

Introduction

Citizenship, identity, and the question of democracy in Turkey

E. Fuat Keyman and Ahmet İçduygu

On the eve of new millennium Turkey finds itself at a critical juncture. As a country whose economy has been going through a severe crisis and whose state-centric politics has been facing a strong legitimacy and governing crisis, and whose social and cultural life has been generating identity-based conflict, Turkey has to make a crucial decision about its future. These crisis-ridden historical changes are forcing Turkey to decide either to shake itself radically in a way to alter its state-society relations in a democratic and liberal form or to decide once again to hide behind the illusionary walls of state-centricism and nationalism by maintaining the privileged status of the Carl Schmittian understanding of politics as governing society on the basis of “the friend and foe relationship.” Although the latter choice has been the dominant tendency in the state-centering political culture of Turkey during the 1990s, today there is a strong societal will and demand, and even a realistic possibility for the creation of an economically stable, democratically governed and culturally pluralistic Turkey.

A number of recent historical events, namely those of the 3 November 2002 national election, the Copenhagen Summit (12–14 December 2002) and the war on Iraq, all have indicated that the possibility of the creation of a different, strong and democratic Turkey is not a naive optimism. On the contrary, it constitutes an achievable reality, as long as the strong societal will and demand for democratization and economic stability can be transformed into a political will to restructure state-society relations in a democratic, liberal and pluralist way. The war on Iraq and its post-war reconstruction has indicated that a democratically and economically strong Turkey has the potential not only to promote multilateralism *vis-à-vis* the security-based and unilateral hegemonic operations of American foreign policy in the Middle East, but also to aid the creation of a peaceful and stable solution to the tragic and human-costly problems of the region. As the American occupation of Iraq continues, it is likely that the more Turkey achieves its democratization and economic stabilization, the more it will play an important role in the possibility of creating a peaceful Middle East. However, the end result of the US-led attempt to reconstruct Iraq still remains to be seen.

2 *Introduction*

In this context, insofar as the democratization and economic stabilization of Turkey entails a strong political will to structure its domestic state-society relations in a democratic mode, we suggest that rather than the war on Iraq, the 3rd November national election and the recent deepening of Turkey-EU relations should be seen as key to the possibility of creating a strong and democratic Turkey.¹ The 3rd November national election has resulted in the emergence of a single party majority government that has created a widespread societal hope for the long-awaited efficient and stable governing of society and economy. Additionally, the Copenhagen Summit declared that the negotiations between the European Union (hereafter the EU) and Turkey for full-membership status will start without delay on the condition that Turkey succeeds in the application of what are known as “the Copenhagen political criteria” in its state-society relations before the Helsinki Summit of December 2004. This has yielded an external pressure on Turkey to achieve the possibility of democratization and economic stability within a given time. In this sense, whether or not Turkey is able to render such democratization and economic stability as an achieved reality depends on the political will of the government to deal effectively and democratically with the problems and demands of society in such a way that also makes Turkey strong enough to begin its full-accession to the EU.

It should be pointed out, however, that creating a strong and fully democratic Turkey is not an easy process. It cannot be achieved only through the set of legal and constitutional changes that Turkey initiated in 2002, regarding the abolishment of capital punishment and the question of human rights and group rights, even if these changes are of utmost importance to Turkey-EU relations. Nor can it be achieved only with a set of partial political and administrative changes that will establish a more transparent and accountable governing system in Turkey, even if the creation of efficient governance is of utmost importance in the elimination of the problems of clientalism and corruption, whose negative consequences for Turkish society have recently become obvious and devastating as a result of the total collapse of the Turkish economy in 2001. In fact, the creation of a strong and fully democratic Turkey requires a radical change and transformation in state-society relations whose scope, content and affectivity go much beyond these superstructural changes. As the decision of the Copenhagen Summit regarding Turkey indicates, a strong and democratic Turkey can be achieved, if and only if Turkey realizes the “full application” of these superstructural changes in such a way that substantial democracy with an emphasis on the normative primacy of individual rights and freedoms becomes the defining feature of the way in which the state attempts to regulate societal relations.

It is here that citizenship becomes an extremely important issue, insofar as (a) it constitutes “a significant sociological and normative ground” on which we can analyze the changing nature of Turkish modernity which has given rise to the recent impasse of the state-centric structure of Turkish poli-

tics. We can also explore possible ways in which such an impasse can be overcome; (b) more specifically, it functions as “an adequate criterion” to measure the degree to which the superstructural changes, initiated by the state in 2002 as a necessary step for the full accession of Turkey into the EU, are being applied concretely to the way in which the state governs its society; and (c) more importantly, it enables us to see that the creation of a strong and democratic Turkey cannot be achieved fully without the successful implementation and dissemination of “the language of rights” throughout society.

This book is an attempt to provide a detailed and comprehensive analysis of Turkish modernity in an historical way. In doing so, it aims at demonstrating in a convincing fashion that a liberal democratic reconstruction of Turkish modernity on the basis of the insertion of “the language of rights” into Turkish citizenship constitutes a necessary condition for the realization of a further democratization of Turkish politics and the possibility of Turkey’s full accession into the EU. In this sense, as opposed to the conventional analysis of Turkish politics that tends to focus exclusively on political parties and their interactions with the state without paying enough attention to economic, social and cultural factors or processes, this book employs an historical and critical analysis of Turkish modernity which focuses on state-society interactions and their changing nature over time, pays attention to the role of sociological and political-economic determinants of Turkish politics and its recent impasse, and more importantly aims at developing a democratic vision necessary for the creation of a different and strong Turkey. We argue that the question of citizenship constitutes an adequate ground not only for an historical and critical analysis of the recent crisis of Turkish modernity and its state-centric *modus vivendi*, but also for its democratic reconstruction. This is so, for, as the chapters of this book will indicate in their own contexts, the crisis of Turkish modernity is also a crisis of the republican model of Turkish citizenship on which it has initiated its state-centric operation; and in the same vein, a democratic reconstruction of Turkish modernity is also a multicultural, differentiated and constitutional reconstruction of Turkish citizenship on the basis of the language of rights. In this context, we propose first that a discussion of both the different dimensions of the republican model of Turkish citizenship and especially the recent challenges to it provides a more comprehensive and detailed analysis of Turkish politics. We also propose that citizenship, understood not only as a legal status but also as a “practice” through which individual and group demands are made for the expansion of the scope of existing rights, should be taken seriously as a significant site for the further democratization of state-society relations in Turkey.

A critical analysis of Turkish modernity, in which the question of citizenship is the main focus, is timely and necessary. It is timely, for the radical changes and transformations that have been occurring and generating important impacts on state-society relations in Turkey are forcing us to go

4 Introduction

beyond the conventional understanding of Turkish politics, whose explanatory power is limited to an analysis of political parties and their relations to the state. It is necessary, for since these changes and transformations involve serious challenges not only to the state and political parties, but also, and more significantly, to the state-centric nature of Turkish modernity and its constitutive elements such as strong-state traditions, national developmentalism, an organic vision of society and a republican model of citizenship, they are forcing us to focus on state-society relations in our search for feasible solutions to these challenges. Four historical processes are of utmost importance for an adequate understanding of the emergence of the radical changes and transformations in Turkish society that have made a critical analysis of Turkish modernity timely and necessary. These processes are those of “the changing nature of Turkish modernity and its legitimacy crisis,” “the process of Turkey’s full accession into the EU and the question of liberal democracy,” “the recent economic crisis, Turkey-IMF relations and the question of economic restructuring,” and “the impasse of Turkish politics and the November 3rd national election.” In what follows, we will briefly look at these processes, insofar as they together constitute an historical context for our argument that citizenship provides us with a significant site for a critical analysis of Turkish modernity, as well as for the possibility of its democratic reconstruction.

