

Lund University
Department of Political Science

STVM23
Spring Term 2018
Supervisor: Malena Rosén Sundström

European Identity: The Turkish quest for EU membership within the
context of Europe's competing narratives

Seçil Nibat

ABSTRACT

The relationship between Turkey and the EU is one that stands out as specifically unique due to a decades long controversy about what constitutes European identity in relation to Turkey's bid for EU membership. This long-standing debate about Turkey regards an identity based on two differing concepts of Modern Europe and Europe where Modern Europe is seen as the 'inclusive' and Europe is viewed as 'exclusive' - where a number of competing narratives continue to be debated in the European Parliament (EP). These revolve around Turkey's potential EU membership. The goal of this research is to more closely examine the competing narratives within the European Parliament that span a period of almost twenty years from 1999 to 2018. These narratives focus on how European Identity is defined and how Turkey's potential EU membership is discussed within the context of this identity. The objective is to approach this topic through the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as it relates to studying competing narratives that seek to refocus on European Identity in the context of Turkey. Poststructuralist theory will also be utilized to explain how European identity is constructed. Finally, through the diverse research presented, EU identity can be more easily discerned.

Keywords: European Identity, competing narratives, European Parliament (EP), DHA, Turkey's Potential EU membership, post-structuralism

Word Count: 16850

List of Abbreviations

Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Party (ALDE)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Discourse Historical Approach (DHA)

Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy (EFDD)

Europe of Nations and Freedom (ENF)

European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR)

European Parliament (EP)

European People's Party (EPP)

European Union (EU)

European United Left/Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL)

Group of the European Liberal, Democratic and Reform Party (ELDR)

Independence and Democracy Group (IND/DEM)

Non-Attached Members (NI)

Party of European Socialists (PES)

Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats (SD)

The European Free Alliance Greens (VERTS/ALE)

The Former Europe of Democracies and Diversities (EDD)

Treaty on European Union (TEU)

Union for Europe of the Nations Group (UEN)

List of Content

ABSTRACT	1
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	2
LIST OF CONTENT.....	3
LIST OF TABLES.....	4
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 THE AIM.....	6
1.2 THE CONTRIBUTION.....	7
1.3 OUTLOOK OF THIS RESEARCH.....	8
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	9
2.2 TURKEY AND THE EU: DEFINING TURKEY AND EUROPEAN IDENTITY WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF TURKEY’S BID FOR EU MEMBERSHIP	11
2.3 CONCLUSION.....	16
3. THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK.....	17
3.1 THE THEORY OF POST STRUCTURALISM AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY	17
3.2 TURKEY’S OTHERNESS: ‘INCLUSIVE’ AND ‘EXCLUSIVE’ ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY	20
4. THE IDEAS OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY	24
4.1 MODERN EUROPE VERSUS EUROPE.....	24
4.2 EXPRESSION OF IDEAS WITHIN THE EU	27
5. METHODOLOGY	31
5.1 THE MATERIAL	33
5.2 THE METHOD.....	34
6. ANALYSIS.....	37
6.1 DISCOURSES IN EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT.....	37
6.1.1 TURKEY’S ACCESSION DEBATE IN 2000.....	39
6.1.2 TURKEY’S PROGRESS TOWARDS EU ACCESSION DEBATE IN 2004	42
6.1.3 2010 PROGRESS REPORT ON TURKEY DEBATE IN 2011	45
6.1.4 TURKEY’S PROGRESS REPORT DEBATE IN 2017.....	48
7 CONCLUSION	50
REFERENCES	53

List of Tables

Table 1	35
---------------	----

1. INTRODUCTION

This research is concerning Turkish EU membership debates and the discussion of European identity. The accession of Turkey to the European Union (EU) continues to remain a highly controversial issue within the concept of European Identity. Turkish potential EU membership bid has divided the EU and intensified the discussion about European's conception of its own identity, its own values and its own project. While European Identity is already contested in the literature, even in the EU itself, the debate of Turkey's potential membership bid has sparked a controversy a mount a number of various factions within Europe and presents Turkey as a unique case in its bid for EU membership.

The heated debates about Turkish potential EU membership have focused around Turkey's Europeanness and European identity. Keridis states that "Turkey's candidacy to the EU is explicitly and intimately intertwined with the European Identity as some of the political elites and former presidents of the EU member states have expressed" (Keridis, 2009, p.148). Those prominent politicians in the EU have placed Turkey squarely opposite in a category that places a fence around Turkey - forcing the view of 'the other' while vociferously arguing that Turkey's democracy, geography, history and culture, place Turkey squarely in the category of a non-European state, as such, unfit to become an EU member (Aydin-Duzgit, 2012, p.1).

The first question put forth for the debate is how the EU decides regarding the scope of evaluation about European Identity, Europeanness for potential EU members. In other words, how the EU decides which country is a European, which one is not? According to the Treaty on the European Union, it is stipulated that any European state can apply for EU membership. So, this implies Europeanness as a prerequisite for becoming an EU member and in Turkey's case – the situation has not been as clear cut. Besides, in the case of Turkey, it is very controversial. The fact is that the topic of identity is very crucial for the future enlargement due to the fact that it raises questions about other countries whose Europeanness, European identity has also been

questions(Aydın-Düzgit & Tocci, 2015, p. 190). Indeed, As Sjurseren indicates that “enlargement have been about deciding the Union’s own ‘Europeanness’. It has been important in the process of constructing Europe, and the EU enlargement is an important factor in shaping the idea of what the EU is or should be” (Sjurseren, 2008).

The second question that arises is how one defines European Identity. Previous research from Risse 2010, Delanty 1995 has defined European Identity through the concept of Europe. When it comes to Turkey, this research, in particular Risse, indicates that “the debate about Turkey involves two differing concepts of European Identity”(Risse-Kappen, 2010). He explains that one of them is modern, inclusive, and liberal Europe which has its expression is in the official documents of the EU, in particular, in the Copenhagen Criteria. The EU is constructed through this modern Europe as a community that upholds human rights, rule of law, and democracy that represents the civic trait of European Identity (Ibid., p. 217). In contrast, the second conception is exclusive, is based on geographical, cultural, religious and historical ideas that represents cultural trait of European Identity that sees itself as a distinct European/Western Civilization referring to Christianity as its core of common heritage of Europe (Casanova, 2006; Delanty, 2013; Levin, 2011; Risse-Kappen, 2010). Therefore, as Tassinari, states that “the issue of Turkey’s membership has become a central battlefield of opposing discourses on European identity”(Tassinari, 2008). This triggers to ask the following research questions:

How is Turkey’s Potential EU membership is discussed in terms of European identity in the European Parliament (EP)?

1.1 The aim

This research is aiming to analyze Turkish EU membership debate with regard to European Identity. By doing so, this research aims to investigate both European Identity and Turkey’s potential EU membership within the context of European

Identity. It would be inappropriate to separate these two concepts because Turkey's bid for the EU membership is intrinsically tied into the concept of the EU identity with regard to Turkey. As one of the researchers indicates that "the difficulty in assessing Turkey's place in Europe to large extent is tied to the difficulty of defining Europe is" (Müftüler-Baç, pp.12-13.) and "construction of European identity within the EU is closely related with Turkey's membership to the EU" (Öner, p.11).

In order to answer the research question, it is best to use DHA in critical discourses analysis because it is a method that reveals the construction of identities through discussions and allows for an examination of the varying discourses about Turkey's potential EU membership in the EP within the context of European Identity. This is the most often used methodology for this type of issue due to the fact that DHA is able to provide a better analysis. This research analyzes the four-plenary debate-2000, 2004, 2011 and 2017- from each one of plenary term in the EP. The theoretical framework of this research is poststructuralist theory, because this theory allows the researcher to view a topic from a number of different angles. It also assists in conceptualizing identity in discursive, relational, political and social discourses to assist in the construction of an EU identity.

1.2 The contribution

There are three influencing factors that have given my research approach a much broader view than other studies that I have examined. The first factor is in-depth examination of European Parliament's discourse in relation to Turkey and European Identity by presenting all the view of the Parties, the Commission and the Council. The second factor is that this research conducts the most current research by analyzing the debate in 2017. The third factor is that since the time period of this research is broad, this research also observes changes and variation among the debates with regard to Turkey and European Identity.

1.3 Outlook of this research

In order to answer the research question, this study is structured as follows. In the following chapter, this research reveals a vast literature regarding Turkey and European Identity. In reference to existing literature about Turkey and the EU in terms of a ‘European Identity’ – in order to analyze the debates or various discourses guidelines are necessary which will be the theoretical framework of this research and methodology. The third chapter presents Post-Structuralist theory. The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate the construction of European identity through Turkey, and to grasp Turkey’s otherness within the context of European identity. The fourth chapter is about the ideas emerging European Identity. The fifth chapter presents DHA in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This approach has been used effectively to analyze discourse on identity construction. It has been combined with ethnographic methods to investigate identity politics and has explored the discursive construction of social identities. More recently, this approach has been used in the construction of national identities (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999; Klymenko, 2016; Siddi, 2018) and it has been applied to identity construction in European politics and the construction of European Identity (Wodak & Boukala, 2015). Also, Tekin utilizes DHA to examine the construction of Turkey’s possible EU membership in French political discourse (Beyza Çağatay Tekin, 2008). In the methodology chapter, five questions will be presented. These questions are used for the evaluation of the chosen debates in the EP. The sixth chapter presents the chosen debates for the discussion. Finally, in the conclusion, findings will be evaluated.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The aim of this literature review is to demonstrate how diverse and challenging the research is with regard to Turkey and its bid for EU membership within the context of competing narratives about what constitutes an EU identity and Turkey's role with regard to such a narrative. This research begins with a more detailed examination of the role that Turkey has played within the differing and widespread discourses regarding its bid for EU membership within the context of varied debates on EU Identity.

When referring to research on this topic, there exists a large volume of information with the more narrow focus being placed on the main question that centers on how does one define Europeanness and European identity and a second question – what criteria are used to define Turkey as the 'other' with regard to European identity. It should be noted that the question of EU identity and how Turkey could potentially be viewed within the scope of Europeanness with respect to an EU identity - should not be seen as separate from Turkey's bid for EU membership and the ongoing debates that have surrounded this discussion.

In order to achieve a more extensive view of this topic, regarding Turkey's role within the context of the construction of European Identity, it is necessary to review a wide swath of research publications in an attempt to more clearly understand the role that Europeanness and European identity has taken. The six authors chosen from at least 22 publications researched for this Literature Review - all attempt to explain Turkey's position as 'the other' in relation to how Turkey is perceived in light of its bid for EU membership within a context of what has been termed – European identity.

The fact remains that agreeing on exactly what constitutes a European identity is a centuries old debate, focused on a series of arbitrary, yet specific criteria, that revolves

around the question of how Turkey could potentially ‘fit into’ the standards and expectations of Europeanness and European identity. This debate is not new and as the various authors point out – still raises a series of ongoing discourses. The literature reflects concepts related to the fact that Turkey continues to remain a decisive factor in whether or not the concept of Europeanness may be applied to how it is perceived in the overall big picture of the EU project. With regard to the concept of “The Other,” that the EU has cast onto Turkey. Two differing concepts will be explained further, as they appear to present the question of Turkey’s fitness as a potential EU member. One concept presents an ‘inclusive’ view while the second concept presents an ‘exclusive’ view which will be elaborated on in the following chapters.

