

Yilmaz, Hakan. 2006. "Two Pillars of Nationalist Euroskepticism in Turkey: The Tanzimat and Sevres Syndromes". In *Turkey, Sweden and the European Union: Experiences and Expectations*, ed. Ingmar Karlsson and Annika Strom Melin, Stockholm: SIEPS (Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies), 2006, pp.29-40.

**Two Pillars of Nationalist Euroskepticism in Turkey:
The Tanzimat and Sèvres Syndromes**

Dr. Hakan Yilmaz
Associate Professor

Bogazici University, Department of Political Science and International Relations

**To be Published by the Swedish Institute
March 2006**

Postal Address:

Bogazici University
Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences
Department of Political Science and International Relations
Bebek 34342, Istanbul
Turkey

Tel: (+90) (212) 359 65 04

Fax: (+90) (212) 287 24 55

Mobile: (+90) (533) 819 23 59

Email: yilmazh@boun.edu.tr

Short Resume:

Dr. Hakan Yilmaz is Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Bogazici University, Istanbul, and the executive coordinator of Bogazici University's newly established Master of Arts Program in European Studies. He completed his undergraduate education at the Economics Department of Bogazici University (1987). He received his MA (1991) and Ph.D. (1996) degrees at the Political Science Department of Columbia University in New York City. He has taught courses and published works in the areas of contemporary Turkish politics, culture and politics, European-Turkish cultural perceptions and interactions, and external-internal linkages in the processes of democratization. Dr. Yilmaz has recently completed a research project on Euroskepticism in Turkey, examining the hesitations, suspicions and anxieties of the Turkish elites and masses towards Europe and the European Union. He is currently conducting research into the major variants of conservative thought in Turkey and the cultural determinants of French and German opposition to Turkey's accession to the European Union. He has been recently awarded by the European Commission a Jean Monnet European Module in the area of "issues of culture and identity in European integration". His most recent works are *Placing Turkey on the Map of Europe* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press,

2005) and “Le conservatisme turc et l’idée d’Europe” (Turkish Conservatism and the Idea of Europe) (in *les défis et les peurs, Entre Europe et Méditerranée*, ed. Paul Sant Cassia and Thierry Fabre, Arles et Paris: Editions Actes Sud, 2005, pp.187-218).

Introduction

In this brief paper we are going to define and focus on two discursive patterns of elite-level Euroscepticism in Turkey, namely the Tanzimat and Sèvres syndromes, which, we believe, constitute the core of the Turkish nationalist discourse on Europe. We will argue that while the “deep policy” imperative of the Tanzimat syndrome is a delegitimation of collective and individual rights, that of the Sèvres syndrome is isolationism in the area of foreign policy and “westernization without the west” in the domestic arena. These two syndromes, we will argue, may help us understand the strategic shift of the nationalist conservatism away from Europe and the generally disapproving attitude of the nationalist conservative political parties and intellectuals to Turkey’s integration with the European Union.

The Strategic Move of Nationalist Conservatism away from Europe: The Tanzimat and Sèvres Syndromes

The Tanzimat syndrome and the Sèvres syndrome represent two premises of the genealogical narrative of modern Turkish nationalism. It was on these two premises that modern Turkish nationalism has constructed its historical narrative of the decline and collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the foundation of the Turkish Republic, covering roughly the one hundred year-period between the early 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century. The syndromes have essentially been consolidated by Kemalism, the founding ideology of the Turkish Republic founded in 1923, and they have been popularized in the larger society by the Kemalist-controlled school system, press, and literature. However, the roots of the syndromes go back to much earlier than Kemalism, to the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid (r. 1876-1909) and the Young Turks (r. 1909-1918), embodying an ideological continuity between the late Ottoman and early Republican state elites.

As Western powers played a determining role in both the collapse of the Empire and the founding of the Republic, both syndromes offer a specific interpretation of the nature of relations between the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, on the one hand, and European great powers, on the other, highlighting the turning points, major actors and their intentions. Although both syndromes give an account of the actions and intentions of the West towards Turkey, each encapsulates a different moment of Turkish-Western history and emphasizes a different facet of the West. Among the two, the Sèvres syndrome is more central, focuses upon Turkey’s foreign relations, and offers a general account of the Western strategy towards Turkey and of what Turkey should do in order to put off direct foreign intervention and subversion. The Tanzimat syndrome, on the other hand, focuses upon domestic politics and identifies the West’s likely collaborators within Turkey itself. These potential collaborators of the West have typically been identified as the Christian minorities (Armenians and Greeks); Muslim but non-Turkish communities (Arabs and Kurds); Muslim and Turkish but over-Westernized segments of the society.