Turkish modernity, change and legitimacy

Although displaying certain continuities with its Ottoman past, Turkey was in fact “made” in the image of the Kemalist elite as a modern republic. In the process of “making,” the primary aim of the Kemalist elite was to “reach the contemporary level of civilization” by establishing its political, economic, and ideological prerequisites, such as the creation of an independent nation-state, the fostering of industrialization, and the construction of a secular and modern national identity. The Kemalist elite thus accepted the universal validity of Western modernity as *the* way of constructing a modern Turkey and attempts to “reach the level of civilization,” which it sees as the process of building a modern nation-state in its fullest form. The conceptualization of the Turkish Republic as nation-state was regarded by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his followers as the precondition for the possibility that “Turkey would live as an advanced and civilized nation in the midst of contemporary civilization” (Ahmad 1993: 53).

In the process of building a modern Turkey, the idea of the state employed by the Kemalist elite was by no means abstract: rather it was derived from a reaction to two fundamental problems which they saw as the key to the decline of the Ottoman Empire. First, the Ottoman state was identified with the personal rule of the sultan, which eventually led to its inability to compete with the European nation-state system (Heper 1985: 49). Second, the Islamic basis of the Ottoman state was regarded as the

primary obstacle to progress in Ottoman society. For the Kemalist elite, there was therefore a need to create a nation-state distinct from the person of the sultan and secular enough to reduce Islam to the realm of individual faith. The state is thus viewed as not an arbitrary institution nor an expression of class interest, but as an active agent that, while taking its inspiration from the genuine feelings and desires of the nation, shapes and reshapes it to “elevate the people to the level of contemporary (Western) civilization” (Heper 1985: 50). In this context, Gellner considered the Kemalist idea of the state to be a commitment to “political modernity,” which sees “the modernization of the polity and society” as “linked to the state.” This commitment “constitutes its legitimation and is itself in turn justified by the strength which it bestows on the state” (1994: 83).

However, for Kemalism modernization was not just a question of acquiring technology, but something that could not be absorbed without a dense network of cultural practices (see Chapter 12 by Keyman). Thus, political modernity could be supplemented with a set of cultural practices, *imposed from above* to “enlighten the people and help them make progress” (Heper 1985: 51). Republicanism, nationalism, statism, secularism, populism, and revolutionism-reformism (from above) were the six principles by which the state was to govern its society by creating a unitary nation as an organic totality.

In the light of the above (synoptic) analysis, we could state that the process of the making of Turkey constitutes a “state-centric modernity.” There are four defining elements of the state-centric operation of Turkish modernity, and since the 1980s and especially during the 1990s we have witnessed the increasing legitimacy crisis of such an operation, whose manifestations have been observed in each of these elements. The four elements can be described in the following way:

- 1 *The strong-state tradition*: since the beginning of the Turkish Republic, modernity has been defined by the dominant role that the state has played in various ways in the production and reproduction of societal affairs as a whole. The state in Turkish modernity has acted as the privileged and sovereign subject operating almost completely independently from society and assuming the capacity to transform society from above. In this process, it has been the state, not the government, that has constituted the primary context of politics, defined its boundaries, and decided who can or cannot participate in it. In doing so, the state was the basic site at which national interest was formulated by the state elite in such a way that it was identified as state interest. Thus, the strong-state tradition meant a state-centric way of governing society from above by assuming a unity between state and nation, as well as between national interest and state interest.
- 2 *National developmentalism*: one of the main ideologies of the strong-state tradition was the ideology of national developmentalism which, in

6 Introduction

its anti-liberal and state-centric modes of operation, involved a “planned, import-substituting industrialization” as the “proper prescription for development (Keyder 1997: 40). National developmentalism defined the state as the dominant economic actor whose basic aim was to regulate the economy in such a way that the rapid economic modernization of what was regarded by the Kemalist elite as a backward society could be achieved. In doing so, the state acted as the developmental state, creating a state-directed economy and taking substantial decisions for the regulation of economic activities for industrialization. In this context, as Keyder (1997: 41) points out, the state in its national developmentalist intervention into society assumed potential autonomy and the administrative characteristic of having no transparency or accountability to society.

- 3 *The organic vision of society*: if national developmentalism established the economic dimension of the state-centric Turkish modernity, its sociological grounding was created through an organic vision of society that defines society not with reference to such categories as class or individual, but on the basis of the “duties and services” of different occupation groups to the state. Thus, in its attempt to modernize Turkey, the Kemalist elite did not approach its society in terms of individual rights and freedoms, nor did it see society as containing individualism, pluralism, participation and claims to difference. Instead, society had to be organic, in that societal affairs were organized in an homogeneous and monolithic way to serve the national interest, that is, for the making of Turkey as a civilized and modern nation.
- 4 *The republican model of citizenship*: in governing society through the ideologies of national developmentalism and organic society, how could the state activate the masses toward modernity? The Kemalist elite answered this question on the basis of the republican model of citizenship, which, while giving the masses political rights, demanded at the same time that they accord normative primacy to the national interest over individual freedoms, to duties over rights, and to state sovereignty over individual autonomy. Thus, the making of modern Turkey involved the transformation of the masses into citizens, but prevented the language of rights from entering into the process of the construction of secular national identity. For the Kemalist elite, citizenship was not a liberal category framed by the language of rights, but refers to a morally-loaded category aimed at creating a secular and rational national identity compatible with the project of modernity as civilization. In this way, the republican model of citizenship serves for the state, first as a “link” between state and society on the basis of the principle of national unity, second as an “articulatory principle” that connects people with different religious, ethnic and cultural origins under the rubric of modernity as civilization, and third as an effective ideological device by which the state attempted to disseminate its will to civilization throughout society.

The strong-state tradition, national developmentalism, an organic vision of society and the republican model of citizenship together established the foundational basis for the state-centric mode of operation of Turkish modernity. To the extent that the will to civilization entailed primarily the construction of Turkey as a modern nation-state, Turkish modernity in fact was successful in its state-centric operation. It was successful in economic development, industrialization, urbanization, education and social welfare. Although since 1945 Turkish politics has been characterized by formal democracy as a multi-party parliamentary system of rule, the material success of Turkish modernity has not gone hand-in-hand with democratization and the development of the language of rights and freedoms. Nor has it led to the promotion of individual autonomy or the recognition of cultural differences.

Since the 1980s and especially during the 1990s, it has become apparent that both in a world-historical context and due to the radical changes and transformations that have been occurring in Turkish society, Turkish modernity and its state-centric governing of society from above “is in serious crisis: the legitimacy it once enjoyed has been withdrawn” (Keyder 1997: 47). Likewise, its democracy deficit has been steadily increasing. The sources of this crisis are many, and most of them will be analyzed in the following chapters of this book. However, we shall highlight briefly these changes and transformations. First, in a world-historical context and in parallel to the changes in the world economy, framed to a large extent by the emergence and subsequent consolidation of the neoliberal discourse of free market rationality, the era of national developmentalism came to an end. The replacement of import-substitution industrialization with export-promotion industrialization in the 1980s, and then the increasing exposure of the Turkish economy to economic globalization, especially in the 1990s, together indicated that national developmentalism was no longer an effective ideological device to be used by the strong-state to dictate the rules of the economic sphere in its regulation of the economy. On the contrary, since the 1980s, the Turkish economy has been radically transformed both ideologically and institutionally. Ideologically, the free market-based economic rationality has begun to play an extremely significant role in the increasing societal dissatisfaction with the strong-state tradition. Rather than national developmentalism, the regulation of state-economy relations has become increasingly dictated by the neoliberal discourse of individualism, the free market and the minimal state. Institutionally, free-market ideology has given rise to the emergence of a multiplicity of economic actors and economic pressure groups accepting the rules and norms of economic globalization and demanding a minimum state intervention. These ideological and institutional changes have radically transformed state-bourgeoisie relations in such a way that calls for autonomy, civil rights, democracy, European integration and economic efficiency have become the main discourse of the Turkish bourgeoisie (Özbudun and Keyman 2002: 296–319).