Allowing for the fact that widespread discourses on this topic exist, the methodology chosen is DHA within CDA. This is utilized to provide a more in-depth look at identities, in order to answer questions with regard to Turkey’s EU membership bid within the framework of an EU identity. Due to the fact that there are a wide range of diverse debates on this subject, thus the use of DHA and the poststructuralist approach, provide a more comprehensive way to examine this topic. A prime example of this type of methodology is the work of the recognized and respected Dr. Ruth Wodak, who has demonstrated the importance of using DHA methodology in her discourses. This approach along with post-structuralist language theory, emphasizes the importance of discourses in forming identities and policies - therefore, this was found to be the most beneficial methodology to use.

In analyzing the literature with respect to varying aspects, it is necessary to understand how the six authors chosen for this Literature Review, have examined this timely subject matter on an in-depth level so as to provide a larger framework, capable of shedding light on a topic that includes ubiquitous details that must be carefully sifted, if one is to grasp the full scope of the role, Turkey has been cast into, with reference to its longstanding EU candidacy bid as well as its continuously debated Europeanness or European identity. EU identity with respect to Turkey’s bid for EU membership is

explained in detail throughout this thesis with the studies of these six authors who take a much more detailed look at how Turkey has been singled out as “the other,” and how the concept of Europeanness and a European identity influences Turkey’s bid for EU membership.

Since 1999, when Turkey first became a candidate to the European Union – the country has stood apart as a ‘special case’ with regard to potential EU membership due to a number of factors that are outlined within this thesis. The purported lack of a specific European identity has been called into question through a number of wide ranging debates and discussions which explains why the literature on this topic is so voluminous. When studying the research literature, it is necessary to be cognizant of the fact that there are at least three criteria influencing where Turkey stands with regard to its stance with the European Union and how Turkey is essentially perceived by diverse individuals either in the European Parliament (EP), the EU itself and those known as the European ‘elite.’

2.2 Turkey and the EU: Defining Turkey and European Identity within the Context of Turkey’s Bid for EU Membership

Author, Paul T. Levin, who wrote the book, “Turkey and the European Union,” expresses a detailed, historical perspective on this issue while he also supports this stance that explains that Turkey’s bid for EU membership raises the question of the EU and EU identity. Levin’s research is significant because it makes the centuries old case for Turkey being viewed as ‘The Other,’ being seen through the eyes of those who wish to place Turkey in a separate category. As Levin sums it up, those who created the narratives about “The Turk” are actually “referring to themselves,” because as he explained, it was easier to label something as unfamiliar rather than allow it to threaten the status quo. Levin’s detailed research covers the European Parliament from 2006-2010 and presents an overall view of how other EU nations view Turkey and its bid for EU membership. As Levin comments: “the ubiquitous use of more or less standardized

images of a Turkish ‘other’ as a tool in the struggle to define a collective European self, must be abandoned (p. 273).”

In contrast to Levin, associate professor of international relations at Bilgi University and Author, Senem Aydin-Duzgit, who wrote the book “Constructions of European Identity – Debates and Discourses on Turkey and the EU,” (Palgrave 2012), follows a premise that revolves around the EU discourses on Turkey in the European Commission, European Parliament and some EU member states. Aydin-Duzgit focuses on Turkey and EU identity, in terms of the construction of European identity through EU representations of Turkey. Her work is based on a poststructuralist format regarding identity, formed through differences. Her book uses CDA to analyze texts and argues that there are “multiple Europe(s)” that are constructed in “talks of enlargement” with respect to Turkey. She also points out that there are distinct differences between ideology as related to “national and institutional texts.” The book’s premise is that Turkey forms “a key case” in exploring the various diverse debates and “constructs of European identity” since the talks on Turkey, “pave the way for construction of different versions of Europe in discourse (p. 171).”

The book entitled, “Turkey and the European Union,” by Nathalie Tocci, is concerned with how Turkey is a global partner and an EU neighbor. As Tocci explains: “Turkey continues to be a critically important country for the EU - the relationship has consequences that are both ideational, embedded in history, politics, identity and culture and material, relating to economics energy and security (p. 7)” This leads to several questions to be explored: What do Europe and the EU mean in the various debates and how does EU identity matter with regard to discussions about enlargement?

Thomas Risse’s book, “A Community of Europeans – transnational identity and public spheres,” talks about “identity politics” (Risse 2010). As Risse commented on and raises a main issue focused on, in this thesis: “The debate about Turkey involves

different conceptions of European identity.” He also adds that “one cannot even begin to understand EU enlargement without taking identity politics into account (p. 204).” He clearly explains this point: “the debate about Turkish membership is a discussion about the orders of Europe: “Where does Europe end and who, as a result, has a legitimate claim to EU membership? (p. 217)” Equally significant, is what Risse demonstrates as the two conceptual views of Turkey: “the one that is a modern, inclusive and liberal vision of Europe, which finds its most important expression in the Copenhagen Criteria (Ibid).” The second concept is a more ‘exclusive’ view that presents a narrower view of Turkey’s role as it relates to a European identity. According to Risse’s research, “Turkey is seen as part of Europe as long as Turkey respects the liberal agenda and complies with its norms (Ibid).” Risse inquires “What is the idea of modern Europe?” - and then explains that modern Europe is based on commonly shared values that include cultural, nationalist Europe. Modern Europe views itself as a Community that upholds human rights, rule of law, democracy and gender equality, according to the research. Europe is ‘exclusive,’ based on cultural, religious historical, geographical ideas, and sees itself as a distinct European civilization that stands alone, Risse explains.

Author, Iver Neumann whose book “Uses of ‘the other’ – ‘the East’ in European identity formation” is an expert on how thinking about European identity in terms of ‘the self’ and ‘the other’ may prove highly useful in the study of European politics. Referring to Turkey, Neumann stated: “the main reasons for presenting a reading of ‘the Turk’ as Europe’s ‘other’ was the very clear-cut way in which Turkey has been represented (p. 63).” He explains how the concept of ‘otherness’ has been useful throughout history in grasping the concept of an EU identity as it relates to political ties throughout centuries. “The East,’ as Neumann states, “has been cut loose from its geographical point of reference and has become a generalized social marker in European Identity formation (p. 207).” His premise resides in the fact that, “as a whole, the East is indeed Europe’s ‘other’(Ibid).” In addition, he adds that it is “continuously being recycled in order to represent European Identities (Ibid).” The bottom line “is

not whether ‘the East’ will be used in forging new EU identities, but how this is being done (Ibid).” Neumann’s research focuses on national and European Identities. The final point Neumann seeks to make is this: “the use of the ‘East’ as ‘the other,’ is a general practice in European Identity formation (Ibid).”

Meanwhile, Associate Professor, Bahar Rumelili’s article, “Constructing Identity Relating to Difference: Understanding the EU’s mode of Differentiation” and her second article “Negotiating Europe: EU-Turkey relations from an Identity Perspective” – provides a solid framework to examine the role of historical “antagonism” between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, as well as the role Christianity and Islam have taken, while continuing to overshadow EU-Turkey relations and serve to strengthen objections to Turkish membership on other grounds (p. 97).” Furthermore, Rumelili demonstrates a view from an essentialist perspective that “the prospects that Turkey’s EU membership could be justified on identity grounds are rather bleak (Ibid).” As Rumelili’s research explains: “Turkey is Europe’s ‘other’ so in this respect, the essentialist perspective presents the EU with a choice between European Identity which dictates Turkey’s exclusion and European interests, which may overall favor Turkey’s inclusion (Ibid).” Overall, Rumelili presents an alternative analysis of “the identity dimension” in EU-Turkey relations.

In fact, her second article, provides a more thorough look at the concept of Turkey as ‘the other,’ that provides an insider look at the very often, debated topic of identities and how they are constructed. As Rumelili states: “because identities are socially construed, negotiated and contested, EU-Turkey relations provide a site where the identities of ‘Europe’ – the ‘Turk,’ ‘Asia,’ and ‘Islam’ are continuously negotiated (Ibid).” In first article, Rumelili’s basic tenet is that “Turkey is differentiated from Europe on the basis of both inherent and acquired characteristics,” where the European “collective identity” promoted by the EU is ‘hybrid’ with respect to its ‘inclusive,’ ‘exclusive’ aspects (p. 44). As a result, Rumelili refers to this ‘hybrid’ state as producing a set of competing debates on Turkey’s identity in relation to Europe.

Rumelili also maintains that the debates or discussions that stress the ‘exclusive’ aspect of European identity are largely based on geography and culture to construct Turkey as “inherently different.” Furthermore, she suggests that the discussions that have inclusive aspects of EU identity, construct Turkey as ‘different’ from Europe “solely in terms of acquired characteristics.” Rumelili adds that due to the ‘othering’ of Turkey, by way of viewing it as ‘underdeveloped’ through its economy, human rights, unstable political system and constant military involvement – the EU can effectively keep Turkey separated. These perceptions form the basis for reasons to view Turkey as ‘the other.’ Rumelili makes the claim that the EU is able to maintain a social distance from Turkey because of their viewpoint toward the predominantly Muslim nation. But she also states that should Turkey choose to meet the requirements the EU expects of it then it will become a member, despite others claiming Turkey’s inherent differences will set it apart.

In contrast, Author Gerard Delanty, who wrote the book, “Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity and Reality (1995) –discusses in length how the EU identity was constructed over a period of centuries as a social construct where “Europe is as much an idea as it is a reality (p.1),” as he states. Delanty discusses this concept at length, but just exactly what constitutes ‘an idea of Europe’ is also contested here. As Delanty points out, it was in adversity, that the EU identity was constructed as a dichotomy of self and other. The book analyzes the origins and developments of the idea of Europe as a social construction from centuries to the present. Delanty explains that “European identity by definition, is a collective identity that is focused on the idea of Europe (p. 13)” so Delanty explains that EU identity was formulated through the idea of Europe and that Europe as an idea has forever been in the process of invention and reinvention (p. 1).”

2.3 Conclusion

This research has observed that the EU is in the process of redefining what EU identity really means within a current and new world order. It appears that the EU is a step closer to a compromise regarding Turkey's position with regard to EU identity. Nevertheless, the controversy observed through the viewpoints of the European Parliament and through analysis, observes that identity discourses that have evolved since 1999 to 2018 regarding Turkey, have been a constant on the European political scene. Therefore, this debate about an EU identity remains a controversial issue. However, the EU is currently debating how to define a universal agreement as to what exactly constitutes an EU identity while Turkey continues to be a source of debate in the European Parliament. Finally, continuing discourses and Turkey's EU membership remains a controversial one as the research demonstrates. The debate, with regard to Turkey's 'fitness' as a European country with a 'European identity,' still remains a 'hot' topic. The question of Turkey's ability to 'fit into' a European model, has stood the test of time and the idea of Turkey's bid for membership is a whole lot more acceptable on the 21st century political scene than it ever was.

As the next chapters will demonstrate, it will become more evident that there still remains much room for enhanced growth and development with regard to Turkey's future EU membership, in light of a European identity. Regardless, the facts clearly indicate that Europe is certainly in a much more flexible stance to offer a broader, more modern vision regarding what constitutes EU identity. The real possibility of an actual compromise perhaps still remains on the distant horizon.

3. THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

In order for this research to be able to study Turkey's potential EU membership in terms of European identity, it is necessary to primarily comprehend the connection between Turkey and European identity. In line of the aim of this research, this chapter is aiming to reveal where Turkey's place is in the context of European identity. This chapter, it will be answered how European identity is discursively constructed through Turkey. This chapter is also directly related to the methodology chapter of this research in various aspect. Firstly, the premise of post-structuralist theory emphasizes the construction of European identity in building in-groups (European, the self, us) and out groups (Turkey, the other, they) through discourse which needs to conduct discourse analysis. Secondly, since this study departs from that Turkey's EU membership became a battlefield of competing discourses in the European identity, the aim of this research is to study Turkey's Potential EU membership in the EP debates, which leads to analyzing the EU discourses. Therefore, the theory and methodology section of this research will be interactive, and they are complementary at each other.

3.1 The theory of Post Structuralism and the Construction of European Identity

This research is drawing upon the post-structuralist theory to explore the discursive construction of European identity through the debate about Turkey. One of the main contribution of this theory is the theorizing of identity, in particular identity's relationship to differences and discourses (Diez, 2004) that enables this research to conduct a study Turkey's potential EU membership with regard to European identity by comprehending construction of European identity through Turkey.

The reason to explore the construction of European identity is to display where Turkey fits in the European identity. The previous research has pointed out that "by debating Turkey's membership, the EU is constructing its own identity"(Ecirli, 2011, p. 80), due to the fact that Turkey represents as 'the other' in the construction of European identity—as this will be explained in this section— and that Turkey, with its European

identity, is increasingly under discussion in the EU 'discourses, is a candidate country, as it makes the EU questioning what the EU's identity, (Casanova, 2006; Kylstad, 2010; Lauren M. McLaren, 2007; Risse-Kappen, 2010). This research looks at Turkey in relation to European identity, and due to the scope and limit of this research, this research follows basic assumptions regarding identity:¹

- Identities are always re/created in specific contexts. They are 'co-constructed' in interactive relationships. They are usually fragmented, dynamic and changeable – everyone has multiple identities.
- Identity construction always implies inclusionary and exclusionary processes, i.e. the definition of oneself and others.
- Identities that are individual and collective, national and transnational are also re/produced and manifested symbolically.
- The EU is seen as an imagined community, therefore its identity construction is based on in-groups as “we, the self” and on out-groups “they, the others.” (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999, p.153-154; Wodak, 2012, p. 216).

Post-structuralism conceptualizes identity as “discursive, political, relational, and social” (Hansen, 2013, p. 1). Policies are dependent upon and constitutive of identities, ideas, as well as representation of identities -that is produced and reproduced- is a constitutive significance for formulating and debating policies (Ibid., p.10). There is no causal relationship between identity and policy due to the fact that they are intertwined and linked each other through discourses (Aydın-Düzgit, 2015, p. 160). Since Turkey is a part of the European Enlargement policy that can be viewed as a part of this process of identity formation (Aydın-Düzgit, 2014, p. 355), it can be articulated that officials and politicians' discourses are important in constructing identities and policies in relation to Turkey's potential EU membership because politicians and

¹ This research traces afore-mentioned assumptions and focuses more on Turkey. This research does not look discussion of European identity over Member states in terms of construction of European identity due to the fact that this research accepts the EU and its member as a whole group towards Turkey that here is out-group. Therefore, this research does not need to discuss whether or not there is a contradiction between national identities and European identity.

officials have power and are legitimate as representatives who speak for us and on behalf of us² (Van Dijk, 2006; Wodak, 2012).

From the point of identity as relational and social, William Connolly defined identity as being constructed through relationship with itself and a series of socially-accepted differences such as culture, religion, geography, history, ranging from the radically different to the familiar. Identity requires difference in order to be in existence, and identity transforms difference into “otherness” to secure its own certainty. The others are an instrumental of forging identities. The others that constitute the self are portrayed and marginalized as dangerous and threatening (Connolly, 2002 p.xiv). Therefore, conventional wisdom concludes that the self “the bearer of identity” cannot be thinkable without its other “the bearer of difference.” Identity is always given through references to something it is not (Bahar Rumelili, 2004, p. 29). With regard to European identity, as Iver Neumann and Jennifer Welsh’ studies states “what European Identity was from the beginning was explained partly in respect of what it was not.” European Identity is dependent on a variety of others, and the non-Europeans as barbarians, savages, Muslims, Turks, etc. played a crucial role in the definition of European Identity historically (Iver B. Neumann & Jennifer M. Welsh, 1991, p. 329). As Neumann states that “The main reason given for presenting a reading of the Turk as Europe's other was the very clear cut way in which Turkey has been represented,” (Neumann, 1999, p. 63).

When it comes to identity as political and discursive, Weldes approaches “identities emerge out of a process of representation through which individuals describe....to themselves and others the world in which they live”(Weldes, Laffey, Gusterson, & Duvall, 1999, p. 14). In post-structuralism, language is treated as constitutive of social reality because language is social and political and reflects what takes place in social word (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, pp. 27-55). It can be implied that discourse

² The EU decides who is going to be a member of the EU as European state in the enlargement. Therefore, deciding who is a European state addresses to define what it means to be a European as identity. Officials; politicians’ discourses in the construction of European identity, and its policies in the enlargement are considered as significant in post-structuralist theory.

relies upon particular construction of problems and subjectives, but also those are constructed through discourses. This view emphasizes that “identities are subject positions that are dictated by broader discourses, and; as a result, the representational practices of identity are bounded by these discourses” (Bahar Rumelili, 2004, p. 5). Traditionally, Identity was believed to be fixed and rigid. However, in post-structuralism, it is considered to be fluid, varied and subject to change. Every identity is regarded to be continuously and socially constructed, negotiated, and contested between actors through discourse (Ibid., p. 2). Therefore, identities should be seen itself as not static, as dynamic which are evolving, changing in time, and being shaped by different contexts and environments. Iver Neumann who has studied geographical and political construction of identity by investigating the representational practice of applicant countries showed how Eastern European countries and Turkey were the other for the EU and European identity during the cold war period. Eastern European countries were represented, repositioned and reframed in the EU as part of Europe and its identity by discourses that emphasize the EU as a political union that has political identity referring to the civic component ³of European identity (Neumann, 1999, p. 63).

3.2 Turkey’s Otherness: ‘Inclusive’ and ‘Exclusive’ Aspects of European Identity

In order to fully comprehend the concept of Turkey and the role it plays within the context of a European Identity, one must become fully aware of the fact as Duzgit states: “that Turkey is conceptualized as discursively constructed within representations where its construction is dependent upon the definition of the European Self with respect to various Others,” (Aydin-Duzgit, 2012, p.2). Turkey represents the main other, out-groups who are being presented as inherently incompatible and mutually exclusive through its representational practice in the EU that derives from an

³ This will be further explained in the chapter of the ideas of European Identity

essentialist view of Europe and European identity based on cultural, religious and geographical limitedness (Diez, 2004; Neumann, 1999; Rumelılı, 2008).

According to the research from (Aydın-Düzgıt & Tocci, 2015; Bahar Rumelılı, 2004; Neumann, 1999) the reason that Turkey remained ‘the other’ was largely due to its past history regarding the European identity. As these researchers have explained, the Ottoman Empire made up the ‘other’ of Medieval Christendom due to its particular and specific, geographical position along with its military power, religion and culture. As the studies reveal - the Ottoman, Turk and Islam were viewed as the opposition to Christendom. In the European perception, these were perceived of as ‘barbarians and inferior to civilized Europeans’ – which clearly referred to the ‘Judeo-Christian roots of European culture and identity.’ When the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923, Turkey began to be perceived in Europe as a nation modernizing itself. Nevertheless, the common view that perceives a ‘former representation’ of the country, still continues to be ‘the other.’ Since Turkey took crucial steps, in order to establish itself with a full Western democracy and economy, whose goal is to be a participant in the European project through the 1963 Association Agreement, “Turkey’s representational practices were portrayed as partly of European self and partly of the other of Europe.” (Bahar Rumelılı, 2004, p. 2). As a result, these representational practices or portrayals of the country, led to Turkey’s potential EU membership being at the center of competing discourses regarding European identity.

The exclusive aspect of European identity sees Turkey as inherently different from Europe in terms of geography, culture, and religion for the reason that, besides geography, the country has not experienced historic moments in European civilization such as the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Enlightenment (Diez & Barbato, 2007, p. 7). This approach conceives of “European identity as in-bounded, fixed and in exclusive terms, embodying a conception of difference that is based on inherent characteristics,” (Elizabeth Shakman Hurd, 2006 p. 410). This has also been the process of the ‘othering’ of the European self in opposition to the Turkish other. Geographical borders symbolize an essential element that separates and defines the Us,

Europe and the Other, Turkey (Gul Pinar Erkem, 2009, p. 497). According to Tocci, “this Otherness would be physically expressed through the delineation and consolidation of the EU’s borders within the boundaries of the European continent” (Tocci & Internazionali, 2007, p. 21). This has led to the conclusion that Turkey does not belong Europe; therefore, it is not a European State, and it cannot be anyway.

The exclusive view is expressed by Samuel Huntington. In Huntington’s proposition - cultures, identities and civilizations are seen as essential as static through a firm border between us and them. Huntington’s clash of civilizations divides the world into two homogenous civilizational blocs of Europe: The West and Muslim, through geographic constellations. They are juxtaposed against one another. In the post-Cold War era, the conflict would be between these two civilizations. In his picture of world, Turkey is split by his geographical boundary that separates Turkey’s Western and Islamic civilizations. According to him, to be considered as European, a country should have been lived through the significant historical process—will be explained further in the following section—that is a significant determination of exclusive aspect of European identity. “Turkey is a torn country with a single predominant Islam whose leaders want to shift it to the West which is an impossible task. Therefore, Turkey cannot be a part of the EU (Huntington, 1993, pp. 22-49).

On the contrary, the inclusive aspect of European identity that is the modern, cosmopolitan view of the EU, “where identities are not seen as fixed or static, that are constructed through time and discourses— emphasizes “the possibility of a state becoming European by gradually acquiring a series of inclusive characteristics and values such as rule of law, human rights and secular democracy” (Aydın-Düzgüt & Tocci, 2015 pp.186-187; Bahar Rumelili, 2004 p. 39). In this aspect, the EU as a multicultural and political project, where Turkey can be seen as a European state and a part of the EU, since the country would enrich the EU’s cultural diversity - the EU’s motto is unity in diversity that is one of the values of modern Europe-, and would be a

model in its region, in promoting the EU's values. Especially, the inclusive aspect of European identity views Turkey as a bridge between the EU and the Muslim world in the region and as a response for the claim of clash of civilizations thesis and for the claim that the EU is a Christian group (Ibid., p.188-190). These claims originate from exclusive aspects of European identity that makes European self and Turkey other as fixed identical to be aligned against one another without interaction.