The syndromes are rooted in the fact that the Turks, beginning with the Seljuks in the 11th century, but particularly with the Ottomans since the 14th century onwards, conquered and settled in the lands, Anatolia and then Rumelia, which had originally belonged to the Christian peoples. Anatolia had been a territory of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) empire, and long after the Seljuk Turks had captured it piece by piece and made it their new home, they continued to call it as the “Land of the Romans” (*Diyar-i Rum*). Once the Ottoman Turks replaced their Seljuk predecessors as the new

masters of Asia Minor, they changed the direction of their conquest and settlement towards Constantinople and the Balkan possessions of the Byzantine Empire. The Balkans became the Ottomans' "Land of the Romans", who called the area as *Rumeli*, a name that is still a common parlance today. The Turkish-Islamic conquest of the Christian territories, the Turkish nationalists believe, prepared the ground for a European-Christian revanchism and restorationism, which started with and is epitomized by the Crusades of the middle ages. The Europeans, in the Turkish nationalist narrative, never gave up their historical mission of driving the Turks away from the historic lands of the Christians and back to the steppes of Central Asia. Hence, in the Turkish nationalist narrative, the Crusades of the middle ages, the capitulations (trading privileges) that the Ottoman Empire granted to certain European states beginning with the 16th century, colonization of some Ottoman territories in the 19th century, the occupation and the final division of the core Ottoman lands by the Allied powers after the First World War, and the American and European political, economic, military and cultural hegemony over Turkey in the period following the Second World War, all are incarnations of the eternal European "crusade" against the Turks.

The Tanzimat and Sèvres syndromes are syndromes, in the sense that they refer to a certain mode of perception, and a resulting code of operation, which are rooted in a traumatic past experience with the West, and which are not revised afterwards, no matter how the real relationship with the West has changed over the years. On the one hand, it is not rational to stick to a past memory of a relationship, and the corresponding reflexive reaction to it, even though the nature of that relationship has significantly changed over time. On the other hand, though, it is not uncommon for states and similar organized collectivities, like big corporations for instance, to develop syndrome-like perceptual and operational patterns and transmit it from one generation to another as the time-honored wisdom of the past. This seemingly irrational behavior may have to do with the overwhelmingly high transaction costs of adapting one's mentality and behavior to the changing conditions, particularly for the big organizations like states. Because of the sheer size of a state-like organization, it takes so much time and work for the acquisition, processing and possessing of information that there occurs an almost natural resistance within the organization to revising that information and adapting organizational behavior in line with the changing conditions. Particularly when the information in question has to do with the survival of the organization in a world populated by rival organizations, then the organization in question may overvalue that information and develop an even stronger resistance to its revision. As such, the syndromes refer to the "deep memory" and the associated "deep policy" of the Turkish nationalist elites regarding the West and its domestic allies. In what follows, we will explore, in more detail, these deep memories and deep policies.

In this connection, a few words about "memory" are in order. Memory is not always what we "remember" as autonomous subjects, but what we are "reminded of" by those in positions of authority, using the ideology-producing and ideology-disseminating institutions (schools, museums, textbooks, the media, cinema, literature, and so on) at their disposal. In that sense, memory is an essential part of every individual's subjectivity, but is not always subjectively (i.e., autonomously) produced and transmitted from one individual to another. A certain configuration of memory is, therefore, always produced by and reflective of a certain configuration of

the balance of political forces and the hegemonic situation as they exist at a certain moment in a given society.

The “Deep Historical Memory” behind the Tanzimat Syndrome

The term *Tanzimat*, which means arranging things in a new and better order, refers to a series of modernizing reforms in the Ottoman Empire, which were set in motion in 1839 by the promulgation of the Imperial Decree of Gulhane. The Gulhane Decree was later supplemented in 1856 by the declaration of another major statement, called the Reform Decree (*Islahat Fermani*). The backbone of the Tanzimat reforms was to provide the Ottoman subjects with modern citizenship rights and to create a state based on the rule of law. These basic citizenship rights included equality before law, irrespective of one's social status and religion; supremacy of law over the acts and decisions of the political authority; security of life, property and honor of all citizens; regulation of taxation and putting an end to the arbitrary confiscations of property. The Reform Decree of 1856 brought special new rights and privileges to the Christian subjects of the Empire, including freedom of prayer; the right to establish their own educational institutions; the right to enter into the military service; and equal taxation.