Second, since the 1980s we have witnessed both the collapse of the organic vision of society and the concomitant development of what has come to be known as the politics of identity. The three sets of developments are of utmost importance in this context, insofar as they have paved the way for the strong critiques of state-centric Turkish modernity and its homogenizing and monolithic political culture. These developments are the resurgence of Islam, the “Kurdish question,” and the emergence of civil society, all of which have initiated in their own ways a strong challenge to the organic vision of society, and thus have contributed to the process of the fragmentation of political culture in Turkey. As we will see later in the book, the resurgence of Islam as a strong political, economic and cultural actor has challenged the secular foundation of organic society and national identity. In doing so, it has brought claims for the recognition of religious identity to the center of Turkish politics. Similarly, the Kurdish question, articulated as a language of ethnic difference and a claim to recognition, has forced us to rethink our understanding of modernity, national identity, and democratic subjectivity. Thus, in the form of ethnic violence, terrorism and identity politics, the Kurdish question has shaken the foundations of the assumed unity between state and nation, which was constructed on the basis of the organic vision of society. In addition, since the 1980s there has been a steady increase in the qualitative and quantitative development of civil society organizations, and a call to democratize state-society relations in Turkey. Civil society organizations have been extremely important in introducing to Turkish society the language of rights and freedoms, the discourse of individualism and the idea of participatory democracy. All of these developments have resulted in the collapse of the organic vision of society on which the secular and homogeneous Turkish national identity was constructed, a collapse that can no longer be prevented by further strong-state interventions into society.

Third, as a consequence of the crisis of national developmentalism and the organic vision of society, during the 1990s the republican model of citizenship has been challenged by the language of rights and freedoms which involved both individual and group-based claims to autonomy, pluralism and democracy. The societal calls and demands for the expansion of the state-controlled space of rights, which were voiced on the basis of both the politics of identity/recognition and the language of individual rights and freedoms, have revealed that the potential for the further democratization of Turkey lies in the implementation and consolidation of a more liberal, democratic and civic understanding of citizenship as a democratic link between state and society. This meant the replacement of the republican model of citizenship that had privileged the duties and services of the citizens to the state with the active, democratic and liberal understanding of citizenship speaking in the language of rights.

By the end of the 1990s it had become very clear that the crisis of the main ideologies of state-centric Turkish modernity, namely those of national

developmentalism, an organic vision of society and a republican model of citizenship, had created an increasing “gap” between the strong-state tradition and the changing society. It is this gap that has given rise to the changing nature of Turkish modernity and the legitimacy crisis. Moreover, it is also this gap that constituted the sociological basis of the current impasse in Turkish politics. What has marked the nature of state-society relations in Turkey during the 1990s have been the mutual efforts of the strong-state tradition and the societal calls for democratization to eliminate each other in their own attempts to define the future of Turkey (Kramer 2000). It is in this sense that Turkey has found itself at a critical juncture, where it must decide between partial democracy in favor of the state and full democracy in favor of society in determining its future. The first option is the preferable one for the strong-state tradition which thinks that it can solve its legitimacy crisis through a partial democratization of its governing of society and by including in its state-centric discourse some of the demands of civil society for the protection of individual rights and freedoms, as long as they do not pose a serious challenge to its primary position in Turkish politics.

Economic crisis, European integration and citizenship

However, the scenario of partial democracy has recently been challenged by the two significant historical processes that have created crucial turning-points in Turkey in 2001 and 2002. These processes concern, first, Turkey’s recent financial crisis and its relations to the IMF, and second, Turkey’s full accession to the EU which has taken a new form via the Copenhagen Summit. Both processes have generated powerful impacts on the strong-state tradition, and have indicated in their own right that Turkey needs an efficient and effective governing whose realization requires both a radical transformation of the institutional structure of the strong-state and a full democratization of state-society relations. It is in this context that the second option, that is, the creation of a different, strong and democratic Turkey, has become a possibility that can be realized.

On 19 February 2001, when at a National Security Council meeting the president of the Turkish Republic, Ahmet Necdet Sezer, threw a copy of the Turkish Constitution at the prime minister, Bülent Ecevit, during their heated debate on the problem of corruption, neither of them realized that their quarrel had the potential to trigger the worst and the deepest economic crisis ever faced by Turkey in its modern history. The next morning, the *Financial Times* declared that the “Turkish economy collapsed.” The crisis negatively and very strongly affected every segment of Turkish society by giving rise to the contraction of the national economy by 9.4 percent, causing Turkey an approximate loss of \$53 billion in its gross national product, creating more than one million unemployed and reducing the gross national income per capita from \$2,986 to \$2,160. Thus, the political economy of Turkish capitalism in the 1990s, which had been organized

around the clientalist and populist ties between the government and its constituencies, and which was also structurally conducive to the problems of high inflation, increasing internal and external debts, corruption and illegal accumulation of wealth, totally collapsed. This economic and financial collapse was also the collapse of the strong-state into its worst legitimacy and governing crisis.

The economic crisis was also a new turn in IMF-Turkey relations, insofar as it created a complete dependency relation between Turkey and the IMF. In order for the state to receive financial assistance, it had to accept the harsh conditionality principles, embedded in the IMF's structural adjustment program. As a result, Kemal Derviş, who had been working for many years as a World Bank executive, was brought to Turkey as the state minister responsible for, and in charge of, economic affairs. Over the year 2001 and until the November 3rd national election in 2002, the Turkish economy was radically restructured on the basis of the "strong economy program" prepared by Derviş. This program entailed a number of legal, constitutional and institutional changes with the aim of creating a strong financial sector and macro-economic stability, both of which were necessary for economic growth on a free-market basis. However, the economic crisis has made it very clear that a strong economic program cannot be initiated effectively without changing the clientalist and corruption-generating structure of the strong-state tradition which became crystallized during the 1990s. For this reason, the strong economy program initiated a set of institutional changes, such as the independent Central Bank and the establishment of the autonomous regulatory institutions, in order to create a new governmental rationality capable of yielding a sound political development management that will make the state more efficient and accountable in the mode in which it governs its society. In this sense, the primary aim of the program was in fact to "restructure the state to achieve the elimination of structural distortions caused by clientalism and populism" (Derviş 2001: 4). It was only in this way that the efficient and accountable state could initiate the sound macroeconomic and political management necessary to eradicate high inflation, to eliminate corruption and so strengthen the financial sector, and thus to make a significant contribution to economic growth.

Within the limited scope of this introductory chapter, we cannot provide a detailed analysis of the multi-dimensional impacts of the economic crisis and the IMF-led structural adjustment program on Turkey. Yet it is clear that the economic crisis has indicated that the strong-state tradition is unable to govern society through clientalism and populism. Nor can it maintain its undemocratic structure that has operated as unaccountable to and detached from society and societal demands. Instead, the long-term solution to the economic crisis has required the radical restructuring of the state to make it more efficient, transparent and accountable, so that it becomes compatible with the new economic rationality. Moreover, the economic crisis has also indicated that an active civil society, consisting of

effective economic pressure groups demanding the expansion of the limited space of civil and social rights, is necessary for the creation of an economically sound and strong Turkey. Thus, the economic crisis, while causing an increasing societal distrust for the strong-state tradition, has also activated in civil society calls for full democratization, the need for an effective state and the protection of individual rights.

