The Bridge that Widens the Gap

Critical Geopolitical research concerning the construction of post-colonial EU-Turkey relations

Richard Huttinga

The Bridge that Widens the Gap

Critical Geopolitical research concerning the construction of post-colonial EU-Turkey relations

Acknowledgement

This thesis is developed in the master Human Geography –Europe: borders, identities and governance. Studying critical geopolitics embarked the need to further deconstruct classical geopolitical narratives. Taking on this critical view on classical geopolitical theories lay bare the inconspicuous position of geopolitical Turkey and encouraged to conduct this research. I want to thank my thesis supervisor dr. Olivier T. Kramsch for his 'spot on' theoretical insights. As well as the supervisor of the Institute for Turkish Studies, drs. Armand Sag, for spending his time on reading and discussing this research, and for giving me the opportunity to deepen the research in the setting of the academic institute.

Temporary One, Fleetwood Mac

Where are you darlin', when my
Moon is risin', and your
Sun is shinin' down

What are you doin', are you
Missin' me
The way that I'm missin' you now

The river goes on and on, and the
Sea that divides us is a
Temporary one, and the
Bridge will bring us back together

What are you doin', goin'
Down in to Soho as I
Get my rest tonight

What are you doin', are you
Busy with your world
Well I wish you were busy with mine (Fleetwood Mac, 1997)

Table of Contents

1   Introduction

"The irony of practical geopolitical representations of place is that, in order to succeed, they actually necessitate the abrogation of genuine geographical knowledge about the diversity and complexity of places as social entities." (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992: 202).

Manifestations of sensitivity and discursiveness about geopolitics and language are very expressively being represented in discussions concerning geopolitical Turkey. The quest of submerging into geographical and geopolitical Turkey, at some point resulted in the Google search on the term 'fault line Turkey'. It subsequently brought me to an insight that - sometimes quite paradoxically- simple details can reveal large and complex structures. This specific search didn't bring me to different digressions on plate tectonics or to news items concerning the highly damaging earthquake of October 2011. Instead, I was directed towards Google Scholar and Samuel Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations', where Huntington emphasized on fault lines between different clashing civilizations. The civilizations opposing each other through the different cultures they represent collide on these fault lines and therefore in Huntington's theory the fault lines ought to be the battle lines of the future (Huntington, 2011)**.** The rhetoric –considering the fatalities because of earthquakes, the painful rhetoric- of the presence of 'fault lines' involving Turkey's geophysical and geopolitical position, depicts a certain inappropriateness within this case. First of all because of the inconvenience that the web search directly steered towards a discursive practice in geopolitical theory by blurring the difference between the 'physical fault lines' and the 'fault lines as a human construct'. The natural fractures of the Eurasian, Arabian and African plate, centre in Turkey and create an area susceptible to earthquakes. How did these fractures become a metaphor for categorized cultural differences? And second, Huntington's way of using the fault lines, implies something definite and impossible to restore. The different fault lines could become more or less stabilized but, in any case, will never merge and become whole again. Whether this accounts for cultural differences can be argued when taking into account the development and changeability of cultures.

Turkey often explicitly posits an exceptional case within geopolitical theories and discussions, being the border of different civilizations, religions, political ideologies, security issues, energy crossroads and so forth (Yanik, 2011). Could Huntington's Clash of Civilizations have invoked a certain speech-act within geopolitics? Various scholars both agreed and disagreed on the

Huntingtonian thesis but did often commit themselves to the rhetoric of the used metaphors. Said (2005), criticizes Huntington in the article 'The Clash of Ignorance' claiming the thesis to be a 'gimmick' (Said, 2005: 149) while also using Huntington's term 'Clash'. It should be realized that Said uses this metaphor in a cynical way, but could it be argued that his thesis contributes to constructing a social reality through this discourse of Clashes. Notable is that by both criticizers as well as devotees, the linguistic form of Huntington's thesis has much been replicated through the narrative of a Clash (Lesser, 2006). 'The Clash of Ignorance' (Said, 2005), 'the Clash of Barbarisms' (Achar, 2005), 'Clash of Security Issues' (Ogozlu, 2002), 'Clash of Emotions' (Moisi, 2007), 'True Clash of Civilizations' (Inglehart & Norris, 2003), 'Clash of Norms' (Powel, 2009) and so forth –all pick up on the speech of difference (not even mentioning the texts/articles/contributions that take Huntington's thesis as inducement for their own purposes (Dahlman, 2004), (Yanik, 2011)).

Within geopolitical debates, 'geopolitical Turkey' is and has been a much-discussed issue. Striking is the seemingly conscious use of language within these debates. Whether Turkey is being described in terms of fault lines, being a bridge, lock, key, hinge, gate, crossroad, pivot area or torn-state; each of the qualifications and geopolitical representations ascribes a specific strategic role to Turkey e.g. liminal Turkey (Yanik, 2011). Articles and books that digress on Turkish politics, seem to often encounter terms like 'Turkey in-between the East and the West' in their titles and when not, definitely make references to the 'difficulty', 'importance' and 'interests' of the Turkish geographical role (Yanik, 2009: 531-532). Within these discussions about Turkey -despite the fact that the different theories do not agree on the Turkish position- a trend is recognizable in which Turkey seems to be both the centre of the discussion while simultaneously being the passive object that depends on surrounding processes. All characterisations of the geopolitical role imply a certain dependent position of Turkey; a key is pretty useless without a door that it can lock or unlock and what would the function of a bridge be without two points that need to be connected? The geopolitical genre developed into a discipline where the all-seeing geopolitician reduced complexity into fixed categories by stripping plurality and multiplicity. Within this act of reducing complexity, metaphors serve a specific role in being the analytics of the explanation (Ó Tuathail, Dalby, & Routledge, 2006: 121), thereby creating breeding ground for exaggerations. The risk of stigmatizing Turkey seems to be taken by the discursive use of language and images, abrogating necessity of genuine geographical knowledge on diversity and complexity of places as social entities (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992).