One particular expectation of the Palace from launching this reform program was to regain the allegiance of the Empire's Christian subjects (mostly Greeks and Armenians) and thereby to contain their separatist tendencies. Another expectation was to stop the Great Powers of Europe from interfering in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, the European states, particularly Britain and Russia, had long been active in mobilizing the Christians against the Ottoman state, and they were putting demands on the Palace to grant the Christians with economic, political and cultural liberties and advantages. By engaging itself in the Tanzimat reforms, the Ottoman center was hoping to satisfy some of the demands of the European Great Powers and thereby to put an end to their provocation and support of the Ottoman Christians towards separatism.

This is not the place to judge the value, wisdom or success of the Tanzimat reforms. However, even a cursory look at Ottoman history after the initiation of the Tanzimat reforms in 1839 reveals a constant process of imperial collapse, which was brought about by the successful independence movements of the Christian and non-Turkish peoples supported by this or that European power. As a result, between 1839 and 1908, the Empire lost its entire east-central European lands. The Balkan and North African territories were gone between 1908-1918, during the Balkan Wars, the Italian invasion of Ottoman North Africa, and the First World War. Finally, during the Allied occupation of the Empire between 1918-1922, the defunct Treaty of Sèvres detached large chunks of Anatolia from the Empire, which had been already reduced to a symbolic entity.

One reason for the reverse effect of the Tanzimat's society-empowering reforms was that they remained suspended in the air as the Ottoman imperial center could not develop a new institutional model of center-periphery relations and it could not define a new imperial ideology which might have contained community demands under the roof of a revitalized empire. Under these circumstances, granting modern national, religious, and legal rights to the peripheral communities, in accordance with Russian and Western European demands, resulted in nothing but the destruction of the traditional

center-periphery relations and the rapid weakening of the Center's hold over the periphery. In many cases, the imperial center had to engage in state-strengthening reforms just to be able to contain the divisive consequences of the previously undertaken society-empowering reforms.

This historical record taught the Ottoman statesmen and the Republican founding fathers two lessons. One was that giving rights and freedoms to a people would not make them more loyal to the state; on the contrary, this would even supply them with more opportunities to organize a stronger assault on the state. The second lesson was that the real intention behind the European demands of respect for human rights was to divide the Turkish nation and weaken the Turkish state. The combination of these two lessons, which are so deeply engraved in the historical memory of the Turkish state and society, and which makes up the main axis of the mentality of contemporary Turkish conservatism and isolationism, we call the Tanzimat Syndrome.

Perhaps the best exemplification of the Tanzimat Syndrome can be found in the words of Sultan Abdulhamid (r. 1876-1909), who had eliminated the Young Ottomans to consolidate his powers and who lost his throne to the Young Turks. In his political memoirs, Sultan Abdulhamid writes:

"The reform demands of the great powers never end. They know nothing about our country, yet they still play the role of the all-knowing counselor. ... Though they disagree among themselves as to what our problems are and how we are going to deal with those problems, there are two points which they all agree on: First, to create the impression in our public opinion that all reforms are done because of their recommendations and pressures, and thereby to put us down in the eyes of our own nation; and second, to enhance the position of the Christians in our country, and to make them come forward with even more excessive demands from us. This reform thing is a dirty trick. They should take off their hands from our business. The reforms they are recommending cannot possibly be taken seriously and implemented without doing serious harm to the interests of our nation. If we proceed in our own way I am sure that we will develop more slowly but more smoothly." (Sultan Abdulhamid 1984: 110-111).