4. The Ideas of European Identity

The previous chapter discloses Turkey's place in the context of European identity and how it is discussed. This section reveals the ideas of Europe within the context of European identity. As it was previously mentioned in the last paragraph of the previous chapter - there exists the exclusive and inclusive aspects of European identity. In this chapter, this research explores where those aspects arise from and also will touch upon how Turkey is discussed in those aspects as an illustration for the following chapters. This research draws upon the previous research that demonstrates two different conceptualizations of European identity, that originates from two different concepts of Europe, that still exist in the discourse about the EU. As a result, two diverse ideas of Europe, as Modern Europe and Europe, are competing in the construction of European identity in discourses.

4.1 Modern Europe Versus Europe

European Identity is a rather contested phenomenon in the literature and within the EU, which involves plenty of questions that must be asked, dealt with and answered. An inquiry as to what is meant by European Identity as a definition. Gerard Delanty states "A European identity, by definition, is a collective identity that is focused on the idea of Europe," (Delanty & Campling, 1995, p. 7). As Delanty, Risse and Levin say that, it is necessary to discover what the concept of Europe means (Delanty, 2018; Levin, 2011; Risse-Kappen, 2010). Is it a sense of belonging to the Greek-Roman ancient times, to Christianity, to the Renaissance, and to the enlightenment which is the way the cultural definition of the concept of Europe is defined⁴—consequently, the definition of European identity— or instead a commitment to the universal values such as liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and rule of law which the EU was found upon (Baycar, 2013, p. 5; Hasan Kosebalaban, 2007, p. 101)⁵?

⁴ The group of Scholars such as Huntington, Wehler, and Winkler cited in Diez & Barbato 2007, p.7

⁵ The group of Scholars such as Keridis, Burgdorf, and Öner cited in Baycar 2013, p.6

As summarizing with the previous question, the discussion of European identity revolves around whether or not European identity is defined by civic and political terms based on common shared values rather than historical, cultural, and essential terms which arise from European concepts. In other words, whether or not European identity should be explained by more exclusive aspects or inclusive aspects. Keridis in his research, emphasizes that European identity should be defined by civic and political terms instead of culture, religion and geography, because, according to him, “there is nothing divine, unalterable or primordial about the basic content of Europe’s identity”, due to the fact that the construction of identities, as well as the concept of a European identity is continually in progress. Nevertheless, Keridis indicates that though history and culture matter, he emphasizes that the most recent culture and history should be the deciding factor where European identity is concerned. Keridis criticizes recent events rather than focusing on distant history to explain current conditions as the most effective way of interpreting European identity. As stated by him, the current view of European identity has largely been a product of World War II, the Cold War and the post-Cold War - and is more an open, inclusive identity. On the contrary, focusing on distant history to emphasize the cultural terms is a rigid way of reading European identity that is to see identity as inalterable, static and exclusive (Keridis, 2009, pp. 147-158).

However, my research does not discuss what form European identity should be defined and in my observations of the overall research, no specific stance is taken, regarding European identity. This study is more interested in grasping European identity by covering all the concepts surrounding this topic because discourses reflect these in Turkey’s potential EU membership debates. Conventional think is that European Identity is a product of specific historical process. (Delanty & Campling, 1995; Keridis, 2009; Levin, 2011). Over the years, wide areas of convergence have developed around the idea of the European identity. Therefore, it is necessary to accept all significant, specific process affecting such a concept of the European identity. However, it is not within the scope of this section to give historical details or to discuss how historical

processes affect the conceptualization of European identity due to the limitation of this research, also due to the aim and main focus of this research. The primary goal of this chapter is related to what particular concepts of Europe come out and are represented within the aspects of European identity. This process brings up these concepts in European identity through a summary at the end.

The concept of Europe can be found throughout history. As Delany has shown that it has been linked to discourses of Christendom, of the Enlightenment period of civilization, the Cold War after 1945 and the Fortress of Europe and that of a social and citizen's Europe after the end of the Cold War. Those discourses have evolved to produce a view of Europe and have been used to explain what the concept of Europe means, since European identity is a product of a specific historical process. (Aydin-Düzgit & Tocci, 2015; Risse-Kappen, 2010). Eventually, two distinct substantive concepts of Europe have been put forth. According to Risse's research, there is the modern European Union's concept of Europe, supported by some European elites, and the Commission, the fundamental concept of a 'United Europe' is viewed as upholding modern, democratic, humanistic values as opposed to the past history of nationalism, militarism and communism that dominated the old vision of Europe (Risse-Kappen, 2010, pp. 50-55). These modern, secular European roots originate from the Age of Enlightenment, and have evolved throughout the time period after World War II, in particular after the Cold War. On the other hand, there is a Europe in the EU that views itself as a distinct European-Western civilization, while adhering to the cultural, geographical, and religious heritage of Europe in a more stringent manner, that is less open to the outside world and draws a border around other cultures (Risse & Grabowsky, pp. 4-23.) These two differing concepts of Europe as Modern Europe and Europe, compete for European Identity within the framework of specific constructions, and represent two essential components of European Identity.

“Two constitutive elements of European Identity are civic and cultural” (Öznur & Ertuğrul, 2018, p.52). Civic elements of European identity, as a consequence of the EU's identity politics after the end of the Cold War, were created by legal institution,

referring to common shared universal values such as democracy, human rights and rule of law where they are embodied in the Copenhagen Criteria (Ibid., p.52). Cultural elements of European Identity refer to the history of Western Civilization, emphasizing Christianity as the common cultural heritage of Europe (Casanova, 2006; Kylstad, 2010). As a result, while the exclusive aspect of European Identity uses the idea of Europe's exclusive values of European Identity, the inclusive aspect of European Identity uses the idea of Modern Europe's civic values in defining itself.

4.2 Expression of Ideas within the EU

When it comes to the expression of these two aspects, Article 49 of the Treaty on the European Union (TEU) lays out the premise that a country that wants to be a part of the EU has to be a European state. However, the official documents of the EU do not express directly what European Identity means in a way that has been claimed via exclusive culture, history and religious elements regarding the discussion between Turkey and the EU. Official documents of the EU express modern Europe's Identity via common universal shared values. As the following quotation illustrates, the expression of Modern Europe can be found in the official EU documentation.

The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail (Official Journal of the European Union 2007, 11, cited in (Baycar, 2013 p.8)

As to the discussion of Turkey within this aspect, the quotation below illustrates the inclusive aspect of European identity. The EU enlargement Commissioner expresses the importance of the values within the foundation of European Identity by stating:

Certainly, geographical borders set out the framework, but values define the borders. Any European country that respects values like democracy, human rights and the rule of law can apply to be a member of the EU. That does not mean that we have to accept every country. But it would also be wrong to close the door forever by drawing a line in a map that forever sets the borders of Europe (cited in Öner 2006, p.11).

On the contrary, as the next quotation shows, the expression of Europe has found its voice in one of the members of the European Parliament (MEP). This quotation below refers to an ‘exclusive viewpoint’ on European values that defines itself within a rigid and narrow view of Turkey, that refers to a definition of European civilization based on a viewpoint, predicated on a preconceived concept of European Identity based on a cultural, historical and religious definition of what Europe should look like.

“Europe should be European, and Turkey is not European. Whatever the advantages, respect or friendship we can offer to this large country, the truth is that it does not share our common European civilization. Turkey is not similar to Europe, neither geographically, historically, culturally nor religiously” (an independent member of the EU parliament cited in (Levin, 2011, p.186)

Furthermore, there is reflected within the European Parliament (EP) a certain level of dichotomy where only certain individuals within the EP have expressed some reservations regarding the previous, aforementioned concept of Turkey as ‘the other’ – specifically reflective of the accepted definition of Europeanness and European Identity as noted in the quotation below:

“We have different conceptions of the future of the European Union; this Europe, this European Union of ours, must have borders, and that is why we conclude special agreements with our immediate neighbors. With this in mind, I believe that Turkey, be it for reasons of history, geography or culture, would not fit in as a direct member of the European Union” (Ebner, EPP-ED, April 1, 2004, cited in Düzgit, 2012, p.132).

In addition to this, two different conceptualizations of European Identity are expressed explicitly in the Preamble of the Lisbon Treaty signed by the European Heads of State.

“DRAWING INSPIRATION from the cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe, from which have developed the universal values of the inviolable and inalienable rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law, RECALLING the historic importance of the ending of the division of the European continent and the need to create firm bases for the construction of the future Europe”

The point must be made that this treaty is the only official document of the EU referring to cultural, religious and geographical attributions of European Identity apart from the speeches in the EU. This quotation refers to Europe's cultural inheritance, to universal values of the European Union, and to the European past that includes World War II and the Cold War. This quote shows an example of Modern and cosmopolitan Europe with its roots in the Age of Enlightenment, a Europe that it is proud of its open borders. Nonetheless, it refers to the religious heritage of Europe, but does not verbalize Christianity. According to this view, the idea of a United Europe is based on a peace project to end the divisions and wars that stemmed from nationalism, militarism, cultural homogeneity and exclusivism. Indeed, this treaty is a prominent example of controversial ideas in European Identity reflected within the EU in one of the most important official documents of the EU.

Returning to the discussion of Turkey regarding these two aspects, if Europe and its Identity is defined in terms of its traditional, historical, cultural civilization, as defined within an exclusive aspect of European Identity, one could legitimately argue that there can be no room for Turkey's potential EU membership in the EU because based on this definition and this aspect, Turkey is not considered to be European. In particular, within this aspect, as it has been also referred to in the aforementioned quotations - Turkey is perceived as endangering 'Union' of the EU because of its perceived differences based on culture, religion and geography, which are seen as 'exclusive' values of a European Identity. As former French president - Valéry Giscard d'Estaing - who was in charge of drafting the EU Constitutional Treaty at the Convention on the Future of Europe, commented:

“Turkey's accession would mark the end of the Union because Turkey was not a European country, it was part of another culture, another way of life (cited in Levin, 2011, p. 4)”

Nonetheless, opening EU candidacy negotiations with Turkey, is a clear sign of the EU's potential commitment to Turkey to examine it within the context of an EU Identity, in terms of its common shared values, and is an indication of Modern Europe

in European Identity. When it comes to being a European country, The Association Agreement between Turkey and the EU, that put forth the membership prospect for Turkey as well as the Commission confirmation of Turkey's eligibility to become a member in 1989 – in addition to the acceptance of Turkey as a candidate country in 1999 while beginning negotiations with Turkey in 2005 - were the official positions of the EU in supporting Turkey's EU membership with the Modern European aspect of the European Identity by confirming that Turkey is a European State and therefore there can be room for Turkey's membership in the EU.

To conclude, in this chapter, this study demonstrates the 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' aspects of European Identity which emanates from the concept of the idea of Europe and Modern Europe. Also, this section, illustrates these two concepts through the research, in order to show their existence in the discourses in the EU. In addition, this chapter demonstrates a discussion of Turkey within those aspects where Turkey is discussed and will be detailed and covered in the discussion chapter.

5. METHODOLOGY

Conventionally, Critical Discourse Studies view discourses “both written and spoken” as an important form of social practice that composes the social reality, including social identities and relations (Wodak & Meyer, 2016). “Seeing discourses as a form of social practice assumes a dialectic relationship between a particular discursive event and situations, institutions, social context where they are embedded” (Wodak & Meyer, 2001, p. 66). The discursive event is not only shaped by them, but also it shapes them. In other words, discourse constitutes social and political reality, and it is constituted by them (Wodak, 2002, p. 7-8).

