 1997.

Gökçe Orhan,. "Milli Kültür ve Küreselleşme" in *Milli Kültürler ve Küreselleşme*, eds. B. Yediyıldız, M. Ç Özdemir, F. Unan. Ankara: Türk Yurdu Yayınları, 1998, 285-291.

Göksu Özdoğan, Günay *"Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a: Tek Parti Döneminde Türkçülük (1931-1946).* İstanbul: İletişim, 2002.

Güngör, C. "Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi", in, *27 Mayıs ve Partileşme Sorunu*, ed. C. Güngör. Ankara: Nurol, 1992.

Hall, John A. "Nationalisms, Classified and Explained" in *Notions of Nationalism*, ed. Sukumar Periwal Budapest, London, New York: Central European University Press, 1995.

Hall, Stuart "Yerel ve Küresel: Küreselleşme ve Etniklik", in *Kültür, Küreselleşme ve Dünya Sistemi*, ed. A. D. King. trans. Hakan Tuncel, Ankara: Bilim Sanat, 1998, 39-61.

Handler, Richard *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Hanioğlu, Şükrü. *Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti ve Jön Türklük*, Cilt: 1 (1989-1902). İstanbul, İletişim, 1989.

Heper, Metin. "'Başkalaşmadan' Değişen Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi," *Türkiye Günlüğü* (March-April 1999), 12-22.

Hirst P. and G. Thompson. "Küreselleşme ve Milli Devletin Geleceği" *Türkiye ve Siyaset*, trans. Selçuk Can, no: 5 (2001) (November-December), 126-145.

Hosbawm, E. J. *1780'den Günümüze Milletler ve Milliyetçilik.* 3rd ed. İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 2006.

http://www.belgenet.com/hukumet/57h.html (accessed October 13, 2007)

http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=67586 (accessed January 13, 2008).

Interview with European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso: www.euobserver.com

İpekçi, Abdi *Liderler Diyor ki.* İstanbul: Ant Yayınları, 1969.

İskenderoğlu, Muharrem "Küreselleşme, Ulus-devletin Geleceği ve Türkiye", *Türkiye ve Siyaset*, no: 5 (2001) (November-December), 191-210.

Kaplan, Baturalp "Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri ve Gümrük Birliği", *Türkiye ve Siyaset*. No: 8 (2002) (May-June), 17-32.

Karpat, Kemal *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi.* İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1967.

Karpat, Kemal. *Osmanlı Modernleşmesi: Toplum, Kuramsal Değişim ve Nüfus*, Ankara: İmge, 2002.

Karpat Kemal. *İslam'ın Siyasallaşması*. çev. Şiar Yalçın. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yay., 2004.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar.* İstanbul: İletişim, 1995.

Keyman, Fuat, Ali Yaşar Sarıbay. "Giriş: Küreselleşme, Siyaset ve Toplumsal Yaşam" in *Küreselleşme, Sivil Toplum ve İslam*, ed. F. Keyman, A. Y. Sarıbay, Ankara: Vadi, 1998, 9-13.

Keyman, Fuat "Globalleşme ve Öteki Sorunu: Postmodernizm, Feminizm, Oryantalizm" in, *Küreselleşme, Sivil Toplum ve İslam*, ed. F. Keyman, A. Y. Sarıbay. Ankara: Vadi, 1998, 201-225.

Kitschelt, Herbert & Anthony McGann, *The Radical Right in Western Europe.* Michigan: Michigan University Press. 1997.

Kloos, Peter. "The Dialectics of Globalization and Localization" in *the end of Globalization: Bringing Society Back*, ed. D. Kalb and others. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2000, 281-297.

Koçdemir, Kadir "Küreselleşme ve Türk Kültürü". *Kök Araştırmalar Dergisi*. Vol 1, no: 1 (1999) (Spring), 5-20.

Landau, J. M. *Radical Politics in Modern Turkey.* Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Landau, Jacop M. *Pan Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation.* London: Hurst, 1995.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Political Language of Islam*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991.

Lewis Bernard. *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey.* 3rd rev. Ed. USA: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Mackay, Hugh. "The Globalization of Culture" in *An Introduction to the Social Sciences Understanding Social Change, a Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*. ed. D. Held. London and New York: The Open University, 2000, 47-84.