Revealing is the image that is being derived when integrating the different geographical representations into a complete view of Turkey –an important feature of metaphor. Then, Turkey, the so-called 'torn state', then connects two separate points being a 'bridge', meanwhile being described standing on 'crossroads' where choices on directions need to be made. Through paradoxical representations of Turkey as a 'gate', 'lock', 'hinge' and 'key', authors fail to compose a unifying image. The question arises whether simplifying theories and metaphors –in contrast to their actual goal- aren't confusing and unrepresentative of reality. Knowing that this combining of different metaphors more or less creates a situation where the 'pot is calling the cattle black' -participating in exaggerating reality- it does hint at a fundamental point of this research: how do these geopolitical representations exist next to each other, and how do they create a so-called self-fulfilling-prophecy? (Lakoff & Johnson in Musolff, 2012: 2). Even more important, how do these metaphors depict and influence Turkeys relations and how do they locate difference? Unravelling the dynamics of visions on geopolitical Turkey will create new insights in the use of geopolitical representations constructing and conserving a relation of dependence; the bridge that derives its right of existence through, and only through the plots of land it connects and which presence is thanked to the gracefulness of the bridge builder. This research thereby complies with the notions of Van Houtum & Strüver (2002), signifying the geographical importance of representations to lie within the people who limit, separate and border. The case of geopolitical Turkey highlights how people and institutions construct and institutionalize narratives through the discursive use of geographical representations.

1.1   Relevance

Compliant with the study of critical geopolitics, this research critically deconstructs discursive metaphor use concerning geopolitical Turkey within EU policy and reports on EU affairs. In doing so, it leaves space open for critical geopolitical inquiry, asking critical questions of how geopolitical discourse functions politically (O' Tuathail, 1988; Dalby, 1989; in Dalby, 1990). Divergence of language use within theorization and broadcasting on geopolitical Turkey, asks for more profound research. Everyday images and practices concerning Turkey are composed through a narration of a dependent in-between Turkey and the European Union seems to adopt and proclaim the use of these geopolitical representations. Hülsse (2006) calls for an increasing emphasize on the role of imaginations and metaphors within discourses. Imaginations are nowhere more apparent than in the linguistic means of imagining, such as

metaphors. These metaphors are not only means of imagining but also construct social reality (Hülsse, 2006: 397). Continuing speech acts on classifying, selecting, arranging, organizing etc. of states, religions and cultures do not seem to do any right to the current complex and diversified Turkish state and its citizens. Ongoing categorisations seem to keep falling into the same stigmatizing and simplifying verdicts. This research critically deconstructs these vast images of geopolitical Turkey and attempts to refute the use of these images by emphasizing on the structuring post-colonial role they perform and could perform in EU-Turkey relations. This is considered both renewing and prerequisite for fully exposing the comprehensiveness of power relations between Turkey and the EU, especially in the dynamics of Turkey following the 'path towards EU accession'. Contemporary research on Turkey remained in highlighting the Turkish uniqueness but undermines the shaping of reality by these representations. The 'constructedness' of the representations is being implied but too little being analysed (Yanik, 2011: 82). The geopolitical representations seem to determine power structures and balances. In contemporary discussions concerning geopolitical Turkey, there appears to be taken little notion of the presence and influence of the constructed images. Simplifying categorisations of Turkey must be acknowledged from the outset that their definition is a socially constructed one. Constructs have changed and do change in political significance over the centuries (Lewis et al, 1997; in Dahlman, 2004: 554), but seem to be interpreted as being the undifferentiated truth. Metaphors are extremely useful in creating a favourable context to pursue policies. The combining of a discursive practice with a geopolitical representation, present an international function and identity: "metaphors of vision are more powerful than a mere geopolitical representation or a mere use of metaphor" (Yanik, 2009: 533). The possibility of representations becoming vehicles for political gain, should be an inducement for a critical attitude towards the position of Turkey as presented in geopolitical debates.

The main reason to stress all this is because of the possible deficiencies of this role of metaphor as 'social construct'. Prominent Critical Geopolitician Ó Tuathail (2006) claims that understanding the geopolitical process, requires studying geopolitics as a discourse and the cultural context that derives its meaning. Analyzing geopolitics being a discourse with constitutive ambitions, asks for being "attentive to the ways in which global space is labelled, metaphors are deployed and visual images are used in this process of making stories and constructing images of world politics" (Ó Tuathail, 2006: 1). And exactly that is what this research will concern: attentiveness to the deploying of metaphors concerning geopolitical Turkey. Through this research, the call on 'academics to advance learning through promoting a better debate and argumentation on geopolitics and not to promote any state over any other

state', by Ó Tuathail; is being answered. "Geopolitics is not a domain of objective stories about world politics. It is world politics itself, about states, cultures, identities, discourses and power" (Ó Tuathail, 2006: 12). Classical geopolitical ideas and concepts have been adopted and adapted to help justify foreign and domestic policy-making. This is especially the case in Turkey, and asks for a critical approach.