A reason for more active civil society organizations and their demands for democratization is also, and more importantly, related to the process of European integration. During the economic crisis, Turkey had to prepare for the Copenhagen Summit of December 2002, where the decision on Turkey's full accession to the EU was to be taken. Turkey has had a long association with the EU, and in order to gain full membership status, it had to implement a set of radical changes and transformations in its state structure, in its partial democracy and in its state-centric modernity. All these changes and transformations were concerned directly with the problem of democracy and the lack of the language of rights in Turkey. Also, as a candidate country, its success in implementing these changes and transformations would give Turkey powers of negotiation to secure a definite date for its accession at the Copenhagen Summit. In other words, while going through a severe economic crisis and implementing the strong economic program necessary to overcome it, Turkey found itself in a situation where it could deal effectively with its problem of the democratic deficit, which was the central concern in its relations with the EU. For Turkey, the economic crisis was also the time for democratization, and in this sense in 2002, the need for development overlapped with the need for democracy. Moreover, as opposed to the previous decades, in which the strong-state tradition had constantly deferred democracy in the name of modernity and development, this time there was no chance for the strong-state to do so, simply because the Copenhagen Summit was to decide the boundaries of the enlarged and "new" Europe. In this context, the summit was extremely crucial for Turkey, insofar as it was to determine the future place of Turkey in the new Europe.

In the long, crisis-ridden process of European integration, the Helsinki Summit of December 1999 constituted an important turning-point for Turkey. The summit declared the inclusion of Turkey into the process of enlargement. Thus, Turkey's long association with the EU has finally produced a certain level of certainty, as the decision to include Turkey also meant that Turkey had a chance to find a place in the enlarged Europe as a full member. In this sense, although the Helsinki Summit did not give Turkey any definitive timetable for beginning the accession negotiations, it indicated that the EU took seriously Turkey's attempt to become a full member. At the same time, the decision taken by the Helsinki Summit made it clear that the main condition for beginning the accession negotiations was the full implementation and application of what have come to be known as the Copenhagen criteria, adopted by the European Council in its Copenhagen Summit of June 1993. The Copenhagen criteria involved:

(a) stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities; – these criteria are integrated into the Charter of Fundamental Rights, adopted in the 2000 Nice summit of the European Council; (b) the existence of a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union; and (c) the ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union, in other words the ability to adopt the EU's *acquis communautaire*.

(in Müftüler-Baç 2002: 10)

These criteria must be fully satisfied by any candidate country. The Helsinki Summit was an important turning-point for Turkey-EU relations, for it defined what Turkey, as a candidate country, should do in order to qualify as a full-member, even if it did not give Turkey a specific date to start accession negotiations. Since then, Turkey has made certain legal and constitutional changes to alter its legal system in accordance with the Copenhagen criteria. However, these changes were not enough for the EU to give Turkey a definite date at the recent Copenhagen Summit of December 2002. Instead, the summit has decided on 2004 as a conditional date, which indicated that if Turkey achieves the full application of the Copenhagen criteria the decision for the beginning of “the accession negotiations without a delay” will be taken at the Helsinki Summit of December 2004. However conditional, the decision of the Copenhagen Summit for Turkey has reinforced the degree of certainty established in 1999 regarding Turkey's accession to the EU. Furthermore, the Copenhagen Summit has also clarified once again that it is the application of the Copenhagen criteria that will constitute the objective basis for the decision about Turkey.

It should be pointed out that by giving a conditional date to Turkey, the Copenhagen Summit has pushed the strong-state into the position of being the main actor that will determine the future of Turkey. Yet, at the same time, it has declared that partial democratization will not be enough for Turkey to become a full member of the EU. Instead, full democratization, which will radically alter the nature of the state-centric Turkish modernity and its constituting elements (ideologies), is what is required as an objective criterion for its full membership. For the full implementation and application of the Copenhagen criteria to state-society relations in Turkey means the radical reconstruction of the strong-state tradition in a liberal democratic way. Moreover, it entails the insertion of the language of rights in the republican model of citizenship. More specifically, it requires granting rights to minorities and ethnic identities. In this sense, when applied fully, the Copenhagen criteria would force the strong-state to approach its society by accepting that it consists of individuals as right-holders.

Having provided a brief account of the impact that the economic crisis and European integration have generated on Turkish modernity, we now

come to the fourth source for the possibility of full democratization in Turkey. This source is the November 3rd national election of 2002, which took place in an historical context dictated by the impasse in Turkish politics. The November 3rd national election was an election in which the changing nature of Turkish modernity and its legitimacy crisis, the 19 February economic crisis and the Copenhagen Summit of December 2002 together played an influential role in the determination of voters' choices and preferences. It was also an election that, as we will see in the following section, has created an earthquake in Turkish politics.

The November 3rd national election

On the evening of 3 November 2002, as the election results were becoming known, an earthquake shook Turkish politics. The three governing parties that had formed the coalition government after the 1999 national election, as well as the two opposition parties, all failed to pass the 10 percent national threshold and found themselves thrown out of parliament as the thorough losers of the election. At a time when Turkey was going through its deepest economic crisis, generating the severe problems of unemployment, poverty and insecurity, the November 3rd national election resulted in the electoral punishment of both the governing parties and the opposition parties, so much so that the winner of the 1999 election, the Democratic Left Party (DLP) lost almost all of its electoral support, and thus its leader Bülent Ecevit has completed his long political career with a tragic but deserved end. The other governing parties, the Nationalist Action Party (NAP) and the Mother Land Party (MLP) lost more than half of their electoral support. The leaders of these parties announced their resignations. The opposition parties, the True Path Party (TPP) and the Felicity Party (FP) were also subject to electoral punishment, in that rather than gaining any electoral support, both were thrown out of parliament. It can be argued, therefore, that the November 3rd national election has created a political earthquake in Turkey. The election took the form of social unrest, meaning that it created a suitable platform for the democratic expression of the deep anger that Turkish people have been feeling since the 1990s toward the existing political system and its parties, whose *modus vivendi* was characterized by economic populism, clientalism, corruption and democratic deficit.

The winners of the election were the Justice and Development Party (AKP) and the Republican Peoples Party (RRP). By receiving 34.2 percent of the popular vote and with the aid of the undemocratic 10 percent national threshold, the AKP gained 66 percent of the parliamentary seats (that is, 363 of 550 seats) and thus constituted a single-party majority government. With its 19.4 percent of the popular vote, the RRP became the main and single opposition party and gained 178 seats. In the near future, Turkey will be ruled by a single-party majority government with a very strong executive structure, and a two party system-based parliamentary

democracy. After having had a series of extremely problematic coalition governments, the general public mood before the 2002 election in Turkey was one which called for an end to the existing ineffective, undemocratic and ungoverning governing structure, that is the strong-state tradition, that had been operating totally detached from society and societal needs. In this context, this new governing structure has been welcomed by the different segments of society in the name of political stability and effective governing. Thus, although the AKP was created as one of the two parties that emerged from within the constitutionally-banned Virtue Party, whose Islamic identity and discourse has been seen by the Supreme Court as a threat to the secular foundation of the Turkish Republic, its electoral success leading to its strong single-party majority government has been received very well by a large part of Turkish society longing for political stability and effective governing.