Another illustration of the Tanzimat Syndrome comes from Recep Peker, a prominent bureaucrat, prime minister, and ideologist of the Turkish one-party regime from the 1920s through the 1940s. In his *Lectures on the Revolution*, which he offered at the Ankara University in the 1930s, Peker sharply criticized the Ottoman constitutional regime as an unwarranted imitation of the Western model. He argued that the Ottomans had borrowed the Western conception of freedom, which was not suitable to the local conditions and traditions. According to Peker, Islamic reactionaries and Christian separatists exploited freedom to achieve their ominous goals:

"...The destructive elements found many supportive opportunities in the atmosphere of constitutional monarchy. In this air of freedom, and in the name of freedom, a fool named Dervis Vahdeti began publishing a newspaper called *Volkan* and founded a party called The Mohammadan Union (*Ittihad-i Muhammedi*). ... Such a newspaper would have done great damage even today, if we had allowed its publication. Back then, however, the Empire was tolerating such newspapers in the name of freedom, and when legal measures were being taken to stop such unwanted developments, a chorus was starting

to shout that freedoms were being violated. Again using this freedom, a deputy of Greek origin could say "My exterior is Ottoman, but my interior is Greek" in the Assembly of Deputies, and the Ottoman Assembly showed no reaction to this in the name of freedom." (Peker 1984: 33).

The "Deep Policy" Imperatives of the Tanzimat Syndrome: Delegitimization of Rights and Freedoms

The "deep policy" imperatives of the Tanzimat syndrome can be formulated as follows:

First: Declare as illegitimate all demands for minority rights, particularly those that are put forward by ethnic and religious groups.

Second: Declare as illegitimate all demands for group rights, including those that are put forward by social classes and regional communities.

Third: Declare as illegitimate all demands for rights, including basic human rights.

The best policy alternative, implied by the Tanzimat Syndrome, has been to deny the very existence of the ethnic and religious minorities, and to try to assimilate them into the mainstream national culture by all means at the disposal of the state. However, if the state had to recognize the existence of a minority, and if assimilation policies did not bring about the total transformation of a group, then it would become essential to resist, as much as possible, their demands for recognition and cultural rights. It was believed that it was the Western powers who would galvanize the minorities to come forward with more and more demands for rights and freedoms. Hence, granting any rights to the minorities would make them less, rather than more, loyal to the state. More rights and freedoms would simply give birth to more and stronger secessionist movements among the minorities, and the Western powers would not hesitate to give them their ideological, political and sometimes military support. In the end, the minorities would end up founding their own independent state, which would be nothing more than a puppet state under the protection of one or more Western powers.

A more general, and certainly more significant, policy prescription of the Tanzimat syndrome is a delegitimization of the very idea of rights, including individual rights, as it was believed that rights would endow the individuals with a larger space of action, and individuals would use that larger action space to engage in anti-state activities. Therefore, the state had to resist granting even the basic rights to the individuals, in order not to weaken the authority of the state over the society. The state, perceiving the world through the lenses of the Tanzimat syndrome, perceived a zero-sum game between state and society, between state authority and societal rights, the latter being either collective or individual rights. Hence, the state perceived itself as a Leviathan and demanded absolute submission from social groups and individuals. Rights simply did not fit into this Hobbesian picture, and all kinds of rights were perceived as challenges, big or small, to the authority, and more than that, to the very existence of the state.

Indicators of the Tanzimat Syndrome in the Turkish Public Opinion: Public Attitudes towards Basic Rights and Freedoms¹

One way of measuring how deep the beliefs and attitudes that are characterized under the Tanzimat syndrome have sunk into the political culture of the Turkish public is to observe the public's attitudes towards individual and collective rights and freedoms. The data in TABLE 1 and TABLE 2 are chosen to illustrate those attitudes. The first remark to be made regarding the data in these tables is that almost everybody expressed an opinion on the issue of rights and freedoms, and those who chose not to give an answer remained around 1% for TABLE 1 and 4% for TABLE 2. In TABLE 1, the respondents are offered a number of basic rights and asked if they think a given right must always exist, regardless of the context and conditions, or if they think the right in question can be restricted under certain circumstances. It should be noted that, at this stage, the circumstances under which a given right can be restricted are not specified. It turned out that the public were most sensitive for two rights, namely, "equality before law" and "freedom of conscience and religion": 90% of the people said that those two rights must not be restricted under any circumstances. Then came two other rights, "freedom of communication" and "freedom from torture and ill-treatment". For these rights, the sensitivity dropped slightly, by 5 percentage points, and around 85% of the people interviewed said that these two rights must be beheld at all times. The last two rights, about which the respondents turned out to be least sensitive, were "freedom of expression" and "the right to use one's mother tongue". Hence, only about 75% of the people were of the opinion that no restrictions should be imposed on these two rights.