Prior research on geopolitical Turkey and the discursive use of language within the EU has pointed to contribute to the geopolitical narrative of EU enlargement (Dahlman, 2004), the construction of Turkish 'exceptionalism' through Turkish foreign policy (Yanik, 2011). It also connects these propositions claiming the case of Turkey illustrates the critical geopolitical argument that geopolitical discourse shapes and is shaped by foreign policy-making (Bilgin, 2007). Metaphor is part of a broad conceptual framework, encompassing the West's view of itself as opposed to its view of the East (Sandikcioglu, 2000: 300). Still, a lacuna in research can be found in the explicit use of metaphors and the material effects of the geopolitical discourse. This needs to be further deepened. Contemporary research can be intensified by -instead of following the origins of language focussing on the implications of metaphor use on geographical Turkey. For it isn't the bridge, buffer or gate itself that should be the topic of study, but the actors applying the geopolitical representations. Then, deconstructing the whole narrative of 'exceptional' Turkey in EU policy and documentation not only creates insight in the construction of social reality but also reveals the language can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The neglect of Huntingtonian dividing is not being invalidated by emphasizing exceptional Turkey, also reinforces the narrative of dependence and inequality.

1.2   Structure

The research can roughly be divided into a part describing and legitimizing theoretical and methodological choices, as well as a part that out of this theory analyses metaphorical implications on geopolitical Turkey. The proposed research design, which is being explicated in chapter two, will be further substantiated through the theoretical framework in chapter three. This chapter synergizes theory on metaphor analysis, critical geopolitics and post colonialism into an appropriate framework for analyzing representations of geopolitical Turkey. Highlighting the commonalities of these different theoretical movements on discourse and the construction of reality will underpin the critical analysis of contemporary postures towards geopolitical Turkey. How to derive answers from the research question e.g. the methodology chapter, is elaborated subsequent to the theoretical framework. The

methodology chapter formulates the practical interpretation and application of metaphor use based on the defined theoretical underpinnings and further defines the research strategy and research material.

The analysis chapters (5, 6 and 7) will be constructed by means of the different metaphors and the image of Turkey they present separately as their way of being more connected to a larger network of representations. Chapter five deconstructs the ways in which the geopolitical representations imagine Turkey by highlighting their specific characteristics; of for example having a function to connect (bridge) or having the abilities to block (shield). The location of power is chosen as determinant of grouping and decomposing the representations of Turkey. In order to reduce the geopolitical representations to a notion of postcoloniality and a narrative of dependence, chapter 6 and 7 bespeak metaphors as part of a more overarching whole and therefore discuss their interconnectedness. The representations are not treated separately but are regarded as the interconnected potential of the ways in which they define difference, present borders and structure power relations. Not wanting to linger on the theoretical level of the representations of Turkey, the research also uses the analysis to elucidate on the material effects of representing Turkey, for example in the ways borders are being represented and difference is being defined.

Altogether, the conclusion will contribute to an understanding of the ways in which the use of geopolitical representations of Turkey, used by the EU, can be characterized by its history of discursive use and post-colonial potential and the ways in which both turn out to be revealing for past and contemporary power relations.

2   Research Design

2.1   Research goal & research question

The research focuses on the geopolitical speech act as a whole, determining Turkey as a conspicuous state within the geopolitical globe and the ways through which metaphors define and materialize dependence, difference and inequality. The goal of this research is to get to the bottom of the different metaphors that are used concerning geopolitical Turkey, to ultimately reveal post-colonial materializing of metaphor use. This to 'reconstruct metaphors

construction of reality' (Hülsse, 2006: 404), by analyzing the ways in which the EU-Turkey ratios present and represent geopolitical Turkey. The extraction, form, influence and manifestations of the different metaphors will be critically deconstructed. Paradoxically, the (criticized) metaphors become a tool for fully understanding geopolitical Turkey and contribute to constituting the hypothesis of metaphors determining a post-colonial relation between Turkey and the EU. This leading to the following question:

> *To what extent does the constructed reality of metaphor influence the definition of difference on the physical and conceptual borders between Turkey and the EU, and how does metaphor determine the past- and contemporary EU-Turkey relations in a discursive and post-colonial way?*

The research question can be disassembled into different domains. The constructed reality of metaphor covers the area of theoretically unravelling the field of metaphor through the lens of critical geopolitics. Thereby, it defines metaphor in a legitimate manner and focuses on the geopolitical aspects of metaphor as a form of representation. To specify these generalities in the case of Turkey, the research seeks for the appearance of different metaphors in EU policy and their geographical implications. Using different kinds of sources deploying the representations. Lastly, this research focuses on how the conceptions of the Turkish borders, e.g. the definitions of difference- materialize the effects of the post-colonial narrative.

Metaphor constructing reality,
> How can cognitive and conceptual functioning of metaphor be distinguished from more lexical and linguistic forms of metaphor?
> How does critical geopolitics perceive language and metaphor?
> How does metaphor function within discourse?