The way in which the AKP gained an electoral victory sufficient to form a single-party majority government consisted of a three-pronged electoral strategy. It is through this strategy that the AKP has established a successful organic linkage with the different segments of society. First, by understanding very well that the November 3rd national election was a society-centered election in which the economy was the dominant issue, the AKP presented itself not as an Islamic party but as a “center-right” party, claiming to have a strong will to govern effectively on the basis of well-prepared and efficient policies to overcome the economic crisis. In doing so, the AKP attempted to convince the Turkish electorate that it had changed from an ideology-based party whose constituency was limited to Islamic identity, to a center-right party concerned about the problems of society at large. Second, the AKP argued that in its attempt to create a new impetus for economic change by cleaning up “the cronyism and corruption that have hobbled Turkey’s banking and financial system for decades,” it would act in the service of society at large by listening caringly to the needs and demands of different social groups, especially those that directly faced the problems of unemployment, poverty and insecurity. Thus, as opposed to the RRP’s economic program, prepared by Kemal Derviş in accordance with an unquestioned acceptance of the IMF’s structural adjustment program, the AKP presented itself as a center-right party which would put the deep problem of “social and distributive injustice” at the top of its immediate economic agenda, even if this should create a conflictual relationship with the IMF. Third, in establishing its organic linkage with society at large, the AKP insistently and repeatedly argued that democracy constitutes the fundamental and effective basis for the long-term solution to Turkey’s problems. This heavy and special emphasis placed on democracy has been maintained and voiced strongly in the AKP’s discourse on the protection of individual rights and freedoms, as well as in its full support for Turkey’s integration into the EU as a full member.

This three-dimensional electoral strategy also enabled the AKP to present itself not as Islamic but as a center-right party whose primary aim is both to

overcome the economic crisis and to work for the further democratization of state-society relations in Turkey. Thus, the AKP created a suitable ground on which to differentiate itself from the other parties in the following (and convincing) ways: (a) it distanced itself from the parties of the coalition government (the DLP, the NAP and the MLP) by claiming that as opposed to the state-centric nature of these parties, it will work for society, and in doing so it will listen to societal actors such as economic pressure groups and civil society organizations; (b) it distanced itself also from the FP and its Islamic nature by arguing that in governing society the AKP would be democratic, and in doing so it would represent a moderate Islamic discourse which respects the secular foundation of the Turkish Republic and sees religious affairs within the context of pluralism and the language of rights; and (c) finally, it differentiated itself from its main competitor, the RRP, by suggesting that the economic program it would initiate to overcome the crisis was more humanistic than that proposed by the RRP and Kemal Derviş, in that not only would it pay more attention to the problem of social and distributive injustice, but also it would support the medium and small-scale industrialists in order to revitalize the production-side of the Turkish economy.

It should be noted at this point that what determined the attitude and the orientation of the Turkish electorate in the 2002 election was the economic crisis and the immediate need to solve the problems of unemployment, poverty and economic growth. In this sense, the majority of the Turkish electorate chose the AKP because of its claim that its economic program was both different to that of the other parties and more suited to providing effective solutions to the severe economic problems. The AKP'S economic program was a *communitarian-liberal synthesis* operating on the basis of three principles:

- (a) *an effective and post-developmental state* which is democratic, transparent and accountable in its interaction with society, but at the same time “caring” and assuming a supervisory role in its relation to the economy. In this context, the AKP claims that in its governing, it will change the existing state structure, which is detached from society, blind to its needs and demands and therefore functions as a closed, ineffective and undemocratic system of rule, and create an effective and post-developmental state;
- (b) *a regulated free market* which is not destructive and corrupt, but enriching, contributing to economic development and socially just. The AKP argues that it promotes a free-market economy and sees it as the basis for growth, to the extent that it will contribute to the further industrialization of the Turkish economy and its consolidation on the basis of financial stability and a strong real economy; and
- (c) *social justice*, which is to be established both in terms of the distribution of wealth and welfare services and with respect to the domain of recog-

nition in which social segments will not be discriminated in terms of their different cultural practices. At this level, The AKP's economic program differentiated itself from the RRP's economic liberal economic program, which saw the question of social justice as an indirect problem at best. In doing so, the AKP argued that a strong, stable and trust-based economy cannot be established without solving the problem of social justice in distribution and recognition.

Working on the basis of these principles, the communitarian-liberal synthesis means, at the very general level, an articulation of the free market with communitarian values, which promotes religious values, societal norms and local characteristics. More concretely, the communitarian-liberal synthesis calls for a just society not organized on the basis of pure egotistical individualism, but as a democratic regulation of state-society relations in which free-market rationality is backed by, in the words of Prime Minister Abdullah Gül, "a moderate and democratic Muslim society." The success of the communitarian-liberal synthesis in the November 3rd national election should be taken seriously, for it has created for Turkey a chance, maybe the last chance, to have a strong and stable government, one which (a) can establish a reciprocal and democratic relationship between state and society, so that the main problem of the 1990s, i.e. the disjuncture and the widened gap between the ineffective strong-state and a changing society, can be solved; (b) can cope effectively with the severe economic problems to create a better quality of life, financial stability, job security and sustainable economic development; and (c) can prepare Turkey as a strong and democratic country for its integration into the European Union.

However, whether or not the AKP can create this chance is open to question. There are challenges ahead for its government. These challenges are focused on the question of democracy and economic stability. Moreover, they have both international and domestic dimensions, and it is almost impossible to separate these dimensions in post-November 3rd Turkey, where global actors such as the EU and the IMF play a very important role in the process of shaping and reshaping Turkish politics. In this context, the first challenge to the AKP occurred immediately after the election, as it found itself facing the very difficult job of obtaining a definite date for Turkey's full accession to the EU at the Copenhagen Summit. The AKP also had to convince the EU that it is not an Islamic party, but a center-right party which strongly supports Turkey's accession to the EU. Although successful in this respect, the AKP received a conditional date for full-membership negotiations in December 2004. As noted before, the conditional date meant that if Turkey achieves a successful realization of the application of the Copenhagen criteria, then negotiations between the EU and Turkey will start "without delay." Of course, the application of the Copenhagen criteria is not limited to the realization of certain constitutional and institutional changes aimed at creating a democratic, transparent and

accountable state. The process of application entails and requires a radical transformation of state-society relations on the basis of the language of rights.

It is in here that the AKP faces a difficult task, for such a radical transformation requires the state to govern its society democratically, to regard its citizens as having rights and freedoms, and to conceive of societal relations on the basis of the principle of difference rather than that of sameness. This means a reconstruction of Turkish citizenship in such a way as to make it democratic, liberal, multicultural and constitutional. This also means that the state deal with societal demands for democratization, recognition and pluralism through a new understanding of Turkish citizenship that is in accordance with post-national values embedded in the EU, that provides a democratic solution to the recent identity-based challenges to Turkish modernity, and that constitutes an adequate normative and political ground for the creation of a different, democratic and economically strong Turkey. We believe that it is through this democratic and liberal understanding of citizenship that Turkey will respond effectively, efficiently and democratically to the European questions concerning the problems of democracy, human rights and freedoms.

Articulating citizenship and identity

Of course, the construction of a democratic and liberal Turkish citizenship requires not only the political and social will to make Turkey a democratic society compatible with post-national values, but also a theoretical and discursive effort that locates citizenship at the center of the academic and public debates in Turkey as a useful heuristic device by which we can deal effectively and democratically with the deep problems of Turkish politics that have given rise to the politics of identity/recognition and the civil society-based calls for individual rights and freedoms. In other words, although the possibility of creating a democratic and economically strong Turkey requires mainly a political and social will, it is also equally important to employ a theoretically sound understanding of citizenship as an adequate and effective heuristic device for strengthening such a will discursively.

This book does not aim to construct a general theory of citizenship. Much has been written on the question of how to reconstruct modern citizenship in a way that it becomes a solution to the problems of our late-modern times (Işın and Wood 1999; Heater 1999; Kymlicka and Wayne 2000; Junonski 1998). Nor does this book aim to provide a theoretical approach to the question of citizenship in a non-Western setting (Ong 1999). However, by relying on the existing literature on modern citizenship, we argue in this book that a feasible and effective solution to the deep problems of Turkish politics should be sought not in “identity terms,” but by exploring “with an emphasis on the practice of democracy” (Işın and Wood 1999: 4) possible ways of

articulating identity-claims to citizenship rights. Of course, such an articulation requires first abandoning a false dichotomy drawn between identity and citizenship, second an attempt to go beyond the purely legal-universal conception of citizenship, and finally, by following Işın and Wood, approaching citizenship and identity “from a perspective that sees modern citizenship not only as a legal and political membership in a nation-state but also as an articulating principle for the recognition of group rights” (1999: 4).