**TABLE 1: Indicators of the Tanzimat Syndrome in the Turkish Public Opinion
Public Attitudes towards Basic Rights and Freedoms**

	SHOULD NEVER BE RESTRICTED	CAN BE RESTRICTED in certain times and circumstances	NA/NO	Total
Equality before Law	91	7	1	100
Freedom of Religion	90	8	1	100
Freedom of Communication	85	13	2	100
Freedom from Torture	83	16	1	100
Freedom of Expression	74	25	1	100
Right to Use One's Mother Language	74	25	1	100

If we leave aside the first two rights, "equality before law" and "freedom of conscience and religion", about which there is almost unanimous agreement that they should in no way be restricted, the picture is not so bright when it comes to the

¹ The data that are used in this section are drawn from TESEV-Bogazici 2002.

remaining four rights. Hence, 13% of the people believe that, when conditions call for it, individuals can be prevented from communicating freely. Yet another 16% think that, if necessary, a person can be tortured. The picture becomes even darker when the respondents expressed their opinions regarding freedom of expression and freedom to use one's mother tongue. Hence, on both occasions, a very sizeable minority, close to 25%, opined that there may be occasions in which the authorities can prevent a person from saying what he wants to say and, even more gravely, that the state can prohibit a person from using his own language.

The cultural penetration of the Tanzimat Syndrome is more visible in TABLE 2. Here, the respondents are again offered a series of rights and asked whether they would agree that the authorities restrict these rights when national interest, public safety, or social order is at risk. In other words, unlike in the previous set of questions, now the type of restrictions is made clear and specified. The results are admittedly much gloomier compared to the ones in TABLE 1. Hence, on all counts, close to 50% of the respondents said that the state can suppress basic rights and freedoms when such highly esteemed community norms and values as national interest, public safety, and social order are at serious risk.

TABLE 2: Indicators of the Tanzimat Syndrome in the Turkish Public Opinion Public Attitudes towards Basic Rights and Freedoms -- Expressed Conditionally (When National Interest, Public Safety, Social Order Is at Stake)

	Tend to AGREE	Tend NOT TO AGREE	NA/NO	Total
We SHOULD NOT tolerate those opinions that are opposed to the opinions of the majority	56	39	4	100
When the newspapers publish news and articles that are opposed to the interests of the nation, they SHOULD BE closed down	51	47	3	100
When the interests of the nation are under serious threat, human rights CAN BE restricted	50	46	4	100

Taken together, these two tables give us important clues of the extent to which nationalist conservatism's perception of rights as illegitimate have been adopted by the general public. First of all, sizeable minorities in the Turkish public do not think that basic rights and freedoms are an inalienable and inseparable attributes and that

they are embedded in the very definition of being a human being. Secondly, and echoing the Hobbesian spirit of the Tanzimat syndrome, the Turkish public seems to be ready to trade freedom and rights for order and security.

The “Deep Historical Memory” behind the Sèvres Syndrome

The Mondros Armistice of October 30, 1918 marked the final defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the World War I. By that time, the CUP cabinet had already resigned on October 8 and the triumvirate of Enver, Cemal and Talat Pashas were about to flee the country (they would do so on November 7). The Mondros treaty provided for a total and unconditional surrender of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman navy and armies, including the armies still operating in the eastern front, were to be demobilized, and all communication and transportation facilities and food and coal supplies were to pass to the control of the Allied powers. The Straits were to be opened to the passage of the Allied warships. The treaty included special provisions for the Armenian population of the empire, such as the releasing of all Armenians held in the Ottoman prisons whatever their crimes were. The Allies reserved for themselves the right to occupy any strategic area of the empire, and particularly the six Armenian-populated eastern provinces, in case of disorder (Kili 1982: 5 8; Lewis 1968: 239 242; Shaw and Shaw 1977: 327 328).

With the exception of Mosul in Iraq, which would be occupied by the British soon after the Mondros Armistice, the Arab-populated Iraqi, Syrian, Lebanese, and Palestinian provinces of the Ottoman Empire had already fallen to the British or French forces right before the conclusion of the Mondros Armistice. Kirkuk had fallen in May 1918; and Nablus, Haifa, Acre, Damascus, Aleppo, Homs, Alexandretta, and Beirut had been occupied in September-October 1918. Thus, by the time the Mondros treaty was concluded, the territory of the Ottoman Empire had already been reduced to Anatolia (including eastern Thrace and Istanbul).