(Discursive) Metaphor and Turkey,
> Which metaphors appear in EU policy regarding Turkey's geopolitical position?
> Do certain metaphors dominate the research data?
> How can the derived metaphors be characterized?
> Do certain actors dominate the discussions?
> Can trends in metaphor use be recognized?

Metaphor and post-colonial EU-Turkey relations

To what extent do the metaphors treat difference and borders in a digital or analog way?

To what extent do the metaphors place initiative to act with third parties or with Turkey?

How do metaphors imagine EU external borders?

How do metaphors materialize Turkish borders?

How do metaphors determine discussion around Turkey's role upon the EU?

Disassembling the research question into different parts doesn't mean that these parts are regarded separately. Combining the different facets of the research question will result in deriving conclusions out of research based on adequate theoretical underpinnings and convincing practical application.

2.2 Legitimizing

2.2.1 Assembling linguistic metaphor, critical geopolitics and postcolonialism

Linking literature on metaphor to critical geopolitics raises the question whether the metaphor as linguistic sign, takes on material consequences for Turkey. The research wants to centralize these material consequences first by shedding light on the ways in which EU policy spreads metaphor. The Huntingtonian taxonomy of differences and classifications invokes a certain speech act that, even when countered, becomes a part of reality and is translated into contemporary metaphor use, i.e. in a certain acceptation of the Huntington thesis (Kilinç, 2009). An ideological debate of Turkey, whether or not being permitted access to the EU, sought and seeks to define the EU, in terms of civilizations (Dahlman, 2004). Through analysis, practical implications of metaphor discourse on geopolitical Turkey are excavated and considered in comparative perspective. This is rendered legitimate because the metaphors applied to Turkey are regarded deeply geographical. It is geographical, because the presented images of Turkey are reduced to mere terms and labels. The way in which metaphor materializes geographical and geopolitical images is being displayed in, for example, the use of the contraposition 'Turkey being a bridge or breach between the East and West and/or between Islam and Christianity", by the CEPS 2005 (Centre for European Policy Studies). In this case the bridge embodies European Turks whom constitute relations and exchange between Turkey and the EU developing their identities into something post-national, cosmopolitan. The breach presumably –definition isn't unambiguous and despite of

categorizing groups under these labels, the concept is only mentioned once in the research paper- proposes the Euro-Turks that still have a strong affiliation with Turkey (Kaya & Kentel, 2005). Material differences are being drawn on the difference based on integration towards so-called 'European values', that imply some kind of social, political, economic and cultural standard. Civilizational differences are being captured and used under the underdeveloped labels 'bridge' and 'breach'. Material consequences also appear when the liminal position, that Turkey posits, is being called-upon by the US for 'being a key within the Middle East conflict and should act upon that role through a mediating role' (EurActiv, 2009e). Exceptional Turkey being a key is thus being translated towards mediating the Middle East conflict. The relevance of these examples is not located within the questions whether Turkey posits the qualities of mediating within the Middle East conflict or whether Euro-Turks can't be distinguished on their level of craving towards their home country, it is the discursiveness of the disputable exceptional role of Turkey that risks being applied for (illegitimate) goals and derives its use through being acted upon and upmost constructs a certain reality.

Seemingly trivial metaphor use within EU policy conceals, determines, structures and narrates the EU-Turkey borders and relationships, in a post-colonial way. Within policy the mobilization of simple geographical understandings are being exposed, and therefore analysis of metaphor use within EU policy can help to understand and derive the ways of social constructing post-colonial Turkey (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992: 191) (paragraph 2.2.4). EU-Turkey relations became 'subsumed' into Huntington's civilizational thesis resulting in the bolstering of arguments against Turkish membership (Dahlman, 2004). Analyzing metaphor-use within policy on EU-Turkey relations will create insight in the ways in which the EU materializes post-coloniality through the use of metaphors. The focus upon EU policy and policy debates could be rendered as comprised for locating postcolonial EU if not being aware of, for example, Ahmad (1997) claiming: "postcolonial theory is marked not by the specificity of its object, since its object is infinitely dispersed and indeterminable, but by its hermeneutic procedure, above all as style" (Ahmad, 1997: 367). The construction of a postcolonial Turkey-EU relation, takes place through the repeated narration of Turkish exceptionalism. Noxolo (2008) acknowledges that this function of metaphor highlighting the connections and relationships, determining research agendas, altering geographic knowledge and by constructing and depicting disciplines, serves as instrument of power. And besides this, Noxolo most importantly argues that the instrument of power to silence and marginalize the interest of the 'other', inherently becomes post-colonial. The metaphors, despite of the way

they are used, decide both what is geography and who does geography and thus construct and legitimatize power relations (Noxolo, 2008).