Mardin, Şerif. "Üç sorun Üç Çözüm", in, *1978 Yılına Girerken ve 1980'lere Doğru Görüşler Öneriler.* İstanbul: TÜSİAD Yayını, 1978.

Mardin, Şerif. *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1996.

Mardin, Şerif. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri*, İstanbul, İletişim, 2000.

McGrew, Anthony. "Globalization: Conceptualizing a Moving Target" in *Understanding Globalization: the Nation-state, Democracy and Economic Policies in the New Epoch*. ed. J. Eatwell, E. Jelin (Stockholm: Pierre Frühlig, 1998), 11; Ohmae, Kenichi. *Ulus-Devletin Sonu, Bölgesel Ekonomilerin Yükselişi*. trans: Zülfü Dicleli. İstanbul: Türk Henkel Dergisi Yayınları, 1998, 7-30.

McGrew, Anthony. "Power Shift: From National Government to Global Governence" in *An Introduction to the Social Sciences Understanding Social Change, a Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*. ed. D. Held London and New York: The Open University, 2000, 127-167.

Nalbantoğlu, Muhiddin .*Alparslan Türkeş ile Tarihi Aydınlatan Sohbetler*. İstanbul: Hamle, 1994.

Nikolas, Margareta Mary. 1999. "False Opposites in Nationalism: An Examination of the Dichotomy of Civic Nationalism and Ethnic Nationalism in Modern Europe".

http://www.nationalismproject.org/articles/nikolas/ch3.htm (accessed August 11, 2007).

Oran, Baskın. *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği.* Ankara: Bilgi, 1990.

Ortadoğu, 12 February 1976.

Ortaylı, İlber. "Osmanlı Kimliği". *Cogito*. No: 19 (1999 August). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi.

Öğün, S. Seyfi. *Türkiye'de Cemaatçi Milliyetçilik ve Nurettin Topçu.* İstanbul: Dergah, 1992.

Önem, Nizam *İki Turan: Macaristan ve Türkiye'de Turancılık.* İstanbul: İletişim, 2005.

Özkırımlı, Umut. *Milliyetçilik Kuramları Eleştirel Bir Bakış.* Ankara: Doğu Batı, 2008.

Özkırımlı, Umut *Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye-AB İlişkileri.* İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2008.

Plamenatz, John "Two Types of Nationalism" in *Nationalism: The Nature of an Evolution of an Idea*, ed. Eugene Kamenka. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1975.

Poulton, Hugh. *Top Hat, Grey Wolf and Crescent.* London: Hurst Company, 1997.

Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?", in *Becoming National: A Reader*, eds. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, 41-55.

Ritchie, Jane. "The Applications of Qualitative Methods to Social Research" in *Qualitative Research Practice,* ed. Jane Ritchie and Jane Lewis. London: Sage, 2003.

Ritzer, George *Toplumun McDonaldlaştırılması, Çağdaş Toplum Yaşamının Değişen Karakteri Üzerine Bir İnceleme.* trans. Şen Süer Kaya, İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 1998.

Robertson, Roland. "Mapping the Global Condition: Globalisation as the Central Concept", in *Global Culture, Nationalism, Globalisation, and Modernity*. ed. Mike Feat Herstone. London: Sage, 1990, 15-30.

Robertson, Roland "Toplum Kuramı, Kültürel Görecelik ve Küresellik Sorunu" in *Kültür, Küreselleşme ve Dünya Sistemi*. ed. A. D. King. trans: Gülcan Seçkin & Ümit Hüsrev Yolsal, Ankara: Bilim Sanat, 1998, 97-120.

Sakallıoğlu Ü. C. & Janvier-Mai. "The Ideology and Politics of the Nationalist Party of Turkey" in C.E.M.O.T.I. (v. 13, 1992), 144-153.

Samih Rıfat. "Türkçe ve diğer Lisanlar arasında İrtibatlar", in, *I. Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları.* İstanbul: BTTK, 1932.

Santamaria, Yves. "Ulus-Devlet: Bir Modelin Tarihi" in *Uluslar ve Miliyetçilikler.* ed. by Jean Leca. Trans: Siren İdemen, İstanbul: Metis. 1998.