Seen in this way, citizenship involves not only legal obligations and entitlements which frame the boundary of the “membership-based relations” of individuals with their states, but also “the practices through which individuals and groups formulate and claim new rights or struggle to expand or maintain existing rights.” Therefore, as Işın and Wood correctly point out (1999: 4–5), citizenship is neither purely sociological nor purely legalistic, but refers to a “relationship” whose discursive and political conditions of existence are constituted sociologically and legalistically by a set of practices which makes the claims of individuals or groups for new rights both possible and limited to the existing regime of modernity in a given country. In this sense, citizenship contains in itself both an enabling and conditioning relationship between individuals/groups and their states, in that it provides a ground for the possibility of new right-claims to challenge and expand the existing model of citizenship in a given country, but at the same time acts as a conditioning practice by framing, situating and limiting those claims within the regime of modernity. This implies first that there is no need to think of identity-claims and citizenship-rights as necessarily antagonistic or incommensurable: instead they should be seen as sociologically interlinked claims involving possible tensions, conflicts and antinomies. Second, it should be pointed out here that, as Turner (2000: 23) has suggested, citizenship could be both “(1) an inclusionary principle for the distribution and allocation of entitlements, and (2) an exclusionary basis for building solidarity and maintaining identity.” In other words, the conditioning and limiting practice that citizenship exercises on new right-claims could generate both negative (exclusionary) and positive (inclusionary) results, for it might be used as a practice of silencing and limiting right-claims, but at the same time it might function as a solution to the politics of identity by preventing its transformation into ethnonationalism or religious fundamentalism.

As for the deep problems of Turkish politics, articulating identity-claims to citizenship rights means then trying to seek democratic solutions to societal demands not in terms of the politics of recognition, initiated by ethnic claims for group rights, but by attempting to reconstruct the republican model of Turkish citizenship in such a way as to make it more flexible, differentiated and constitutional. In so doing, it becomes possible to transform the claims to particularism, essentialism and communitarianism into “claims for group rights as a challenge to the *modern* (and republican) interpretation of universal citizenship, which is itself a form of group identity”

(Işın and Wood 1999: 4). In this way, we recognize the omnipotence of claims to identity/difference as a social and historical fact “that cannot be wished away, that cannot be phantasmatically made to disappear” (Yeatman 2000: 103). Thus, we become able to attempt both sociologically and historically to articulate identity-claims to citizenship rights as a solution to the deep problems of Turkish politics and its strong-state tradition within the context of democratic, liberal, constitutional and multicultural citizenship. In doing so, we think of citizenship “not only as a legal and political membership in a nation-state but also as an articulating principle for the recognition of group rights.” Thus, as will be discussed throughout the book, we become able to create the conditions for Turkey’s full accession into the EU by responding effectively to the requirements of the Copenhagen criteria.

The content of the book

Under the title *Citizenship in a Global World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, the essays collected in this volume provide in their contexts a historical and theoretical analysis of the republican model of citizenship, its crisis and its possible transformation into a democratic and liberal model as a solution to the recent impasse in Turkish politics. In doing so, these essays together also offer a comprehensive and detailed account of Turkish modernity and its changing nature, which constitutes the foundation for a thorough understanding of Turkish politics.

In this introductory chapter we have sought to establish a thematic analysis of Turkish modernity which constitutes a general ground for the arguments that the chapters of this book make in their own analysis of their subject-matter.

Part I presents a theoretical and contextual approach to Turkish modernity and its republican model of citizenship.

In Chapter 1, Işın provides us with a fascinating historical analysis that contemplates the significance and relevance of investigating Ottoman citizenship for an understanding of the problems embedded in the accession of Turkey to the EU. In this context, he makes two important suggestions: avoiding Orientalism in investigating (Ottoman) citizenship, and constituting it as an object of analysis. Işın suggests that one should avoid Orientalist and Occidentalist approaches in approaching the question of Ottoman citizenship, so that it becomes possible to understand it within the context of what has come to be known as “a generalized problem of otherness.” This attempt also makes a significant contribution to advancing our understanding of Turkish citizenship in terms of its past and contemporary figurations. Işın questions the debate about the compatibility between the European tradition of citizenship rights and Turkish republicanism. He argues that the problems of convergence, divergence and approximation, as well as distortion, which occur in the process of analyzing the relationship

between Turkish and European citizenship rights, need to be considered in a different context, that is, the relationship between Orientalism and citizenship. Işın's chapter not only examines the roots of the notion of citizenship in Turkey, but also makes an important theoretical intervention which enlarges our thinking space about modern citizenship.

Feyzi Baban, in Chapter 2, stresses the importance of the concept of universal citizenship for modernity despite the fact that there are variations between the ways that modern societies organize their citizenship regimes. While the citizenship regime in Turkey claims to contain the main premises of universal citizenship under civic republicanism, it in fact carries the communitarian notion of the republican tradition and consequently denies the primacy of the individual and of diversity. According to Baban, what really defines the two competing political projects of our times in Turkey, the republican citizenship regime and its critique by Islamists, is their perception of the Ottoman tradition of community. Both are communitarian projects, which refuse the dynamic characteristics of identity positions and are intended to limit the boundaries of identity politics. In this context, Baban highlights the risk of ahistorical approaches. He focuses on the universal variations in citizenship regimes by giving the examples of Britain, the United States, and France. Then, drawing parallels between the French and Ottoman/Turkish cases, he points out that the contemporary debate around citizenship in Turkey becomes meaningful only when it is historically grounded.

In the contribution by Kahraman (Chapter 3), modernity is again central to the study of citizenship in Turkey. He discusses the cultural foundations of Turkish citizenship by looking at the various phases of the history of Turkish modernity. Defining Turkish modernity as the process of Westernization since the Ottoman empire of the nineteenth century, he elaborates three successive periods in which both discourses and practices of citizenship in Turkey have evolved: 1839–1908, 1908/1923–1980, and post-1980. Since the *Gülhane Verdict* in 1839, which could be seen as the starting point of the reformation of the Ottoman empire, “the question of ‘identity and citizenship’ as the two offsprings of modernity,” as argued by Kahraman, falls into the broad context of Westernization that is the political and social perception of modernity. While citizenship had been seen almost as a tool of survival and of imitation and implementation of Western social and political institutions in the early stages of Turkish modernity, in the nineteenth century, as a natural articulation of the other offspring of modernity, it also involved references to notions of nationalism and democracy. Kahraman demonstrates in a historical fashion that the same kinds of causes and consequences of citizenship debates still prevail in Turkey in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, especially within the wider context of Turkish-European relations. Thus, approaching Turkish citizenship as an epistemological problematic, Kahraman relates the dynamics of the realm of identity and citizenship to the various dichotomies

dominating the political reasoning and practices in the country: civilization/culture, gemeinschaft/gesellschaft, political reason/reasons of state, and individual/community.

Considering the fact that the Turkey-EU membership issue is not only a question of the application of the Copenhagen criteria but also a matter of the identity problem inherited both in Turkey's European-ness (as a cultural problem) and in the process of European enlargement (as a problem of territoriality), Vardar (Chapter 4) rightly points out that notions of citizenship and democracy are essential subjects in the context of Turkey-EU relations. Vardar first examines the nature of the EU identity, looking at its political construction and its citizenship context, and then provides a historical analysis of Turkey's long association with Europe. This analysis enables Vardar to argue that, as the Copenhagen Summit of December 2002 indicates in terms of its decision on Turkey, Turkey's full accession to the EU depends on its attempt to transform the republican model of citizenship into a more liberal, democratic and constitutional understanding of citizenship that is compatible with the post-national values of the new Europe. Of course, as Vardar correctly warns, Turkey's accession also depends on the EU maintaining and reinforcing its commitment to a multicultural Europe based on a political rather than culturalist definition of European citizenship.