2.2.2 Research focus

The choice to tackle the role of metaphor concerning geopolitical Turkey and the focus out of a EU position is made because of intrinsic as well as more pragmatic reasons. Metaphors on geopolitical Turkey could rise out of notions on the geographical position of Turkey being in-between, buffering, being part of both Europe and the Middle East. This liminal position of 'torn' Turkey isn't exclusively been applied upon Turkey. The widely debated Huntingtonian civilizational thesis also described countries as Russia and Mexico to be important torn countries. Turkey distinguishes itself from these countries –as Huntington claims- because of it being the most obvious, prototypical and profound torn state (Huntington, 2011). Torn Turkey proves to have many different representations, but within the appearances consistently acts between Europe/the EU/the West and the Islam/Muslim world/the East. The research annotating on the EU-Turkey relations complies with the vivid discussions around the Turkish accession of the EU. The pursuit for Turkey to join the EU, created a certain comprehension of Turkey being dependent of EU judgements. Exactly this relation and the use of geopolitical representations needs to be deepened in the light of the relation of power inequality and dependence, especially in the light of the Huntington civilizational divides and the potential that these EU-Turkey relations had to boost contemporary inequality.

More pragmatic, a certain limit on this already broad notion of metaphor use upon geopolitical Turkey is requisite. Mainly Yanik (2009, 2011) conducted quite a body of research upon the posture of metaphor use in Turkish politics and is one of more scholars that emphasized research on the origins of different metaphors, but always out of a Turkish point of view. The choice than to focus on EU use of representations explicitly doesn't mean that this research falls in its own pitfall of discursiveness upon one-sided analyses on geopolitical diversity out of a EU perspective. Prominent Turkish actors will also be appointed but Turkish-EU ratios will have the main emphasis. Because of a possible lack on knowledge on specific geographical, political and geopolitical Turkey, collaboration was sought at the 'Institute for Turkish Studies (ITS). A three-month internship provides realising this research through benefiting from an environment of expertise upon specific Turkish matters and co-operating in the 'International Review of Turkish Studies' (IRTS). Concerning the time focus, it is being chosen to research EU policy and documentation upward the year of 2000. Because of the December 1999

happenings, where Turkey was being declared 'candidate state destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to other candidate States', a historic watershed in EU-Turkish relations had been reached (Dismorr, 2008: 52). Second of all the beginning of the twenty-first century was being marked by the 9/11 matters, reviving the Huntington thesis and the classification speech acts concerning Turkey (Dismorr, 2008), (Yanik, 2011), (Kilinç, 2009). All rendered to demarcate a period that is worth to put in perspective EU-Turkey relations.

2.2.3   Importance and feasibility

I reckon this research to be beneficial to the current understanding of the role of metaphor within critical geopolitics. Analysis of metaphor enables us to look behind the explicit utterance and reveal conceptual structures that speakers could be not aware of. The yielded knowledge helps to 'bridge' the studies of metaphor and critical geopolitics. Focussing on the specific role of metaphor can help further understanding the discursive ways in which language constructs discourse and, as this research will indicate, this is more than relevant for the case of geopolitical Turkey.   Choices on the case being broad and overarching are consciously made because that is exactly what discourse tries to construct being the 'superstructure of texts' and applying a specific stock of metaphor; becoming the 'superstructure of geopolitics'.

3   Theoretical Framework

The theoretical backbone of this study is formed by critical geopolitics, and through critical geopolitics a focus is brought upon metaphor and metaphor analysis. Literature on metaphor analysis displays developments, differences and (therefore) discussions within the fields of metaphor analysis and discourse analysis. The research field can be characterized by the differences between metaphor analysis in disciplines like linguistics, semiotics, hermeneutics and philosophy of language on one side, and metaphor analysis in politics, political geography and history on the other. These differences manifest themselves through both ontological as well as epistemological ways of knowing, understanding and using metaphor. Metaphor and metaphor analysis are introduced in this chapter and by using a more sophisticated view on metaphor analysis theory, the role of metaphor as geopolitical representation in the field of critical geopolitics are outlined and defined for this specific research. I reckon it to be important to illuminate the background of research regarding metaphor and metaphor analysis, to create more understanding of the origins of metaphor research. This also to further redefine the role of metaphor in relation to discourse and critical geopolitics, ultimately to create an ontological base where metaphor is presented a cognitive and discursive tool (which will function to get underneath the reasoning of the rulers and ruled) (Yanik, 2009). At last, post-colonial implications of metaphor use are mentioned by envisioning how EU policy can be regarded through a post-colonial lens. This chapter forms the legitimization of the research foundations and shows why research of metaphor in critical geopolitics is essential; answering the questions of what metaphor is, how metaphor manifests itself and how it creates its own post-colonial reality.

3.1   Metaphor analysis

3.1.1   Bamboo- and iron curtains

The (political) significance of metaphor can be traced back to the origins of speech(ing) and democracy. The whole of negotiated and distributed power made actors want to persuade each other and got skilled in this persuasion. Aristotle deracinated Plato's opposing of reason and emotion, and advocate for an acknowledgement that reasoned persuasion could be influenced by emotional response. Aristotle and the primeval of metaphor definitions, elucidates metaphor to be some kind of 'transfer'. Meanings are transferred in such a way that a certain

'thing' is given a name that belongs to something else (Charteris-Black, 2005: 6,21,31). This definition in terms of 'a movement' was called 'meta-phorein', which means: 'to carry over' and thereby stresses the act of transition (Carver & Pikalo, 2008a: 2). Within metaphor analysis this movement between terms is described as movement between the 'source'- and the 'target domain'. The common sense and literal meaning of a word or phrase is referred to as 'the source domain' (or vehicle), while the metaphoric sense differs from the common or basic sense and is known as the 'target domain' (or topic) (Lakoff, 1993). Regarding the metaphor of geopolitical Turkey being a bridge, this would mean that the common sense and known concept is 'the bridge' and transfers metaphorical sense to 'Turkey'. The shift in the use of a word or phrase is thus caused by a metaphor giving the word a new sense (Charteris-Black, 2005), creating an extremely important source of ambiguity wherein politicians can manoeuvre while speaking, thinking and making policy (Yanik, 2009).