This research utilizes DHA within CDA because DHA is a method that reveals the construction of identities through discourses and allows for an examination of the varying discussions of Turkey’s potential EU membership in the EP within the context of European Identity. This is the most often used methodology for this type of issue due to the fact the DHA method is suitable with the theoretical framework of this research is post-structuralist theory because this theory conceptualizes identity in discursive relational political and social, so DHA assists in formulating or constructing the EU identity. In particular, DHA approach in CDA fits well in this research on the ground that it emphasizes identity constructions in which the discursive constructions of “we, the self, European” and “they, the other, Turkey” seems as the fundamental basis of discourse of identity and difference (Wodak & Boukala, 2015, p.92).

According to Wodak, The DHA provides an appropriate methodology to explore the discursive relationship between identities and policies. Apart from the other approach in CDA, it emphasizes the historical framework for analyzing discourses to obtain the appropriate interpretation. It is an interdisciplinary methodology that integrates the social and political context in the investigation of discourses. “It triangulates knowledge about historical, intertextual sources and background of the social and political field where discursive events are embedded.”(Wodak, 2008, p. 9.) Also, it

reveals the discursive strategies that are exercised by a speaker, to reach a particular political and social aim. (Flowerdew, 2014).

Wodak explains the method in following way: “DHA investigates intertextual and interdiscursive relationships between utterances, texts, genres and discourses to explore their changes in relationship to sociopolitical change. Intertextuality refers to the connection of the texts to the other texts both in the past and in the present. This connection can be built through continued reference to a topic(s), the main actor(s) the same events as the other texts. The second process is re-contextualization which means that is to take an argument, a topic, or a discursive practice out of context that is de-contextualization, and then realizing it in a new context that is re-contextualization. Interdiscursivity means that discourses are linked to each other in various way. For instance, the discourse about climate change that is related the other discourses on health and international competition” (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, pp. 27-28).

The distinct strengths of DHA is that it combines a variety of interdisciplinary, methodological, and source approaches to study on discourses and texts. It is a historical analysis that is emphasized and considered when studying and interpreting the texts and the discourses. As an example, while investigating the discourse construction of identities, DHA’s interdisciplinary combines historical, socio-political and linguistic perspectives (De Cillia et al., 1999; Wodak & Meyer, 2001, 2016).

The main weakness of DHA is that its nature is interpretive. DHA is based on the premise that research has to rely on its interpretive skills and knowledge of the social and political change, process and conditions. To be specific, “building of analytical interconnections between different texts and discourses known as the de and re-contextualization process, is criticized that taking out of the text may leads to a different meaning when the text is removed from its original context and put into a new one with which have not been associated” (Siddi, 2018, p. 39). This research comes over this weakness by making this analysis transparent, by focusing on text (EP debates)

published that is available for the inspection of the reader. This research is also only focuses on the debates which are directly related Turkey's EU membership and European identity.

5.1 The material

This research analyses the discourses in the European Parliament on Turkey, regarding the terms with reference to European Identity. The data for this research was gathered from the EP's website, from the section of the European Parliament Plenary. The time period in the event of speeches in plenary debates that covers the questions with regard to Turkey's accession to the EU is from December 1999—when Turkey was declared a candidate country—to February 2018. This time period covers the four parliamentary terms⁶ where 102 plenary debates titled Turkey have been found. Since the time period of this research is too broad, and due to the space and limitation of this master's thesis, this research selects four plenary debates one from each of the parliamentary terms, in which the EU discusses the annual report of Turkey's progress towards accession. These debates are chosen from 2000, 2004, 2011 and 2017. Totally, 227 speeches are analyzed.

The reason to choose the debate from the year 2000, is that this debate was the debate right after Turkey was declared as a candidate country. In this debate, the European Parliament cast arguments forth about Turkey as a first-time candidate country. Prior to that, Turkish EU candidacy was not up for debate. Referring to the 2004 debate, this was the last debate before the Commission announced it would open accession negotiations with Turkey. In this debate, the EP discussed two things: the annual report of Turkey and the Commission's recommendation to open negotiations with Turkey. It was known that the prospect of Turkish EU membership would be more likely to become a reality. Regarding the 2011 debate, the aim was to choose a debate from 2010

⁶ The Parliamentary terms of the European Parliament from 1999 to 2018: 1999-2004, 2004-2009, 2009-2014, 2014-2019

since this research determined approximately a four to five-year time period between the debates to cover 20 years that this research chose—that discusses Turkey’s 2009 progress report. However, due to the fact that the debate in 2010 discusses Turkey together with all of the EU candidate countries—the focus is not only on Turkey’s EU membership—the aim of this research is to keep the focus on Turkey’s EU membership—which would be a difference in the analysis—this research selects 2011 debate. In order to produce the most current study, this research chooses the debate in 2017 which discusses Turkey’s 2016 report due to the fact that Turkey’s 2017 annual report has not been published by the Commission. This research is also aware of that choosing debates differ from the selected(s) would have made a difference in terms of the conclusion, given the fact that every debate would be under different circumstances based on the relationship between Turkey and the EU.

5.2 The method

Analytically, DHA is utilized in three dimensions. These are content or topic(s) of a specific discourse, discursive strategies, linguistic means and form of linguistic realizations that are drawn upon to realize both topics and strategies (Wodak, 2013; Wodak & Boukala, 2015). The first dimension is about the discourse topics in the narratives on Turkey’s EU membership with reference to Europe, the EU, and European identity. The second dimension is related to strategies used in the discursive construction of Turkey and European identity in the narratives to answer the following five questions:

1. How are Turkey, the EU, Europe named and referred to linguistically in the narratives (debates)?
2. What characteristics, qualities, and features are attributed to them?
3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in relation to them?
4. From what a point of view are these arguments and attributes expressed?
5. Are the respective utterances intensified and mitigated?

These questions elaborate five types of discursive strategies. These strategies are involved in construction of European Identity and the construction of Turkey in the EU's discourses in terms of European Identity. The third dimension explores the linguistic means that are employed to perceive these discursive strategies.

Table 1

Source: (Wodak & Meyer, 2016 p. 33)

Strategy	Objectives	Devices
Referential/Nomination	Discursive construction of in-groups and out-groups	Membership categorization tropes, metaphors
Predication	Discursive qualification of social actors positively and negatively	Stereotypical evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits
Argumentation	Justification of positive and negative argumentations	Topoi ⁷
Perspectivization	Positioning the speaker's perspective	Beliefs, ideas, position
Intensification or Mitigation	Modifying the epistemic or deontic position of utterances	Expressions, verb of saying, feeling thinking

⁷ “Within argumentation theory, topoi can be described as parts of argumentation which belong to the obligatory, either explicit or inferable premises. They are the content-related warrants or ‘conclusion rules’ which connect the argument or arguments with the conclusion, the claim. As such, they justify the transition from the argument or arguments to the conclusion” (Wodak, Meyer, & Wodak, 2001, p.13). Such as the topos of threat, dangerous, culture, history, advantageous, disadvantageous are faced in the discursive construction of national identities (ibid., p.13)

As a summary of the table, the first strategy “nomination” focuses on membership categorization devices in order to represent social actors “in-groups and out-groups.” (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, p.32). As it has been addressed in the theory section, delineation of the self, the EU, European and the ‘other,’ Turkey or the in and out group is the first step in the discursive construction of identity. The second strategy - ‘predication’ - attributes negative and positive characteristics to the EU and Turkey in the discourses. The third strategy, “argumentation” justifies and legitimizes attributions through argumentation. The fourth strategy refers to the position of speakers in the EP. The fifth is about whether the respective utterances are intensified or mitigation. In each of these strategies, special attention needs to be paid to linguistic devices. However, the primary objective of this research is not to respectively investigate these five discursive strategies due to the scope of this research. This is not manageable within all speeches made in four plenary debates. It is worth noting that this research only uses the aforementioned questions—but not reflected as detailed in every speeches utilized in this research—in order to answer the research question. This research is more interested in overall what these questions bring up.

Since this research aims to do the-depth investigation in Turkey’s EU membership in terms of European identity, this research discloses the Commission’s the Council’s, the European Parliament’s and the parties’ view of Turkey and of European Identity in the context of European Identity. Nevertheless, it is necessary to make a point that this research cannot tell how Turkey’s potential EU membership within the Council and within the Commission is discussed, or whether or not Turkey’s potential EU membership discourses in European Identity are competing within these EU institutions. This research can only deduce as much as the representative of the Commission and the Council reflect their ideas in the EP debates. Therefore, this research cannot grasp the competitiveness of discourses of Turkey’s EU membership in European Identity within the Commission and the Council.

6. ANALYSIS

This chapter will present the answers to the five questions outlined in the former chapter - these questions are answered by analyzing the four debates. After that, in the following sub-sections of this chapter, it is analyzed respectively the debates and presents the reflected views of the Commission, the Council, and the parties with regards to European Identity and Turkey's potential EU membership.

6.1 Discourses in European Parliament

In the EP discourses, the EU is equated with Europe and the EU membership is equated with Europeanness. Speaking of the EU as interchangeable with Europe shows the importance of the geographical and cultural dimension, instead of the political perception of speakers. Speakers in the EP debates use the first person plural pronoun We, Us, Our - which is the establishment of a group. Speakers use “We the Europeans,” “We who belong to Europe, European,” “We who belong to European culture and civilization,” - “Our Europe, our values, and our union.” As to Turkey, the prominent images of Turkey in the speeches emerging from the EP, Turkey is a country that wants to be part of this group or wants to come closer to the EU, as it is represented as out of this group “non-Europeans,” and it is equated with Turkish, Turkish EU membership. In addition to this, in recent times – specifically, in the 2017 debates, Turkey is depicted as it is “far from Europe,” and “moving away from Europe,” “as a danger.”

The features attributed to be a European are varying in the discourses. On the one hand, being a European is to have values based on democracy, human rights, rule of law and multi-culturalism. Thus, being a European is attributed to being “Modern, liberal and secular.” Its union is referred to be a “community of values” and “club of democratic nations.” In particular, this expression of modern Europe is to be found in the utterances of the Commission, the Council, left-wing, and liberal and green parties in the EP. Furthermore, Europe and Europeanness are often referred to together with

adjectives such as “tolerant,” “secure,” “respectful,” and “peaceful,” while Turkey is referred vice versa. The EU is attributed to as “*an anchor*” due to the representation of Turkey as an undemocratic country incapable of change or ‘capable of change’ under European help. The features attributed to Turkey are also diverse. In the speakers’ discourses, Turkey is attributed to as “non-modern,” “non-liberal,” “non-secular.” Also, it is attributed as “a bridge” between the civilizations, and “a valuable neighbor.”. On the other hand, the features of being a European means to have the same culture, history and religion in the speaker speeches. It is to share the same civilization referring to “Judeo-Christian” “Greek-Roman,” “the renaissance and reform” and “the enlightenment”. “Geography,” is also one feature attributed to being a European. This Europe is stated by Christian Democrat, far right and conservative parties in the EP. Turkey is equated with “Islam,” “Orient,” “Muslim” and “Ottoman.” Being a European is also equated as a distinct superior civilization that draws a border against outsiders where the image of Turkey has been constructed as inferior.