The Turks made up the majority in western and central regions of Anatolia, with sizeable Greek minorities living in Istanbul and the Aegean. Eastern Anatolia was home to the Armenians remaining after the expulsion of 1915, the Kurds, and the Turks. Calculations based on the 1914 census show that, out of the 11 million people living in Anatolia (excluding eastern Thrace and Istanbul), 85% were Muslims (Turks and Kurds), 9% were Greeks, 5% were Armenians, and 0.8% were Jewish and other non-Muslims. In eastern Thrace, the total population was approximately 630,000, of which 57% were Muslims, 35% were Greeks, 3% were Armenians, and 4% were Jewish and other non-Muslims. Finally, the population of Istanbul was divided between the Muslims (60%), the Greeks (25%), the Armenians, Jews, and other non-Muslims (15%) (Kili 1982: 72).

In the year that followed the Mondros Treaty, Istanbul and parts of Anatolia, and particularly those regions with sizeable Armenian and Greek minorities, also came under the occupation of the Allied powers and the Allied-supported armed forces of Greece. On November 13, 1918, the Allied warships anchored in the port of Istanbul, though the official occupation of the city did not yet begin. In December 1918 the French occupied the southeastern Anatolian province of Adana (Cilicia). At about the same time, the British forces entered Antep, Birecik, Maras and Urfa in southeast, Batum and Kars in northeast, and Samsun in the Black Sea coast of Anatolia. On March 16, 1919 Istanbul was officially taken under Allied occupation. Beginning

from March 28, 1919 the Italian forces landed on the western Mediterranean city of Antalya and its environs. Finally, on May 15, 1915, accompanied by the Allied warships, the Greek forces began occupying the city of Izmir and the Aegean region.

The new situation created by the occupations was formalized in the Treaty of Sèvres, signed by the Ottoman Empire and the Entente powers on August 10, 1920. According to the Sèvres Treaty, the Arabian Peninsula and Mesopotamia (Iraq) was ceded to Great Britain; Syria and the southeastern Anatolian provinces of Antep, Mardin, and Urfa was taken by France; eastern Thrace, and Izmir and its environs were surrendered to Greece; and western Anatolia except Izmir was designated as the economic dominion of Italy. The Sèvres Treaty also stipulated that an independent Armenian state under American mandate would be created in northeastern Anatolia, and an autonomous Kurdistan would be established in southeastern Anatolia. According to the terms of the treaty, all the non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire who had been previously expatriated would be allowed to return to their homelands and their initial wealth and property would be returned to them. Istanbul was left as the Ottoman capital and the seat of the sultan, but the Straits was taken under the control of an international commission. The Ottoman government was denied the right to have armed forces other than a gendarmerie for internal security purposes. The Ottoman finances were to be regulated by a permanent Allied commission and part of the Ottoman revenues was to be reserved for payments of reparations to the Allies (Kili 1982: 84 86; Shaw and Shaw 1977: 356).

The circumstances created by the treaties of Mondros and Sèvres, and especially the prospect of the foundation of Armenian and Greek states in Anatolia, led many Turks in the occupation zones to found Defense of Rights Committees and to start to start an armed resistance movement. Thus, in the course of November-December 1918 three such committees were formed: Committee for the Defense of the Ottoman Rights (*Mudafaa-i Hukuk-u Osmaniye Cemiyeti*) in Izmir, Committee for the Defense of Thrace (*Trakya Pasaeli Cemiyeti*) in Thrace, and Committee for the Defense of Rights of Eastern Provinces (*Vilayat-i Sarkiyye Mudafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti*) in Istanbul. The Defense of Rights Committees were accompanied by urban and rural guerilla wars against the occupation forces. The Kemalists entered the stage after these initial organizations and forms of nationalist resistance had already taken root. What Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the Kemalists did was, first, to organize the various Defense of Rights Committees into a centralized resistance organization called the Committee for the Defense of Rights of Anatolia and Rumeli. Another contribution of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the Kemalists to the nationalist cause was to replace the irregular guerilla forces by a regular army called the National Forces (*Kuvva-i Milliye*). In 1922 the national resistance movement ended in victory, and many of the territorial losses of the Sèvres Treaty were reversed under the Lausanne Treaty of 1923. The Lausanne Treaty also implied the Western recognition of the Kemalists as the new political authority of Turkey, replacing the defunct government of the Ottoman sultan.