Sarıbay, Ali Yaşar "Kültürel Bir Olgu Olarak Globalleşme" *Siyasi Ekonomik ve Kültürel Boyutlarıyla Küreselleşme.* İstanbul: Ufuk, 2002, 45-54.

Sarınay, Yusuf. *Atatürk'ün Millet ve Milliyetçilik Anlayışı.* Ankara: Türk Kültürü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yay., 1990.

Sencer, Muzaffer. *Az Gelişmişliğin Yapısı: Türkiye'de Siyasal Partilerin Sosyal Temelleri.* İstanbul: Geçiş, 1975.

Smith, Anthony D. *Ulusların Etnik Kökeni.* trans. Sonay Bayraoğlu, Hülya Kendir. Ankara: Dost, 2002.

Smith, Anthony D. *Millî Kimlik.* trans. Bahadır Sina Şenel. 3rd edt. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004.

Smith, Anthony D. *Küreselleşme Çağında Milliyetçilik.* trans: Derya Kömürcü, İstanbul: Everest, 2002.

Smith, A.D, *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism.* London: Routledge, 1998.

Synder, Louis. *The Meaning of Nationalism.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1954.

Tezcan, Nurhan *Atatürk'ün Yazdığı Yurttaşlık Bilgileri.* İstanbul: Çağdaş, 1989.

Turkish Dairy "Chronology of Turkish-EU Relations" (January-March).

Türk Tarih Kongresi-Zabıtlar, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar Müzakere Zabıtları, 1932, İstanbul: BTTK.

Türkeş, Alparslan *Dokuz Işık ve Türkiye.* İstanbul: Hamle, 1994.

Türköne. Mümtaz'er. *Siyaset.* Ankara: Lotus, 2003.

Türköne, Mümtaz'er. "Tanzimatta Millet Fikrinin Doğuşu" *Türkiye Günlüğü*, No: 8, 1989 November.

Türköne, Mümtaz'er, *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu.* İstanbul: İletişim, 1994.

Uzun, Turgay. *Türk Milliyetçiliği ve MHP.* Ankara: Ebabil, 2005.

Uzun, Turgay "Ulus, Milliyetçilik ve Kimlik Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme". *Doğu Batı*, no: 23 (2003), 131-154.

VIII. 5 Yıllık Kalkınma Raporu, DPT Arşivi, 2000.

"V. Demirel Hükümeti Koalisyon Protokolü 5 Haziran 1977 (AP-MSP-MHP)", http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/KP41.htm (accessed Septernber 2, 2007).

Watson, Hugh Seton. *Nations and States An Enquiry into Origins of Nations and Politics of Nationalism.* London: Menthuen Publishers, 1977.

Weber, Max. *Sosyoloji Yazıları.* trans. Taha Parla, İstanbul: İletişim, 1996.

Yalçıner, "Varoluşsal Öz Bilinçten Meşruiyet Krizine Avrupa İdeali, Kendilik ve Ötekiliğin Demokratik Diyalektiğini Siyasal Bir İnşa Projesi Üzerinden Yorumlamak", *Siyaset ve Toplum*, Winter: 2005, n. 1.

Yanardağ, Merdan "MHP'nin Geleceği: Sonuçlar ve Olasılıklar" in *Milliyetçilik, Faşizm ve MHP*, ed. Seyfi Öngider. İstanbul: Aykırı Güncel, 2002, 15-38.

Yeğen, Mesut *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu*. 2nd ed., İstanbul: İletişim, 2003.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey, A Modern History.* 3rd rev. ed. London, New York, I.B. Tauris, 2004.

DOCUMENTS FROM THE MHP HEAD OFFICE AND DEVLET BAHÇELİ'S SPEECHES

"3 Mayıs Türkçüler Günü Antolojisi". Ankara: Türkiye Milliyetçiler Birliği Ankara Ocağı Yayınları, Öğretmenler Matbaası, 1967.

 "1977 Party Programme".

"1989 MÇP Parti Programı"

"2000 Yılı Parti Programı". Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi.

"2004 Avrupa Komisyonu'nun Türkiye İlerleme Raporu, Etki Raporu ve Tavsiyeleri-Genel Değerlendirme Raporu". 2004. Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi.