Part II considers how notions of state and democracy are articulated into the citizenship debate in Turkey.

In Chapter 5, Kadioğlu presents the distinction between a view of citizenship as membership (either of a nation or a state) and a view of citizenship as a position (as an empty space or as non-membership) "in the set of formal relations defined by democratic sovereignty" (Donald 1996: 174). She argues that as the modern notion of citizenship that involves membership of a nation-state is inapt in responding to the demands of diverse societal groups, it often creates a serious obstacle to the democratization efforts of modern nation-states. Hence, Kadioğlu argues for the adequacy of envisioning citizenship as "a position" which enables us to see citizenship as detached from the notion of identity. However, taking into consideration the argument that "the citizen precedes the individual in Turkey," she suggests that Turkish modernity makes it very difficult for us to approach citizenship as non-membership. According to her, evolving within the civic republican tradition, citizenship in Turkey is heavily embedded in national identity and defined in relation to duties rather than rights. Trapped in the mission of various social and political projects such as Kemalism, Socialism, and Islamism, Turkish citizenship is unable to situate individual rights and freedoms prior to duties and services to the nation.

In Chapter 6, Soyarık-Şentürk focuses on the legal and constitutional foundations of citizenship in Turkey. In doing so, she emphasizes that these legal and constitutional arrangements have stood out as political phenomena in Turkish modernity since the early twentieth century. In this context, in analyzing the evolution of Turkish citizenship, she focuses on the

constitutions of 1924, 1961 and 1982, as well as on a set of citizenship laws enacted by the state. Her analysis demonstrates clearly that these three constitutions are directly reflective of the state-centric operation of the republican model of citizenship and its exclusionary mode, especially with respect to individual and group rights. Soyarik's analysis also makes it clear that the ongoing debates and negotiations between the European Union and Turkey concerning legal and constitutional reforms are directly related to citizenship issues. In this sense, Soyarik reminds us that constitutional and legal reforms are a necessary and essential component of transforming Turkish citizenship into a liberal and democratic one compatible with the post-national values of the EU.

Part III considers three particular instances of Turkish modernity where serious challenges have been posed to the republican model of citizenship during the 1990s: gender, entrepreneurship, and migration.

Vital to any consideration and systematic analysis of the relationship between gender and citizenship in Turkey is a critical assessment of the various dimensions of gendered citizenship. In this context, Sirman (Chapter 7) provides a gendered perspective to issues of citizenship and sovereignty in the Turkish post-colonial context. Sirman elaborates the conditions and discourses through which citizenship was instituted in Turkey around the problem of realizing national sovereignty. She argues that the building of a national sovereign state is usually the product of discourses of the identity of the nation in the process of constituting the nation-state as a specific kind of polity. Focusing on these discourses in the country, Sirman points out that the particular form of citizenship that was produced can best be described as familial citizenship. What becomes clear in this framework is a gendered discourse in which the ideal citizen is inscribed as a sovereign husband and his dependent wife or mother rather than as an individual, with the result that his/her position within a familial discourse provides that person with status within the polity. According to Sirman, it was through the forms of intimacy pertaining to the nuclear family that the morality of the proper citizen was to be produced and citizens turned into the subjects of the modern nation-state.

Focusing on the case of TÜSİAD, a voluntary interest association representing big business and large conglomerates in Turkey, Öniş in Chapter 8 explores the key role played by business leaders and business associations in the emergence of societal calls for democratization and citizenship rights, particularly with reference to Turkey's potential membership of the EU. Öniş emphasizes the radical shift in the business-democracy relationship, which changed from a relatively authoritarian stance to a clearly pro-democratization position. In the course of neoliberal globalization, two main routes of democratization and two main understandings of democracy have been classified by Öniş. The first, which is narrower in its scope, sees democratization as a way of "good governance," and citizenship rights as "market-centered" rights. The second, which is more liberal, concerns the

necessity of improving and enlarging the scope of civil and human rights. It is clear that the latter approach promotes a more comprehensive understanding of democracy on the basis of the extension of citizenship rights. In his chapter, Öniş poses the question of how the Turkish business community positions itself in relation to the second and broader understanding of democracy and citizenship. Taking the example of TÜSİAD, he argues that the interest of the business community in supporting this kind of democratization agenda stems from their awareness that the dynamics of the second or third wave of democracies in the context of neoliberal globalization require economic actors to act not only as economic pressure groups but also as civil society organizations concerned for larger societal problems. According to Öniş, this awareness amongst the Turkish business community can be clearly observed in Turkey-EU relations in which TÜSİAD has become an important actor promoting and actively supporting Turkey's full accession.

Chapter 9, İçduygu's contribution, draws our attention to the linkage between international migration and citizenship issues in Turkey. İçduygu argues that as far as individual citizens are concerned, international migration has become a new aspect of Turkish citizenship. Thus, the demand for a personhood-based understanding of citizenship was initiated against the state-based one. İçduygu's historical analysis of international migration suggests that in order to better understand the personhood-based conception of citizenship, one must consider not only the notions of membership and belonging, but also the concept of "attachment to the state." İçduygu argues in this sense that we have to recognize the fact that citizens seek a secure bond of attachment to the state in the context of the international migration-citizenship puzzle. This recognition enables us to consider citizenship in terms of the following three ways in which attachment to the state occurs: legal status, identity, and civic virtue. Thus, İçduygu's important analysis demonstrates that each of these elements is conceptually and empirically linked to the other and is affected by the experience of international migration. İçduygu concludes that if international migration has the potential to make the interrelatedness of these three elements of citizenship more complicated and multi-dimensional, then attention should be paid to an adequate model of citizenship. This model should accommodate not only the membership, belonging and attachment aspects of citizenship, but also the status, identity and virtue elements.

One of the important sites at which international migration generates its impacts on citizenship is the question of diasporic citizenship of which the case of German-Turks provides an illustrative example. In Chapter 10, Kaya presents a historical analysis of German-Turks and their struggle to gain citizenship rights. In doing so, Kaya explores how the German state might meet the demands of Turkish immigrant workers for citizenship rights. Kaya argues that the idea of a shared German citizenship is necessary in order to recognize and protect the transnational position of the German-Turkish identity. After presenting some details of the migratory process of Turkish

migrants in Germany, Kaya addresses various legal and political aspects of citizenship laws in Germany and relates them to the notion of “hyphenated” German-Turkish identity. He suggests in this context that in Germany, there are two antithetical notions of culture, the holistic versus the syncretic, that have played a key role in determining the position of diasporic identities in the realm of citizenship. After a discussion of the multiplicities of membership and identity that German-Turks, or Turkish Germans, themselves experience, Kaya argues that we need to go beyond these two antithetical notions of culture and promote a third space in which diasporic identity claims can be articulated to citizenship rights. This third space is the space of hybridity, as a resistance to cultural essentialism and as a way of constructing a multicultural and democratic community.

Part IV discusses the politics of identity and the claims for recognition that have emerged in the last decade in Turkey, but whose roots can be traced to the early period of the Republic in the twentieth century, and even to the late Ottoman period in the nineteenth century.