The “Deep Policy” Imperatives of the Sèvres Syndrome: Isolationism and Westernization without the West

The following formulae are the “deep policy” imperatives of the Sèvres syndrome:

First: Isolationism: Do not enter into economic, political or cultural pacts and alliances with the Western world. Never trust the Western states and always watch your back.

Second: Westernization without the West: Westernize/Modernize the state, the military, the economy and the society without getting engaged in economic, political or cultural pacts and alliances with the Western world.

The basic assumption underlying the Sèvres syndrome was that the Europeans perceive the Turks as the illegitimate invaders and occupiers of the European-Christian lands and as the oppressors of the European-Christian peoples. Therefore, the syndrome went on, the Europeans have always tried to sweep the Turks away from the ancestral European-Christian territories and to restore those lands back to their rightful owners, the Armenians and the Greeks in the past and now the Kurds. This historic “missionary struggle” of Europe had started with the Crusades in the middle ages and culminated in the Sèvres Treaty of 1920 ending the First World War, under the terms of which Turkey was carved up between Western powers and the Christian minorities collaborating with them. Scrape every European and you will find a Crusader behind it! The Sèvres Treaty, and with it the Crusader mission of driving the Turks away from Anatolia, became defunct as a result of the Turkish national resistance. However, Europeans, and the Christian minorities inside Turkey, have never given up the Crusader’s mission. Even today, the European Union’s seemingly innocent demands for individual and minority rights are nothing but concealed attempts to revive the terms of the Sèvres Treaty, and they simply want to get by peaceful means what they could not achieve by the force of arms eight decades ago.

Indicators of the Sèvres Syndrome in the Turkish Public Opinion: Public Attitudes towards Europe and the West²

The data from the public opinion survey, which was conducted in November 2003 as part of our Euroskepticism project, offer ample evidence on the way to measure the impact of the Sèvres syndrome on the political beliefs and attitudes of the Turkish public. Part of this evidence is shown in TABLE 3 below:

² The data that are used in this section are drawn from OSIAF-Bogazici 2003.

TABLE 3: Indicators of the Sevres Syndrome in the Turkish Public Opinion: Public Beliefs on the Crusades, Capitulations and the Sèvres Treaty

	We Would Have Been Better Following National Ways Rather Than Westernization	Europeans Have Been Trying to Divide Turkey in the Past and Now	Crusader's Spirit Shapes European Policies towards Turkey	EU-Related Reforms Are Like the Capitulations of the Ottoman Times	EU-Related Reforms Are Like the Terms of the Sèvres Treaty of the WWI
Tend to AGREE	63	54	46	41	36
Tend NOT TO AGREE	26	33	27	27	27
NA/NO	11	13	28	32	37
Total	100	100	100	100	100

The basic assumption of the Sèvres syndrome was that the Europeans perceive the Turks as the illegitimate invaders and occupiers of the European-Christian lands and as the oppressors of the European-Christian peoples. Therefore, the syndrome went on, the Europeans have always tried to sweep the Turks away from the ancestral European-Christian territories and to restore those lands back to their rightful owners, the Armenians and the Greeks in the past and now the Kurds. According to the data presented in TABLE 3, this assumption is well received by the Turkish public. Hence, a net majority of the public, 54%, think that European states are now trying to divide and rule Turkey, just as in the past they tried to divide and rule the Ottoman Empire.

Moreover, a close look at the data in TABLE 3 show that a sizeable plurality of the Turkish public, approximately 40%, is of the opinion that Europeans, today, continue to be motivated by the “Crusader’s spirit” in their dealings with Turkey, that they relentlessly try to regain the capitulations of the middle ages and to degrade Turkey to an economic colony, and that they still pursue to resuscitate the Sèvres Treaty of 1920. It is to be noted that those who do not share these ideas remained only at 27%, as opposed to the 40% approval rate, and that one third of the respondents expressed no opinion on the issue of the Crusades, capitulations and Sèvres. Finally, based on the data in TABLE 3, we will try to find some evidence for one of the “deep policy” imperatives of the Sèvres syndrome, namely, “westernization without the west”. “Westernization without the west” would imply an inward-looking model of development without following the economic, political or cultural models of the West. As we can follow in TABLE 3, this policy imperative has gained wide recognition in the Turkish public opinion. In fact, a clear majority of the people interviewed, 63%, said that Turkey would have been better off today if she had followed her own, rather than Europe’s, values and traditions. Only about 25% of the respondents opposed that idea, while 11% chose not to express any opinion regarding that issue.