One of the arguments employed with regard to Turkey in the discourses is that “Turkey is not a European country,” consequently, “it cannot be a member of the EU.” In order to legitimize and justify this argument, speakers use features attributed by them to being European, Europeanness. In other words, for this argument, the idea of Europe is defended by speakers who is opponent of Turkish membership. Another argument employed in the discourses regarding Turkey is that “Turkey can be a European,” and “a member of the EU.” This argument is justified by means of the features attributed by speakers, who is proponent of Turkish membership, to Modern Europe.

These two arguments are expressed in two different ways in the EP debate. From the point of the view of the exclusive aspect in European identity, the speaker believes Turkey as inherently different from Europe. The values of being European are not acquired. From the point of view of the inclusive aspect in European identity, the speaker believes Turkey is different from Europe though. However, in this aspect, the

speaker's idea is the possibility that Turkey become a European and a member of the EU because the values of being European can be acquired gradually. The EU is constructed as more open.

Arguments employed on both sides in the utterances regarding Turkey and the EU are intensified. For instance, from the side of opposition of Turkey's membership, it is uttered that Turkish EU membership would be "detrimental." Enlargement with Turkey would be "fatal," losing of the EU's identity. Turkey-EU membership is "a crime" and "don't commit it." Furthermore, it is aggravated as 'a great historical mistake,' "senseless," and "absurd negotiations," From the side of a proponent of Turkish-EU membership, it is uttered that Turkey's EU membership would "enrich" the EU. Turkey is a "great" country, culture.

6.1.1 Turkey's Accession debate in 2000

This debate that is from 1999-2004 parliamentary term was the first debate after Turkey gained a candidate country status which is the reason that this research selected this debate. There are 28 speakers in this debate. One of them is the Commissioner, one of them is the Representative of the EU Council and two of them are rapporteurs. One of the rapporteur is from European People's Party and European Democrats (PPE-DE). The other is from European United Left and Nordic Green Left (GUE-NGL). Totally, 26 members of the European Parliament (MEPs) discussed Turkey's EU membership in this debate.

Starting with the Commission and the Council, they discuss Turkey's potential EU membership in a similar way. They are discussing Turkey's EU membership within the idea of a modern Europe as related to European Identity. Since, in both of the Commission's and the Council's utterances, the idea of Modern Europe in European Identity is more prominent, it can be said that they are constructing Europe and European Identity, in this way. As an illustration of their views, and as more detailed answers for the five questions respectively, the quotation is put:

.... our common objective of bringing Turkey closer to the European Union...to anchor Turkey solidly and permanently in our community of values. We want Turkey to be a modern, open State in which democracy and human rights are respected, the rule of law applies, and minorities are protected and respected...to bring Turkish system into the line with the values of the European Union. ('The Debates of European Parliament: Turkey', 2000, p. 4, Commission)

Turkey is referred to as a country that needs enhance its development through the values of the EU Community whose features are attributed to the EU that is a modern and an open State, where democracy and human rights are respected, where the rule of law and minority rights are protected. These values represent the civic component of the European Identity. The EU is attributed to be the anchor that Turkey is firmly settled in European community of values due to the fact that Turkey does not have these values as much as the European countries have, which makes Turkey not completely as the self, European, but partly, in the Commission and the Council view. However, from their point of view, it can be implied that they are sharing an inclusive aspect of European Identity, which means Turkey can gain these values and become a European country, consequently, a member of the EU.

As to the main center PPE-DE, as surprisingly, in this debate, the majority of PPE-DE follows the same line with the Commission and the Council, while this party is supposed to voice an expressly essentialist view of the EU Identity in opposition to Turkey's EU membership⁸. This party used to discuss Turkey's potential EU membership within the cultural, religious and geographical features attributed by this party to European Identity. However, in this debate, this party refers to Turkey as a country that is expected to comply with the relevant European values that are meant to respect democratic freedoms, to have a better human rights record, and to accept the

⁸ Opposition of Turkey's potential EU membership on account of culture and identity were explicitly voiced in the first time at Luxembourg European Council in 1997, and Turkey was not included as a candidate country. In that period, the most controversial statements were made by EPP, at summit of March 1997. The party announced that "Turkey is not a candidate to become a member of the EU in the short and long term the European Union is a civilization project and within this project, Turkey has no place" (quoted in Laçiner 1999:40 and Düzgit 2012:198)

rule of law, ('The Debates of European Parliament: Turkey', 2000, p. 13) and discusses Turkey's potential EU membership in the Modern idea of Europe in European Identity.

As a further example for discussion of Turkey's EU membership in this way, it is illustrated by one of the MEPs from The European Socialist Party (PES):

...we are not an exclusive Christian club which wants, can or should exclude Turkey on relativistic religious or cultural grounds. The premise should be that a country with a laicistic constitution inhabited predominantly by Muslims which is based on the values on which the European Union itself is founded – i.e. freedom, equality and tolerance – could enrich the European Union. The European Union is not founded on religious values, it is founded on values which we owe to the Enlightenment and which, quite independently of the religious leanings of a person or a country and its inhabitants... This means that, as a democratic state under the rule of law with separation of powers and fundamental values as we understand them, Turkey will enrich the European Union. ('The Debates of European Parliament: Turkey', 2000, p.14-15)

This view is found in voice from the European Liberal Democrat and Reform party (ELDR), Europe of democracies and diversities (EDD) as well. It is expressed that the EU is founded on freedom, equality and tolerance, and its identity is not based on religious and cultural values, but rather based on the values coming from the Age of Enlightenment, the *acquis communautaire* and the Copenhagen Criteria which are the EU's common values as democracy as Copenhagen Criteria. The EU is not constructed as an exclusive Christian group which excludes Turkey from the EU with religious and cultural grounds. Therefore, Turkey's EU membership is being discussed through modern, civic and inclusive identity of the EU. Despite Turkey's differences being emphasized being Muslim, the exclusive aspect is not shared towards Turkey. Even, this view is intensified by saying that Turkey could enrich the European Union due to the country's features as differences ('The Debates of European Parliament: Turkey', 2000, p. 15).

GUE-NGL addresses the geographic quality of Turkey's membership that the EU stretches well beyond Europe into the unstable regions, from the point of view of a security perspective, by EU' enlargement with Turkey ('The Debates of European

Parliament: Turkey', 2000 p.7) As it has been touched upon in the theory section of this research, geography is also one of the attribution for the European Identity in exclusive manner. This group does not state that Turkey is not a European State in terms of its geographic aspect of European Identity, but it is still argued that Turkey's membership is perceived as a disadvantage in terms of geography with a security perspective surrounding it. On the contrary, the Union for Europe of the Nations Group (UEN) is arguing that Turkey is not in Europe and by Turkey's potentially joining the EU, the EU's border would move toward war and conflict. GUE-NGL criticizes the use of religious arguments in the European Identity regarding Turkey's EU membership. ('The Debates of European Parliament: Turkey', 2000 p. 8)⁹. However, this group also refers to Turkey as a barbaric nation that is incompatible with today's EU values as it regards a European Identity due to its Ottoman past. This is also voiced by one of the parliamentarian from Technical group of independent members (TDI) who puts forward that Turkey is not a European country; its culture is not European referring which is shared the exclusive aspect of European Identity (Ibid., p. 8)

6.1.2 Turkey's progress towards EU accession debate in 2004

Totally, 86 speakers took a word in this debate. Compared this debate to the previous debate, it can be said that there is a sharp contrast. In this debate, the heated discussion is turning around Turkey's compatibility with the EU in terms of European Identity - in particular, a cultural, essentialist aspect of European Identity.

The Commission's and the Council's position on Turkey's EU membership is the same as it has been in the previous debate. Their emphasis of European Identity is still on the civic, modern idea of Europe. They are discussing Turkey's EU membership with regard to the civic traits of European Identity. Therefore, modernization of turkey as

⁹ The religious argument is that Turkey as the other in European identity because Turkey is not Christian. This quotation is also an answer for that Turkey is other in the context of European identity because of Turkey's past history. This is discussed in the theory section of this research by drawing upon Iver Neuman's study on Turkey's otherness in the European identity.

compatible with the EU's values set by Copenhagen criteria is a key aspect of Turkey's potential EU membership.

When it comes to the parties, the majority of PPE-DE, Non-attached members (NI), UEN, and Independence democracy group (IND-DEM) discuss Turkey's EU membership according to their essentialist view of the European identity in this debate by contrast with the debate in 2000. These parties are defining the EU and its identity with a strong emphasis on exclusive, cultural, religious, and geographical values of European Identity. As illustrated with one of the speech of MEPs from UEN:

reading this report, it is obvious that the rapporteur and the majority that supports the report are quite clear about the profound differences between Turkey and the EU (...) Turkey and the EU being two widely different civilizations whose values are incompatible. In the light of this report, no responsible politician can come to any conclusion other than that Turkey does not belong in the EU and that there is no basis for embarking upon accession negotiations. (...) Turkey is not Europe (...) A country's culture cannot be taken away from it; or, rather, any attempt to do so takes centuries

Turkey and the EU are referred to as two different civilizations whose values are not compatible with one another. Turkey's otherness is more explicitly explained through saying Turkey is not Europe. Moreover, in this debate, as illustrated in the quotation below, there is a strong emphasis of both Turkey's and Europe's cultural differences referring to their past history.

What is Turkey? Since when has Turkey been in Europe? Ask your own children. Ask your children who study geography if it is in Europe or in Asia. Ask the priest who married you if Turkey is in Europe. Which brings me to the Eurlings report: the original differs from the report we are debating today just as the Holy Bible differs from the Koran. And while we are on the subject of the Holy Bible, may I remind you of the multitude of races housed many centuries ago in the Tower of Babel. It fell. If you too wish Europe to fall, bring 80 million Turks with a different culture and different religion into Europe. When de Gaulle built Europe with the other Europeans, he said that Europe was determined by her geography, her Greco- Roman culture and the Christian religion. So now we are going to bring the Turks into Europe. That will be a crime for Europe. Do not commit it ('The debates of European Parliament: Turkey's progress towards accession', 2004, IND/DEM p. 17)

Besides, these parties are intensifying their utterances against Turkey's EU membership in terms of cultural aspect of the European identity by referring to that Turkey's EU membership would be a crime, detrimental, catastrophe which leads to the EU losing its own identity. As an illustration; it is put:

...I including myself are gravely concerned that, should Turkey join the European Union, this enlargement might prove fatal and Europeans might lose their identity, that it might be detrimental to the sense of being 'us' on which solidarity in the European Union is founded ('The debates of European Parliament: Turkey's progress towards accession', 2004, PPE/DE p.4)

PSE, the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), European Free Alliance and European Green Party (VERTS-ALE) and GUE-NGL¹⁰ discuss Turkey's EU membership in the context of European Identity, by contrast with the arguments specially made by PPE-DE. For instance, one of the MEPs from ALDE states that

Ms. Pottering, I believe that the identity of the European project consists in its being a political project and not a geographical project or a religious one. I also believe that our identity does not reside so much in our past and our roots – which some would claim to be completely Christian or Catholic – as in our present and, especially, our future. Our past has seen not only glories but also wars and bloodshed. Ladies and gentlemen, I believe instead that our identity is represented by the last fifty years, in which we have tried and to some extent succeeded in bringing about the rule of law, the separation of powers and the secularization of our institutions, as well as the protection of human and political rights as an essential part of human development. That is our identity, and that is the project in which the Turkish people and government are asking to take part. ('The debates of European Parliament: Turkey's progress towards accession', 2004, p. 6)

Moreover, as it has been touched upon the theory chapter of this research, in particular ALDE, PSE and VERTS-ALE attribute to the EU as remedy for a clash of civilization

¹⁰ This party is generally discussing Turkey in terms of civic traits of European identity referring to the Copenhagen Criteria. The most of speech made by this party is composed of Cyprus issue. This research can say that this group is generally constructing European identity on civic values referring modern idea of the EU, but this research cannot say more than that because this group generally talks about Cyprus issue. Even this group asserts that Cyprus is an obligation for Turkey's EU membership due to the fact that it is directly related to the democratization process of Turkey, respecting for its commitment to the EU's *acquis communautaire* the EU's accession.

and to Turkey's EU membership as a bridge between the civilizations which are the arguments that proponent of Turkey's EU membership uses against the opponent of exclusive, cultural reading of European identity.