In this context, Çolak, in Chapter 11, examines the role of secularism in the formation of Turkish citizenship and the problematic place of Islam in it. Çolak argues that Kemalist secularism, which has operated on the basis of a “specific interpretation of Islam,” has been an important element in the making of Turkish citizenship. He suggests that Islamic groups have tended to expand the scope of Turkish citizenship in such a way that their cultural claims can be included in the public sphere. By utilizing the ideology of secularism, the Turkish state has always repelled these demands. After presenting a selection of historical developments and current events, Çolak’s analysis draws our attention to the period of the 1990s, in which Islamic demands for various civil, political, and cultural rights have challenged the Turkish state’s conventional idea of secular citizenship. In this challenge, Islamic discourses claim that Turkish secularism employs an exclusionary understanding of citizenship, which prevents not only the Islamic presence in formal politics but also the symbolic and ritualistic practices of Islamic identity in the public sphere. Çolak argues that such citizenship-related policies and practices have set the limits of equitable rights, access and opportunities, which are essential to the modern notion of citizenship. For instance, as in the case of the headscarf issue, the state has initiated strict policies aiming at limiting the right of religious women to education. Çolak suggests in this sense that we need a new regime of rights to provide a secure political and social ground for increasing pluralism and diversity in Turkey. This new regime of rights and freedoms, according to Çolak, leads to the emergence of “cultural citizenship” which accepts the secular foundation of the Turkish state but at the same time recognizes the practice of cultural rights in a pluralist society, to the extent that they are exercised democratically.

In Chapter 12, Keyman evaluates the Kurdish question in Turkey by locating it in Turkish modernity as “a hegemonic ground for the construc-

tion of a secular and homogeneous discourse of national identity.” This enables him to suggest that one should not seek a solution to the Kurdish question in “ethnic terms.” Instead an attempt should be made to articulate ethnic claims to citizenship-right debates within the context of the practice of democracy. According to Keyman, this approach helps to abandon a false dichotomy drawn between identity and citizenship. Additionally, it enlarges the purely legal-universal conception of citizenship. Finally, it sees modern citizenship within the context of recognition of group rights in addition to the legal and political membership of a nation-state. He argues that seeing dynamic linkages between identity claims and citizenship rights enables us to shift from ethnonationalist assertiveness to the area of citizenship. This move provides a chance for egalitarianism, an inclusive political culture, and the construction of societal consensus in Turkey. As a solution to the Kurdish problem, Keyman calls for a new form of citizenship, promoting post-national, multicultural and constitutional values, which in turn makes an important contribution to creating “a possibility of coping effectively with the recent legitimacy, representation and governing crisis of Turkish modernity by democratizing its state-centric operation.”

In addition to the cases of religious and ethnic identity-claims, the position of non-Muslim minorities poses a serious challenge to the republican model of citizenship. In Chapter 13, Soner attempts to provide a historical analysis of the minority question in Turkey. In doing so, he refers to the distinction between the notions of state-membership (citizenship) and ethno-cultural membership (nationality) that in fact reflects a tension between the principle of sameness and that of difference. In the context of non-Muslim minorities, Turkish citizenship excludes difference in the name of sameness. Soner indicates therefore that the Turkish state officially recognizes the minority status of the non-Muslim religious identity in Turkey. In doing so, the state enables the non-Muslim identity to have certain group rights integrated into their citizenship status. However, the minority question occurs as the concrete practice of how these rights have been seriously limited by the mono-culturalist construction of Turkish society. Soner’s very detailed historical analysis concludes that a solution to the minority question in Turkey requires a system of substantive equality tolerant to the ethno-linguistic, religious and sectarian differences of both Muslim and non-Muslim members of the Turkish citizenry. However, in order for this system of substantive equality to be operative, there is an essential need to consolidate and deepen the process of democratization in Turkey.

Having read the chapters to come, we hope that the reader will have an understanding of Turkey which goes well beyond the existing simplistic and Orientalist visions that tend to reduce the complex history of Turkish modernity either to a portrait of a traditional Muslim society striving for modernization and democratization or to a story of an authoritarian state and its state-centric political actors. In this book, we aim to provide the reader with a substantial, comprehensive and detailed analysis of Turkey

and its changing modernity through a sociological, cultural, political and multi-dimensional reading of Turkish citizenship. In doing so, we take seriously the recent societal challenges to the strong-state tradition and its republican model of citizenship, and argue that the possibility of democracy in Turkey lies in the reconstruction of state-society relations in such a way that these challenges and their demands, articulated in different discourses of identity, self and difference, can be negotiated in a democratic platform of public deliberation. Of course, to achieve this possibility of democracy is also to achieve the possibility of creating a new Turkey where citizens define themselves as right-holders, give their loyalties to post-national values, and participate actively in the process of the consolidation and deepening of Turkish democracy. In this way, we believe that a democratic Turkey as a full member of Europe will become an achievable reality.

Note

- 1 See Larrabee and Lesser (2003) for further information.

References

- Ahmad, F. (1993) *The Making of Modern Turkey*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Derviş, K. (2001) "Turkey's crises: causes, Consequences and solutions," *Insight Turkey*, 3 (2): 3–10.
- Donald, J. (1996) "The Citizen and the Man About Town," in S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds) *Questions of Cultural Identity*, London: Sage.
- Heater, D. (1999) *What is Citizenship?*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heper, M. (1985) *The State Tradition in Turkey*, North Humberstone: The Eothen Press.
- Gellner, E. (1994) *Encountering Nationalism*, London: Routledge.
- Işın, E. F. and Wood, P. K. (1999) *Citizenship and Identity*, London: Sage.
- Junonski, T. (1998) *Citizenship and Civil Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keyder, Ç. (1997) "Whither the Project of Modernity?," in S. Bozdoğan and R. Kasaba (eds) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, London: University of Washington Press.
- Kramer, H. (2000) *A Changing Turkey*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kymlicka, W. and Wayne, N. (eds) (2000) *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larrabee, F. S. and Lesser, I. O. (2003) *Turkish Foreign Policy in an Age of Uncertainty*, Santa Monica: RAND.
- Müftüler-Baç, M. (2002) *Enlarging the European Union: Where does Turkey Stand?*, Istanbul: TESEV Publications.
- Ong, A. (1999) *Flexible Citizenship*, Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Özbudun, E. and Keyman, E. F. (2002) "Cultural Globalization in Turkey," in P. L. Berger and S. P. Huntington (eds) *Many Globalizations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Turner, B. (2000) "Liberal Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Virtue," in Vandenberg, A. (ed.) *Citizenship and Democracy in a Global Era*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Yeatman, A. (2000) "The Subject of Democratic Theory and the Challenge of Co-existence," in Vandenberg, A. (ed.) *Citizenship and Democracy in a Global Era*, New York: St Martin's Press.

1. Citizenship, Through Thick and Thin. The traditional view of citizens as voters, volunteers, and writers of letters to the editor is no longer accurate or sufficient. Finally, the different kinds of engagement may reflect different visions of what democracy could be. Thin democracy would be fast, viral, convenient, fun, and full of choices for people to make individually. Thick democracy would be informed, deliberative, emotional, and full of choices for groups to make collectively. By and large, the people interviewed for this paper felt that both thin and thick engagement have their merits and their shortcomings, which have some interesting parallels. Citizenship, identity, and the question of democracy in Turkey. Article. Full-text available. In fact, democracy and citizenship can be experienced in schools, as pupils are meaningfully involved in participatory dialogue and decision making (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999; Fletcher, 2005; Wilde, 2005). Are these experiences, however, recognised both by pupils and teachers, as instrumental in learning to be engaged, critical and responsible citizens? A tale of ambiguity: citizenship, nationalism and democracy in Turkey. (involving procedural democracy with parliamentary system of rule, consolidation and deepening of democracy through the development of the language and practice of rights and freedoms). (c) From 1980 to the present: the process of globalisation (involving the squeeze of the national the nation-state, national economy, national identity between global forces and local dynamics, the rise and prevalence of neoliberal economic policies, discourses. Although there have recently been significant shifts towards a civic understanding of citizenship, as a way of responding to globalisation and identity claims, the ethnic Nation-state building and the making of state-centric modernity in Turkey