Concluding Remarks: The Syndromes and the Europeanization of Turkey

An unrelenting source of resistance to Turkey's ideological and institutional Europeanization consists of the individuals and institutions whose political identities have been shaped by the Tanzimat and Sèvres syndromes. Therefore, Europeanization of Turkey means, first and foremost, an ideological and institutional re-equilibration in the area of national identity and foreign policy. This re-equilibration implies a gradual disarticulation of the Tanzimat and Sèvres Syndromes and their replacement by a commitment to human rights in the domestic arena and to integrationism in the international arena.

The Tanzimat and Sevres Syndromes, taken together, have defined a Hobbesian modus operandi for the Turkish state: Providing security in exchange for freedom. The two syndromes have been the founding ideological pillars of the modern Turkish state since the late 19th century (from the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid onwards). The modern Turkish state has (so far) been a Hobbesian state. Europeanization of Turkey, on the other hand, signifies a not-so-easy transition from a "Hobbesian" to a "Kantian" state. The founding principle of a Kantian state, as opposed to a Hobbesian one, is to put freedom before security and morality before politics. This principle is best captured by the following words of Immanuel Kant taken from his 1795 essay entitled "On the Opposition between Morality and Politics with Respect to Perpetual Peace", which appeared in his book *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*: "If there is no freedom and no morality based on freedom, and everything which occurs or can occur happens by the mere mechanism of nature, certainly politics (which is the art of using this mechanism for ruling men) is the whole of practical wisdom, and the concept of right is an empty thought."

References

- Bayar, Celal. 1991. *Bir Darbenin Anatomisi [The Anatomy of a Coup D'Etat]*. Istanbul: Emre Yayinlari. Prepared for publication by Ismet Bozdog.
- Cakirtas, Osman. 1994a. *Osmanli Tarihi 1 (Siyasi) [Ottoman History 1 (Political)]*. Ankara: Koza Yayıncılık.
- Cakirtas, Osman. 1994b. *Osmanli Tarihi 2 (Kultur ve Medeniyet) [Ottoman History 2 (Culture and Civilization)]*. Ankara: Koza Yayıncılık.
- Karaosmanoglu, Ali L. 1991. "The International Context of Democratic Transition in Turkey." In Geoffrey Pridham (ed.), *Encouraging Democracy: The International Context of Regime Transition in Southern Europe*. Leicester, London: Leicester University Press, 159-174.
- Kili, Suna. 1982. *Turk Devrim Tarihi [The History of the Turkish Revolution]*. Istanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.
- Lewis, Bernard. 1968. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- OSIAF-Bogazici. 2003. "Euroskepticism in Turkey: Manifestations at the Elite and Popular Levels". Research project supported by a joint grant from the OSIAF (Open Society Institute Assistance Fund) and Bogazici University Research Fund. Date of completion: July 2004. Project director: Hakan Yilmaz. The opinion survey was conducted in November 2003, over a nation-wide random sample of 2250 people.
- Peker, Recep. 1984. *Inkilap Dersleri [Lectures on the Turkish Revolution]*. Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari. First published in 1935.
- Shaw, Stanford J., and Ezel Kural Shaw. (1977). *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey. Volume II: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sultan Abdulhamid. 1984. *Siyasi Hatiratim [My Political Memoirs]*. Dorduncu Baski. Birinci baski 1974. Istanbul: Dergah Yayinlari.
- TESEV-Bogazici. 2002. "Turkish Public Opinion Regarding the European Union". Research Project supported by a joint grant of TESEV (The Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation) and Bogazici University Research Fund. Date of Completion: January 2002. Project directors: Ali Carkoglu, Refik Erzan, Kemal Kirisci, Hakan Yilmaz. The opinion survey was conducted in May 2002, over a nation-wide random sample of 3060 people.