Turkey can demonstrate that it is possible, and Europe can demonstrate that it can contribute to preventing a clash of civilizations between the West and the Islamic world, a clash for which many fundamentalists in the East and West are hoping. Europe can show that, based on shared values, there is room for more than one culture and that in the Europe of the twenty-first century, there is room for more than one religion. ('The debates of European Parliament: Turkey's progress towards accession', 2004, VERTS-ALE, p.7)

Furthermore, in this debate, along with the above quotation, there is also a strong point of the EU's multiculturalism which is one of the common shared values of modern idea of Europe in European Identity arising from the foundation of the EU. Furthermore, these parties are giving utterance to the Western ideas of Modern Europe that sees the Modern European nations' values are based on respecting pluralism, different identities and defending cultural diversity as it is illustrated with a quotation;

...A European Union in which one religion is worth more than another, one in which there are superior and subordinate cultures, has nothing to do with the Treaties of Rome ('The debates of European Parliament: Turkey's progress towards accession', 2004, p.10)

6.1.3 2010 Progress report on Turkey debate in 2011

Totally, there were 53 speakers commenting in the debate. Compared this debate to the previous, it is found that there is a change. Identity related arguments are not explicitly expressed in a way as was in the 2004 debate. There is strong emphasis on the values of the EU. In this debate, strong emphasis is on the civic component of European Identity, specifically more referring to the Copenhagen Criteria— democracy, freedom of press, freedom of expression, human rights, minority rights (Alevi and Christians) women's rights and journalist's rights—. European's culture is being defined by Copenhagen Criteria, emphasizing that freedom of expression is a crucial importance

for the EU – specifically, religious pluralism¹¹ (‘The Debates of European Parliament: 2010 progress report on Turkey’, 2011). Almost all of MEPs from the parties in the EU discusses Turkey’s incompatibility with the EU’s identical values such as a modern democratic state with full Copenhagen Criteria. In particular, secular, modern, democratic states that has human rights, rule of democracy, freedom of expression and freedom of speech are the attributes the EU possesses. As an illustration,

Turkey must further improve the respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, particularly the freedom of expression and the freedom of religion, in both legislation and practice. Additional efforts will also have to be made in order to ensure full compliance with the Copenhagen criteria, in respect of property rights, trade union rights, the rights of persons belonging to minorities, the rights of women and children, the fight against discrimination, gender equality and the fight against torture and inhuman treatment, among other areas(‘The Debates of European Parliament: 2010 progress report on Turkey’, 2011, p. 2, The Council).

The Council discusses Turkey as being a dialogue between civilization promoting European values to its region as it has been discussed in 2004 debate. For the Commission, Turkey is a model country in its region that advocates the values and standards of the EU. The EU is being constructed as the defender of rights in Turkey, and the European Identity is built upon European value. PPE also defines Turkey, as the Council and the Commission defines, as a bridge in its region between the EU and the Middle East in terms of foreign policy.

However, it is worth noting that there is still discussion of Turkey’s potential EU membership within culturalist, exclusive view of European identity. Some of MEPs from PPE, The European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR), and nearly all of Non-Attachment (NI) express the cultural aspect of European Identity. As it is seen in the quotation below, there is still a prominent argument about the differences between Turkey and the EU and defining Europe with respect to Judeo-Christianism. Moreover,

¹¹ That is also a concern in 2000 debates voiced by ELDR. The criticism is that Turkey does not have a high standard in terms of respecting religious pluralism that is a shared value in the EU.

Turkey's accession is presented as mistakes, detrimental effect for the EU which is the way that he is intensifying his argument. As is seen once more, culturalist, historical and religious arguments based on an essentialist reading of Turkey's quest for EU membership are dominated on cultural and identity grounds.

Turkey's accession to Europe would be one of the greatest historical mistakes...Turkey's accession would have a detrimental effect on integration, too... Mr Erdoğan's agenda is that of an Islamic party and, on that point too, the balance would shift if Turkey joined the EU. We would have to deal with millions of people who, unfortunately, are not familiar with the Judeo-Christian fundamentals of Europe and who would want to change them. Let us therefore make sure that the 2010 progress report is the last one. Let us stop these senseless negotiations!(*The Debates of European Parliament: 2010 progress report on Turkey*, 2011, p. 11, ECR)

Furthermore, this view is intensified more as illustrated with a quotation:

Ladies and gentlemen, when are we going to stop this sham? Europe does not want Turkey and Europe does not want Islam. Mr. Sarkozy has already said that. Mrs. Merkel has already said that, and the majority of European citizens do not want Turkey as a member of the European Union, either... a backward Islamic culture has no place in Europe. Prime Minister Erdoğan, are you a real man or a subservient coward? How much longer will you continue humiliating the Turkish people? Take the honorable way out and stop doing that (*The Debates of European Parliament: 2010 progress report on Turkey*, 2011, p. 6, NI).

On the contrary, the majority of ALDE, EFD, SD and VERTS-ALE, builds the EU's values in its identity based on Copenhagen Criteria, referring to freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and human rights. They are defining the EU as our European club of democratic nations which Turkey wants to be a part of. In addition, they discuss that Turkey has to fulfill its obligation, that is the European idea set in the treaty of the EU, towards the EU, if Turkey wants to accede to the Union.

Since, the situation in Turkey in terms of democratic reform, regarding the values of the EU is in concern voiced by these parties, Turkey's EU membership is mostly discussed in civic traits of European Identity. Therefore, a modern, secular country with a high standard on the freedom of press, freedom of expression and human rights

are core shared values of the EU that is a part of the modern idea of Europe in European Identity in the discussion of Turkey's potential EU membership.

6.1.4 Turkey's progress report debate in 2017

About 60 speakers commented in this debate. The general finding in this debate is that Turkey's EU membership is discussed in terms of the civic component of the European Identity. The heated debate is turning around migration issues, the result of constitutional referendum in Turkey, arrested journalists. Almost all of MEPs discussion that is centered around Turkey's EU membership includes a civic component of European Identity. Therefore, they agree that Turkey is moving away from the EU in the sense of the EU's civic values built up in Copenhagen Criteria, as it has been highlighted in the annual report of Turkey ('The Debates of European Parliament: 2016 Report on Turkey'). Within this aspect, the discussion of Turkey's unfit for the EU due to the fact that the country is violating EU's values and principles determined by the European Identity, as it is turning into authoritarian regime not democratic, shows up in this debate. Therefore, Turkey is explicitly found in voice that Turkey is not a European state, no place in Europe as it is illustrated in above quotation;

Mr. President, as many speakers have already mentioned, the situation in terms of freedom, democracy and the rule of law in Turkey is getting worse, and it is hard to watch...A country which does not respect its ethnic and religious minorities, and does not respect human dignity and freedom, has no place in the European Union...Commissioner, I have to say you admitted that democracy and the rule of law in Turkey have been violated. These things are in the Copenhagen criteria. I therefore call upon you immediately to break off the EU accession talks with Turkey. ('The Debates of European Parliament: 2016 Report on Turkey', p.18, ECR)

Likewise, the Commission and the Council discuss Turkey's potential EU membership. The matter regarding Turkey's EU membership is Turkey's fulfilling the EU's criteria and values because of Turkey's declining compatibility with the EU in terms of Copenhagen Criteria - in particular referring to the freedom of speech and freedom of democratic expression. Besides, in this debate, the EU is attributed to as an anchor for Turkey's democratic process again.

The EU should remain the anchor for Turkey's reforms.... We continue to expect Turkey to respect the highest standards when it comes to democracy, the rule of law and respect for fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of expression We must continue to promote the values on which our Union is based ('The Debates of European Parliament: 2016 Report on Turkey', p.3, The Council).

Similarly, SD, ALDE, VERTS-ALE, EFDD, ECR and GUE-NGL emphasizes that rule of law, democracy, fundamental rights, separation of power, freedom of express are the core values of the EU which is representing the modern idea of Europe in European Identity. Turkey is not compatible with the EU's own standards, and principles. These parties agree that Turkey has to be under the state of rule of law, democracy and human rights which is the demand by modern idea of Europe in European identity.

However, there is still argument made in some of MEPs from NI, PPE, ENF that Turkey is not European. Their argument is that Turks are oriental, not European which causes different perspectives on values. The EU is attributed to be a secular, modern, having gender equality and minor rights. However, Turkey's culture is not compatible with those values of the EU. Thus, Turkey is violating the EU values and principles. European Western oriented Turkey is demanded by the EU. Besides, the essentialist arguments of European Identity are repeated in this debate.

When will the European Union cease this masquerade which dishonors Europe...Is it still necessary to repeat that Turkey cannot pretend to be European by its geography, its culture, its religion, its language and its history? This is not an insult but it's just a fact which Brussels refuses to admit... Turkish President Erdogan is posing himself as the heir of the Ottoman Empire, an empire which put our European and Christian civilization under great peril through its military conquests. Remember Lepanto and Vienna. ...please have at last the courage to put a definitive end to these absurd negotiations. ('The Debates of European Parliament: 2016 Report on Turkey', p.14, ENF)

7 CONCLUSION

The aim of this research was to analyze the Turkish EU membership debate in the EP within the context of European Identity. By doing so, this research investigated European Identity, and the discussion of Turkey's EU membership within the context of European Identity that remain a most controversial, intertwined issue, raising competing discourse within the EU. This research concludes with a few points worth emphasizing.

One of the major points, at the end of this research is that Turkey's EU membership bid is still up for debate with respect to European Identity. Turkey's quest for EU membership is discussed within two different concepts of EU identity. The topic of European Identity as it relates to Turkey's EU candidacy has played itself out in two separate and distinct delineations. The first delineation includes a view of Europe as modern, inclusive, liberal and cosmopolitan which is reflected in official documents of the EU – specifically The Copenhagen Criteria. It is based on a modern, European community that upholds human rights, rule of law and democracy – representing the civic component of European Identity. The second delineation involves a more essentialist, exclusive culturalist view of Europe that draws its distinction along the lines of history, culture, religion representing cultural component of European Identity.