"2005 Yılı İlerleme Raporu ve Katılım Ortaklığı Belgeleri Siyasi Kriterler Çerçevesinde: Talep ve Dayatmalar-AB'nin Türkiye Hakkında Dikkat Çeken Tespitleri". Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi AR-GE, November 2005.

"2006 Yılı İlerleme Raporu ve Strateji Belgesi Siyasi Kriterler Çerçevesinde: Talep ve Dayatmalar- AB'nin Türkiye Hakkında Olumsuz Tespitleri ve Beklentileri". Ankara: MHP AR-GE, 2006.

6. Ayında AKP İktidarı Gelişmeler, Gerçekler, Uyarılar. Ankara: MHP, 1 June 2003.

AB-GB ve Türkiye. Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 1995.

"AKP'nin Teslimiyet Belgeleri – AB Türkiye İlerleme Raporu-Tavsiyeler". Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 6 ctober 2004.

Bahçeli, Devlet, *18 Nisan 1999 Seçimlerinin Ardından.* Ankara: MHP, 1999.

"Bahçeli'nin TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları.* Ankara: MHP, 1999.

Bahçeli, Devlet 1 May 1999. "Sürmeli Oteli MKK, MYK ve Milletvekilleri Toplantısı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=01051999 (accessed August 2, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 3 May 1999. "Milliyetçiler Günü Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=03051999 (accessed November 19, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 6 December 1999. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=06121999 (accessed July 27, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 8 May 1999. "TBMM Basın Toplantısı", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi.

Bahçeli, Devlet. 23 May 1999. "TBMM Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi.

Bahçeli, Devlet. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı", in *18 Nisan Seçimleri Sonrası Siyasi Gelişmeler: Dr. Devlet Bahçeli'nin Basın Açıklamaları.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 1 June 1999.

Bahçeli, Devlet. 5 September 1999. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=05091999 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 2 November 1999. "Basın Toplantısı konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=02111999 (accesed January 11, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 26 November 1999. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=26101999 (accessed January 14, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. "14 December 1999 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/1999/index.php?page=14121999 (accessed June 17, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. "2000 Yılı Vesilesiyle Milliyet Gazetesi'nde Yayımlanan Değerlendirme Yazısı", in *Yeniçağın Eşiğinde Türkiye ve Dünya.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2000.

Bahçeli, Devlet "Yeni Yıl Mesajı", in *Yeniçağın Eşiğinde Türkiye ve Dünya.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2000.

Bahçeli, Devlet. "TBMM'de 2000 Yılı Bütçe Görüşmelerinde Yapılan Konuşma", in *Yeniçağın Eşiğinde Türkiye ve Dünya.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2000.

Bahçeli, Devlet. *Yeni Çağa Bakış: Eleştiriler, Tespitler ve Öneriler.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 5 November 2000.

Bahçeli, Devlet. 24 February 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=24022000 (accessed January 16, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 29 February 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=29022000 (acessed December 12, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 21 March 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21032000 (accessed August 9, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 4 April 2000. "MHP Yeni Genel Merkez Binası Temel Atma Töreni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=04042000_2 (accessed November 19, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 19 May 2000. "Ülkü Ocakları 19 Mayıs Şöleni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=19052000, (accessed January 7, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 21 May 2000. "Erdemli Türkmen Şöleni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21052000 (accessed November 19, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 27 May 2000. "Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği 55. Genel Kurul Toplantısındaki Konuşma", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=27052000 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet 19 June 2000. "Genel Merkez Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=19062000 (accessed February 9, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. "5 November 2000 MHP 6. Büyük Kurultay Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05112000 (accessed June 17, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 14 November 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=14112000 (accessed January 14, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 19 November 2000. "Türkiye Esnaf ve Sanatkarlar Kredi ve Kefalet Kooperatifleri Birlikleri Merkez Birliği'nin "Esnaf ve Sanatkarlarımızın Sorunları ile 57. Cumhuriyet Hükümetinden Talepleri ve Türkiye Halk Bankası'nın Özelleştirilmesinden Beklentileri" Konulu Toplantıdaki Konuşma" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=19112000 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 21 November 2000. "Basın Toplantısı, http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=21112000 (accessed Septermber 28, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 5 December 2000. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2000/index.php?page=05122000 (accessed July 1, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 2 January 2001. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2001/index.php?page=02012001 (accessed January 13, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 13 February 2001. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2001/index.php?page=13022001 (accessed December 12, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 12 June 2001. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2001/index.php?page=12062001 (accessed January 13, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet *Son Gelişmeler Işığında Türkiye'nin AB Üyeliği ve Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi – Temel Yaklaşım Biçimimiz ve Görüşlerimi.z.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, July 2002.