Disputable in this transformation of meaning is the question 'where the truth is located'. Generally we understand the common sense of a word being located in a dictionary. Metaphor would lead away from the basic known definition of a certain word. Metaphor arises within our knowledge of how words and phrases are used and can only rise within a certain discourse, e.g. within knowledge on how words should be used. The Asian expression used for referring to the boundary between Communist China, and the non-Communists neighbours is 'the Bamboo Curtain'. The geopolitical boundary between communism and non-communism in Asia was comparable to the European or 'Western' equivalent, which is called the 'Iron Curtain' (separating Soviet Russia and their non-Communist neighbours to the West) (Charteris-Black, 2005: 31,34). Within that specific situation on the border of China the metaphor of Bamboo was more adaptable then referring to, for example, an Iron Curtain. To recognize the concept of the bridge -when used in context of Turkey- requires some knowledge of Turkey as a geographical state that posits an exceptional position. Also, some basic knowledge on the features, characteristics and functions of a bridge is requisite. Appreciating metaphor is therefore much more complicated than a literal understanding of a text. This because of the requirement of contextual information -something a literal understanding by definition doesn't need (Glucksberg, 2001). Because of all different associations with the source domain, metaphor can alter strongly. Divergence of individuals using metaphor, depending on their knowledge and experience with language, can cause waves of novel metaphors in an ocean of conventional metaphors (Charteris-Black, 2005: 32).

3.1.2   Cognitive and conceptual metaphor

Distinction within the whole of metaphor and metaphor analysis can be made between the classical- and the more cognitive and conceptual notions of figurative speech (Ponterotto, 2000). Classical concepts of metaphor stress how metaphor transforms meaning from literal to figurative, identified in samples of discourse. The classical conception of metaphor is mainly constituted out of classical rhetorical theory where –bluntly said- because of the mere rhetorical essence, metaphor as such is irrelevant for political analysis. To criticize this statement, Hülsse (2006) claims that metaphor often sheds new light upon the target domain (the domain that we try to understand e.g. Turkey being the bridge) thereby creating a new kind of reality (Hülsse, 2006). Thus implicitly stating that metaphor surpasses the possibilities that it would inhabit within classical rhetoric's, where it would function in a more pragmatic, lexical way (Cameron, 1999a). This more discursive interpretation of metaphor can be described as 'cognitive and conceptual', emphasizing the 'framing and guide thinking character' that metaphor possesses. Within the use and practice of metaphor and metaphor analysis this would mean that the classical-rhetoric notion points to the selective usage of metaphors as linguistic tools. The cognitive conception stresses metaphors as means i.e. end, to a better understanding of cognitive processes (Carver & Pikalo, 2008a).

To comprehend metaphor both within its original field of metaphor analysis as well as applying it within the study of critical geopolitics, this paragraph describes the conceptions of metaphor analysis in discourse. Often, different approaches on metaphor bespeak the role of metaphor with respect to discourse as –to speak in the words of Carver & Pikalo (2008)- 'inevitably insufficient', because they primarily concentrate on individualistic cognitive processes (Carver & Pikalo, 2008b: 126). It is not the case that metaphor and discourse influence each other from their independent and exclusive positions, rather metaphor is embedded in discourse. Discourses are known being the 'superstructure' of texts, structuring entire topic areas, creating order in social knowledge (Van Dijk, 1980; in Carver & Pikalo, 2008b: 127) and authorising specific metaphors. Hülsse (2006) states that regarding to separate discourses a particular stock of metaphors is commonly used when referring to its topic (Hülsse, 2006). Concerning metaphor and discourse, Gee (1999) claims: "Very often people are unaware of the full significance of these metaphors, which usually have come to be taken for granted. Sometimes these metaphors are connected to 'master models' in the sense that the tacit theories they imply, are used widely to organize a number of significant domains for a given culture or social group" (Gee, 1999: 84). Cameron (1999) agrees to that, noticing

that metaphoricity can only in practice be identified when studied in particular socio-cultural groups and discourse contexts (Cameron, 1999b).

3.1.3   Relativity of truth

Central to the understanding of metaphor concerning the geopolitical role of Turkey is the way in which metaphors determine what is real for us. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) -fathers of reconceptualising metaphor in a structuring and determining way- claim that "because of much of our social reality is understood in metaphorical terms, and since our conception of the physical world is partly metaphorical, metaphor plays a very significant role in determining what is real for us" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). This claim endorses the importance of analyzing and critically deconstructing the different representations concerning geopolitical Turkey. Metaphors project the meaning of a familiar issue on a less familiar and abstract one (Hülsse, 2006: 397), and by doing this we consider the meaning of the metaphor to be better suitable and we consciously try to alter truth. The new sense given to a word through metaphor can eventually change the meaning of a word.