When it comes to the discourse on European Identity, The Commission and The Council are mostly associated with Modern European Identity and The Commission stands out as a firm defender of the idea of modern Europe. In this sense, Turkey as a full member would contribute to cultural diversity in the EU. Europeanness is defined more on the basis of acquired values such as democracy, human rights and the rule of law. The 'unity' of the motto 'unity in diversity' is sought and cherished in these values. The idea is that Turkey can be accepted in the Union as long as those values are fully shared and implemented. Also, Turkey in Europe is even deemed a potential model for

the rest of the Muslim world in promoting the EU' values in its region as well as a bridge between the EU and Muslim worlds.

The parties in the EP are divided regarding Turkey's EU membership in the context of European Identity. The left and liberal political parties are not expressing culturalist and identity-based arguments in an exclusive way. In relation to Turkey's potential EU membership within the context of European identity, their approach to the concept of the EU identity is based on the modern idea of Europe. They explicitly refuse cultural essentialism, remain proponents of multiculturalism and argue for the adoption of democratic values as the most fundamental criteria for EU membership. Left and Liberal parties in the EP, state that Turkey's EU membership enhances the multiculturalism of the EU that is the symbol of the modern idea of Europe in European Identity. The main center right European Peoples Party expressly voiced an essentialist view of the EU Identity in Turkey's EU membership while the socialist, the liberal and the greens defined it the other way around. The Eurosceptic and far rights have found their expression in their exclusivist identity narratives in the debates.

Another important major point made by this research is that identity- related discourses have evolved since 1999 to 2018. This research observed the variation among the debates. There was a sharp contrast among the debates in terms of discussed identity aspects. In light of the speeches made in the EP debate, while the civic component of European Identity was more prominent in the 2000 debate, Turkey's EU membership is discussed in terms of that concept by attaching importance to rule of law, democracy and human rights, whereas the 2004 debate discussed Turkey's EU membership more in cultural component of European Identity. In addition, after 2010, Turkey's EU membership was barely discussed in the cultural component of European Identity. After 2010, the emphasis of European Identity was on civic trait of European Identity. Especially, the values of the civic component of the European Identity were discussed around freedom of speech, freedom of expression and minority rights in Turkey's EU membership. Significantly, democracy, human rights and freedom of express as civic values of European Identity and as the most important aspects of discussing of Turkey's

potential EU membership were prevalent in the 2011 and 2017 debates. They were voiced by MEPs from almost all party groups. These values were in agreement with the Copenhagen criteria and showed what an inclusive aspect of European identity is. Besides, the view accorded to Turkey from the parties was that of a candidate country with issues of concern such as gender equality, democracy and human rights at the forefront of its overall perception that overshadowed its potential bid for EU membership.

One more conclusion remark is that this research has observed that the EU is still in the process of redefining what EU identity really is the EU appears to be is closer to a compromise regarding Turkey's position with regard to EU identity, even if the controversy remains as seen through the viewpoints of the European Parliament. In the last decade, the EU is currently one step closer to a universal agreement on what constitutes EU identity, redefining exactly what Europe, Europeanness mean based on the common shared values such as democracy, human rights, rule of law, freedom of speech and gender equality. For now, this modern Idea of Europe in European Identity seems a reconciliation in the EP in the discussion of Turkey's quest for EU membership. This research concludes that the majority of views on both sides would converge on an inclusive, modern and liberal definition of European Identity. Consequently, a resolution of ongoing identity issues and stepping towards a compromise on Modern European Identity in the EU would show a positive development for the future enlargement of the EU.

REFERENCES

- Aydın-Düzgıt, S. (2012). *Constructions of European identity*. [Elektronisk resurs]: Debates and discourses on Turkey and the EU. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.004272062&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Aydın-Düzgıt, S. (2015). Post-Yapısalcı Yaklaşımlar ve Uluslararası İlişkilerin Temel Kavramları. (Turkish). *Post-Structural Approaches and Basic Concepts of International Relations*. (English), 12(46), 153. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edo&AN=110433357&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Aydın-Düzgıt, S. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in analysing European Union foreign policy: Prospects and challenges. *Cooperation & Conflict*, 49(3), 354–367. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=98367509&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Aydın-Düzgıt, S., & Tocci, N. (2015). *Turkey and the European Union*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Bahar Rumelili. (2004). Constructing Identity and Relating to Difference: Understanding the EU's Mode of Differentiation. *Review of International Studies*, (1), 27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210504005819>
- Baycar, N. (2013). Turkish Cultural Identity: A European Identity. *Turkish Journal of Politics*, 4(2), 5–21. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=97330100&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Beyza Çağatay Tekin. (2008). The construction of Turkey's possible EU membership in French political discourse. *SAGE Publications*, 19(6), 727–763.
- Casanova, J. (2006). The Long, Difficult, and Tortuous Journey of Turkey into Europe and the Dilemmas of European Civilization. *Constellations: An International Journal of*

- Critical and Democratic Theory, 13(2), 234–247. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=phl&AN=PHL2087547&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Connolly, W. E. (2002). Identity \ difference: democratic negotiations of political paradox. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2002. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.001501683&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The Discursive Construction of National Identities. Discourse & Society, 10(2), 149–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002002>
- Delanty, G. (2013). Formations of European modernity. [Elektronisk resurs] ; A historical and political sociology of Europe. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan: [distributor] Not Avail, 2013. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.004276320&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Delanty, G. (2018). The European heritage: a critical re-interpretation. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.005037736&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Delanty, G., & Campling, J. (1995). Inventing Europe: idea, identity, reality. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.000948689&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Diez, T. (2004). Europe's others and the return of geopolitics. Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 17(2), 319–335. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=13971950&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Diez, T., & Barbato, M. (2007). Using My Religion: Reflections on the Role of Christianity in European Integration. Conference Papers -- International Studies Association, 1–19. Retrieved from

<http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=26960575&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Ecirli, A. (2011). Feeling “European” and European identity: Public Perceptions in Turkey – EU Relations. *Sociologie Românească*, 9.

Elizabeth Shakman Hurd. (2006). Negotiating Europe: The Politics of Religion and the Prospects for Turkish Accession. *Review of International Studies*, (3), 401.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021050600708X>

Flowerdew, J. (2014). *Discourse in context*. London; New York : Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.004704097&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Gul Pinar Erkem. (2009). Identity Construction of Europe by Othering: A Case Study of Turkey and the EU Relations from a Cultural Perspective. *Europolis*, (5), 489–509. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=43082199&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Hansen, L. (2013). *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. Routledge.

Hasan Kosebalaban. (2007). The Permanent ‘Other?’ Turkey and the Question of European Identity, (4), 87. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edspmu&AN=edspmu.S1527193507400872&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/20045621>

Iver B. Neumann, & Jennifer M. Welsh. (1991). The Other in European Self-Definition: An Addendum to the Literature on International Society. *Review of International Studies*, (4), 327. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.20097270&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Keridis, D. (2009). Turkey and the Identity of Europe: Contemporary Identity Politics on the European Frontier. In *Turkey’s Accession to the European Union: An Unusual*

- Candidacy (pp. 147–159). Athens: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Klymenko, L. (2016). Nation-building and presidential rhetoric in Belarus. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 15(6), 727–747. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.15.6.04kly>
- Kylstad, I. (2010, October). Turkey and the EU: a ‘new’ European identity in the making? [Monograph]. Retrieved 1 May 2018, from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/europeanInstitute/LEQS/LEQSHome.aspx>
- Lauren M. McLaren. (2007). Explaining Opposition to Turkish Membership of the EU. *European Union Politics*, 8(2), 251–278. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=25016693&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Levin, P. T. (2011). *Turkey and the European Union Christian and Secular Images of Islam*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Müftüler-Baç, M. (2011). *The European Union and Turkey: Democracy, Multiculturalism and European Identity*, 28.
- Neumann, I. B. (1999). *Uses of the other: ‘The East’ in European identity formation*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, cop. 1999. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.001157340&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Öner, S. (2008). *An Analysis of European Identity within the Framework of the EU: The Case of Turkey’s Membership*.
- Öznur, A. Y., & Ertuğrul, K. (2018). The Otherness of Turkey in European Integration. *Turkish Studies*, 19(1), 48–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2017.1396895>
- Risse, T., & Grabowsky, J. K. (n.d.). *European Identity Formation in the Public Sphere and in Foreign Policy*, 23.
- Risse-Kappen, T. (2010). *A community of Europeans? [Elektronisk resurs] : transnational identities and public spheres*. Ithaca, N.Y.; London : Cornell University Press, 2010. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.004836648&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Rumelılı, B. (2008). *Negotiating Europe: EU-Turkey Relations from an Identity Perspective*.

- Insight Turkey, 10(1), 97–110. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=31821052&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Siddi, M. (2018). An evolving Other: German national identity and constructions of Russia. *Politics*, 38(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263395717715819>
- Sjursen, H. (2008). Enlargement in Perspective: The EU's Quest for Identity (ARENA Working Papers No. 5). ARENA. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/p/erp/arenax/p0251.html>
- Tassinari, F. (2008). Variable Geometries: Institutions, Power, and Ideas in Turkey's European Integration Process. In *the Geopolitics of Europe's Identity* (pp. 207–223). Palgrave Macmillan, New York. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230610323_12
- The Debates of European Parliament: 2010 progress report on Turkey. (8 March 2011). <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bCRE%2b20110308%2bITEM014%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN>
- The Debates of European Parliament: 2016 Report on Turkey. (5 July 2017). <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bCRE%2b20170705%2bITEM012%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN>
- The Debates of European Parliament: Turkey. (14 November 2000). <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bCRE%2b20001114%2bITEM003%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN>
- The Debates of European Parliament: Turkey's progress towards accession. (13 December 2004). <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bCRE%2b20041213%2bITEM010%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN>
- Tocci, N., & Internazionali, I. A. (n.d.). Conditionality, Impact and Prejudice in EU-Turkey Relations: IAI-TEPAV Report, 161.
- Van dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2),

115–140. Retrieved from

<http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=21193648&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Weldes, J. E., Laffey, M., Gusterson, H., & Duvall, R. (1999). *Cultures of Insecurity: states, communities, and the production of danger*. University of Minnesota Press. Retrieved from [https://research-information.bristol.ac.uk/en/publications/cultures-of-insecurity-states-communities-and-the-production-of-danger\(f211a678-90ff-43fd-a4b4-55b3364b5cf5\).html](https://research-information.bristol.ac.uk/en/publications/cultures-of-insecurity-states-communities-and-the-production-of-danger(f211a678-90ff-43fd-a4b4-55b3364b5cf5).html)

Winther Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. [Elektronisk resurs]. London: Sage Publications Ltd., 2002. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.004991972&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Wodak, R. (2012). *Language, power and identity*. Cambridge University Press, 45(2), 215–233.

Wodak, R. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis*. Los Angeles, Calif. : SAGE, 2013. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.002503379&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Wodak, R. (2002). *Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 27.

Wodak, R. (2018). *Discourse and European Integration*, 34.

Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union A discourse historical approach. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 14(1), 87–109. <https://doi.org/doi.10.1075/jlp.14.1.05>

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 6 Bonhill Street, London EC2A 4PU: SAGE Publications, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.005055834&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Wodak, R., Meyer, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis. [Elektronisk resurs]. London: SAGE, 2001. Retrieved from <http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01310a&AN=lovisa.004753150&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Lisbon Treaty <https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:12007L/TXT>

Rome Treaty <https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:xy00>