Bahçeli, Devlet. 5 January 2002. "Hollanda Türk Federasyonu 4. Büyük Kurultayı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=05012002 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 12 January 2002. "Merkez Yürütme Kurulu Toplantısı" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=12012002 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 20 January 2002. "Nevşehir Belediye Başkanları Toplantısı Konuşması" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=20012002 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 22 January 2002. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.tumgazeteler.com/?a=223918 (accessed December 17, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 31 January 2002. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=31012002 (accessed December 13, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 5 February 2002. "TBMM Grup Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=05022002 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 2 March 2002. "http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=02032002 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 11 May 2002. "Büyük İstanbul Buluşması Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=11052002 (accessed January 13, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 7 June 2002. "Liderler Zirvesi Sonrası Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=07062002 (accessed January 13, 2008.

173

Bahçeli, Devlet. 11 June 2002. "TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=11062002 (accessed January 13, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 10 August 2002. "Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2002/index.php?page=10082002 (accessed January 14, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. *AKP İktidarının 90 Günü ve Son Gelişmeler.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003.

Bahçeli, Devlet. *6. Ayında AKP İktidarı – Gelişmeler, Gerçekler, Uyarılar.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003.

Bahçeli, Devlet. *AKP İktidarının Bir Yıllık İcraatı.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkez Yayınları, 2003.

"Bahçeli'nin AKP İktidarının İlk Üç Ayının Değerlendirilmesine İlişkin Basın Toplantısı Metni" in *AKP İktidarının 90 Gün ve Son Gelişmeler.* Ankara: MHP, March 2003.

"Bahçeli'nin AKP İktidarının 6. Ayı Münasebetiyle Düzenlemiş Olduğu Basın Toplantısı", in *6. Ayında AKP İktidarı Gelişmeler, Gerçekler, Uyarılar.* Ankara: MHP, 1 June 2003.

Bahçeli, Devlet. "7 Aralık 2003 İl-İlçe Başkanları Toplantısının Açılış Konuşması", in *AKP İktidarının Bir Yıllık İcraatı.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003.

Bahçeli, Devlet. 17 March 2003. "Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2003/index.php?page=17032003 (accessed January 16, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 19 June 2003. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2003/index.php?page=19062003 (accessed December 23, 2007).

"Bahçeli'nin 7 Ekim 2004 Tarihli Basın Açıklaması" in *MHP Haklı Çıkmıştır,* ed. Merzifonluoğlu, Davut. Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2004.

Bahçeli, Devlet. 8 May 2004. "MYK Toplantısı Konuşması" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2004/index.php?page=08052004, (accessed January 12, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 15 June 2004. "Tarihî Görev Çağrısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2004/index.php?page=15062004 (accessed September 26, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 19 November 2004. "MKY Kurulu Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2004/index.php?page=19112004 (accessed January 12, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 21 June 2005. "Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=21062005 (accessed December 9, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 27 July 2005. "Basın Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=27072005, (accessed January 13, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 13 August 2005. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=13082005 (accessed June 14, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 11 November 2005. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2005/index.php?page=11112005 (accessed September 14, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 19 March 2006. "Ülkemizdeki son Siyasi ve Sosyal Gelişmeleri Değerlendirdiği Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=19032006 (accessed January 13, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 30 March 2006. "Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=30032006 (accessed November 27, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 20 May 2006. "Tarih Yeniden Yazılacak Mitingi Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=20052006 (accessed September 27, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 14 June 2006. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=14062006 (accessed September 26, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 19 September 2006. "TBMM'nin Olağanüstü Toplantıya Çağırılması ve Gündemdeki Son Gelişmelerle İlgili Yazılı Basın Açıklması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=19092006, (accessed September 30, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 9 November 2006. "8 Kasım 2006 Günü Açıklanan Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlerleme Raporu ve Strateji Belgesi Hakkında Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=09112006 (accessed September 14, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet "8 December 2006 Avrupa Birliği ile Kıbrıs Pazarlığı Hakkındaki Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=08122006 (accessed June 24, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet "15 December 2006 AB Zirve Kararları Sonrası Türkiye-AB İlişkilerinde Gelinen Nokta Hakkındaki Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2006/index.php?page=15122006 (accessed July 13, 2007)