Metaphor being a central part in the construction of reality already implies the relativity of truth. The truth is always relative to a conceptual system that is largely defined by metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). What is interpreted as 'scientific truth' is often a metaphorical representation; the simplifying representation becomes plain truth (Brown, 2003). Lakoff & Johnson's thesis on the role of truth reflects the essence of metaphor use and thereby the importance of this research. When truth is relative and metaphor fulfils a role in the construction of this truth, then possible discursiveness around metaphor use with regard to geopolitical Turkey needs to be argued. People, who get to impose their metaphors on culture, religion, states or whatsoever, get to define what we consider to be absolutely and objectively true (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). The metaphors projected on Turkey can be characterized by their way of categorizing and subdividing geopolitical order. Through accentuation of difference, Turkey is bordered in a way that even a metaphor that implies all kinds of possibilities for connecting and opening-up, such as the 'Turkey is a gate metaphor', creates a boundary. In this sense, the gate opens up the world towards differences. We perceive various things in the natural world as entities, often projecting boundaries and surfaces on them where no clear-cut boundaries or surfaces exist naturally. Hence, could it be that this metaphor of Turkey being a gate only makes sense in our categorized geopolitical world, but meanwhile lacks to properly acknowledge everyday realities? Since truth is based on understanding and

metaphor is a principle vehicle of understanding, metaphors on geopolitical Turkey construct an own truth (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

3.2   Critical geopolitics

Definitely not covering all of- but certainly indicative for critical geopolitics and for the philosophical underpinnings of this research, is the following citation of Derek Gregory (2004) quoted in Dalby (2008): "But in order to conduct ourselves properly, decently, we need to set ourselves against the unbridled arrogance that assumes that 'We' have the monopoly of Truth and that the world is necessarily ordered by –and around- 'Us'" (Dalby, 2008: 413). In this research, critical geopolitics is presented as study where power-, knowledge- and identity manifestations are recognized in geopolitical matters of representation. By pulling away from declarative and imperative geopolitics, it seeks to scrutinize conventional geopolitics and to create an image of metaphor envisioning geopolitical discourse, both on theory level as well as in everyday life practices.

3.2.1   Post-structuralism, post-modernism and feminism met a revived political geography

The original rejection of imperialism and domination that resonates in the quote of Gregory (2004) (as mentioned above) can be regarded as elementary to critical geopolitics. The movement of critical geopolitics developed throughout the late 1980s and 1990s into a study where geopolitical matters of representation and text required a more thorough understanding of the ambivalence of power, knowledge and identity. In an overarching philosophical disquisition, Dalby (2008) states that: "Critical geopolitics is what happened when post-structuralism, post-modernism and feminism (…) met a revived political geography in the late 1980s" (Dalby, 2008: 417, 418). The origins of this research lay in the encouragement of critical geopolitics to open up new ways of thinking in politics (of geography). The demise of the Soviet Union exploited a period where the prior binary power division (World power was battled between the US and the Soviet Union) collapsed and led to a situation where geopolitical divides became fluid and re-definable again (Dalby, 2010). The revived political geography persevered in the process of constructing spatial, political and cultural boundaries that it projected upon 'the threatening Other'. This, to exclude the Other and discipline the domestic political sphere (Dalby, 1990). The situation functioned as incentive for geopolitics to further deploy the narrative of being declarative and imperative (reiterating on 'how the world

is' and 'what we need to do with it'). Critical geopolitics originated as a reaction to this study of geopolitics, calling upon deconstructing, developing, unravelling and exposing discourses. This, in order to lay bare schemes of power operating beneath them, e.g. exposing manifestations of the excluding and disciplining political sphere (Muller, 2008). Thus, critical geopolitics is an approach "that seeks to problematize these epistemological assumptions and ontological commitments of conventional geopolitics" (Ó Tuathail, 2000: 166), combatant with the conventional panoptic form of power and knowledge that sought to analyse world power. Critical thinkers should become aware that we are al embedded in cultural ways of seeing and constructing the world (Ó Tuathail, 2000; 2006).

3.2.2 Comparing apples and oranges for the sake of metaphor

I want to emphasize some critical comments regarding critical geography, to become conscious of possible deficits and shortcomings in this field of research. I mention Dodds (2001) and Kelly (2006) for the criticism they express concerns the development of (critical) geopolitical discussions and can therefore help in gaining a better understanding of the dynamics in (critical) geopolitics. Geopolitician Klaus Dodds (2001) depicts appraisal both on the form and on the content within the study of critical geopolitics. Dodds claims (2001) that critical geopolitics refers "disappointing little towards methodology" and that there is "too little detailed ethnographic research on foreign policy communities" (Dodds, 2001: 473). Dodds accentuates the value of studies analyzing geographical boundaries that shape everyday life in borderlands -as conducted by scholars like Newman, Paasi and Sidaway. He summarizes his criticism by stating: "critical geopolitics needs to engage with these concerns over the role of practices in everyday life" (Dodds, 2001: 474). Political scientist Phil Kelly (2006) points to the deviances between geopolitics and critical geopolitics, suggesting that combining both is necessary for a more extensive study of geopolitics. Kelly argues the contrast between the two studies to be this clear that one approach would be nearly unrecognisable to the other. "Comparing both classical- and critical geopolitics would then be like comparing 'apples and oranges' when reasoning out of the modern and postmodern differences in-between both" (Kelly, 2006: 25,28). I do agree on the necessity of critical geopolitics to perform ethnographic fieldwork in everyday life and everyday expressions of power, as stated by Dodds (2001). But then again I do not agree with Dodds that critical geopolitics fundamentally lacks in performing this more practical research. The relatively young study of critical geopolitics did have a predominant focus on the primarily theoretically and overarching function of geopolitics. Still, it must not be forgotten that exactly the critique on geopolitics lay, next to its