Bahçeli, Devlet. 24 January 2007. http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=24012007 (accessed September 14, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 25 January 2007. "Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25012007 (accessed September 14, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 6 February 2007. "Basın Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=06022007 (accessed November 15, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 8 February 2007. "Teşkilatlara Göndermiş Olduğu Genelge", "http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=08022007 (accessed August 10, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 15 February 2007. "MKY Toplantısı Öneci Basın Toplantısı Konuşması",http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15022007 (accessed Septermber 19, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 25 February 2007 "1. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25022007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 3 March 2007. "Ankara Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=03032007 (accessed August 5, 2007.

Bahçeli, Devlet. 7 March 2007. http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=07032007 (accessed September 24, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 12 March 2007. "İstiklal Marşı'nın Kabulünün Yıldönümü Mesajı",http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=12032007 (accessed June 12, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 15 March 2007. "Türkiye'de Giderek Ağırlaşan Ortam ve Son Siyasi Gelişmeler Hakkında Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15032007 (accessed August 12, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 18 March 2007. **"**Bursa Ülkü Ocakları Çanakkale Zaferini Anma Şöleni Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=18032007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 31 March 2007. "5. İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-Adana", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=31032007, (accessed June 17, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 15 April 2007. " 6. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı-Kayseri konuşması" http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15042007 (accessed November 13, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. 21 April 2007. "7. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı-Konya", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=21042007 (accessed November 16, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet 6 May 2007. "8. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-Erzurum", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=06052007 (accessed August 5, 2007)

Bahçeli, Devlet. 19 May 2007. "19 Mayıs Atatürk'ü Anma Gençlik ve Spor Bayramı Yazılı Basın Açıklaması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=19052007 accesed 12 December 2007.

Bahçeli, Devlet "2 October 2007 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=02102007 (accessed December 12, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. "20 November 2007 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=20112007 (accessed December 12, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet 9 December 2007. "Türkiye Tek Yürek Mitingi Konuşması-İzmir", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=09122007 (accessed January 11, 2008).

Bahçeli, Devlet "25 December 2007 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=25122007 (accessed December 29, 2007).

Bahçeli, Devlet. "6. Bölge İstişare Toplantısı Konuşması-Kayseri", http://www.mhp.org.tr/genelbsk/gbskkonusma/2007/index.php?page=15042007 (accessed August 5, 2007).

"Devlet Bahçeli'nin 28 Kasım 2000 TBMM Grup Toplantısı Konuşması", in *Siyasette İlke Ekonomide Kararlılık.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi.

"Devlet Bahçeli'nin 7 Aralık 2003 İl-İlçe Başkanları Toplantısının Açılış Konuşması", in *AKP İktidarının Bir Yıllık İcraatı.* Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2003.

"Dünyada Yeni Dengeler, Türk Dünyasının ve Türkiye'nin Meseleleri". Ankara: MÇP Genel Merkezi, 1990.

http://www.voanews.com/turkish/archive/2004-10/a-2004-10-22-17-1.cfm (accessed January 12, 2008).

"İşte AKP'nin Avrupa Birliği Yol Haritası – Çıkmaz Sokak". Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi-AR-GE, 2006.

MHP Parti Programı: http://www.mhp.org.tr/program/programgiris.php (accessed 17 May, 2007).

"Milliyetçi Hareketin el Kitabı" –"Dış Politika, Dış Ekonomik Münasebetler ve Yabancı Sermaye". Ankara: MHP, 1973, 1977.

Şandır, Mehmet, (MHP Asist. of General Chief) "Giriş" in Davut Merzifonluoğlu. *MHP Haklı Çıkmıştır* .Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi, 2004.

Türk Siyasetinde Yozlaşma ve Arayış Sürecinde Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi. Ankara: MHP Genel Merkezi AR-GE, Nisan 2002.