practical implications, in the way geopolitical theory manifests itself on this meta-level. Moreover, the concerns of Dodds on the lack of research focussing on everyday life, undermines the importance of discourse- and power demonstrations on the overarching level. In this, I want to follow Kelly (2006) in emphasizing on combining different functions, both in geopolitics and critical geopolitics. Where Kelly quite easily disembarks the role of the differences between geopolitics and critical geopolitics I do want to underline the function of critical geopolitics being discerning towards manifestations of classical geopolitics (Ó Tuathail, 2000). Texts of geopolitical discourse are not free floating and innocent contributions to an objective knowledge but are rooted in power-knowledge (Hepple, 1992 in Bilgin, 2007). This research consciously focuses on the overarching level of metaphor constructing discourse and power relations. Simultaneously, it acknowledges the importance of manifestations of discourse and power relations in everyday life. Compliant with Kelly's (2006) statement: "I have come to realise that study of both the critical and the classical (or in my case 'critical through the classical'), although often at wide variance, is truly necessary for a more complete understanding of the broader field of geopolitics" (Kelly, 2006: 27,28).

3.2.3   Metaphor constructing geopolitical storylines

The elaboration on the study of critical geopolitics above, already hinted at the role of language and images within critical geopolitics. I want to further discuss the specific part of metaphor constructing the social geopolitical world: "how we understand and constitute our social world is through the socially structured use of language" (Franck & Weisband, 1971; Todorov, 1984 in Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992: 191). Metaphorical influence is compared with 'visioning', 'frame working' and 'picturing'; it transforms the opaqueness of world affairs into an apparently clear picture. Where in classical metaphor analysis the function that metaphor posits doesn't exceed the role of lexical and pragmatic rhetoric, in critical geopolitics metaphor embodies the geopolitical strive for reducing complexity of world politics to a simplified framework. "Spatial metaphors like heartlands, fault lines and axes are popular" (Ó Tuathail, 2006), as are the metaphors concerning geopolitical Turkey like: 'bridge', 'hinge', 'crossroads' etc. The question arises whether this simplifying of the geopolitical world could be referred to as inappropriate. Critical geopolitics refers to this geopolitical simplifying as geopoliticians being like gods who stand above the separate reality as detached observers who view the globe as if they were not on it (Ó Tuathail, 2006). I want to stress that geopolitics and those engaging in it, not only operate as gods who overview global processes but use geopolitical representation in a discursive way by influencing and constituting global processes. Ó Tuathail

locates this insight regarding the use of images, metaphors and storylines in speechwriting. A state's historical and geographical experiences are often used to produce the desirable effect: the construction of geopolitical storylines. Blood and treasure are still involved in military conflict and many wars are justified through language, which is structured in explicitly geographical terms (Ó Tuathail, 2006).

3.2.4   Critical geopolitics and discourse,

Part of the most fundamental background of critical geopolitics is the role of discourse structuring the geopolitical world. Ó Tuathail and Agnew describe discourse in terms of being 'sets of social-cultural resources' and 'sets of capabilities' both used to construct and give meaning (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992 in Muller, 2008: 325). The geographical metaphors cannot be said to be only rhetorical devices, because they are part of the broader discourse (Dalby, 2008). "Discourses limit what is possible to talk of and about. The agendas of research in political geography will in turn limit what it is we talk of and about" (Dalby, 1990: 185). The act of, excluding other ways of specifying geopolitical discourses, links to specific claims of speaking legitimately about the world. "Discourses create and then specify the relationship of the speaker to the object of knowledge (...) delegitimizing other forms of this relationship" (Dalby, 1990: 174). Regarding metaphor this can be seen as the incompatibility of different metaphors concerning geopolitical Turkey. The bridge relation seems to leave little space for Turkey being a buffer; the presence of different metaphors proves its own improbability.

The question whether people are being structured by discourse or the other way around remains disputable. Through the eyes of Muller (2008), critical geopolitics -that claims to be a poststructuralist approach- seems to be somewhat deterministic in leaving the individual controlled by structure (Muller, 2008: 326). When reading Agnew, Dalby and Ó Tuathail, I cannot agree on their view of being deterministic. The scholars explicitly and implicitly emphasize on discourse being acted upon: 'discourse is used to construct and give meaning' and 'through discourse, leaders act'. The dominant position of discourse in critical geopolitics has been criticized on its forms and utterances. I have to agree with Muller, that discussions around discourse can seem to become a 'catch-all term with vague notions of its conceptual underpinnings'. Muller claims critical geopolitics to under-theorize the theoretical breadth and depth of the discourse concept (Muller, 2008: 323). This does not mean that researching the function and form of discourse in this study needs to be marginalized. A better

understanding of -for example the exhibition of language in discourse- can be deepened, leading to increased attention to practices in everyday making of geography.

Ó Tuathail (2009) elaborates on the question whether discourse fulfils a function to practice and he thereby implicitly conforms to the vision of discourse as focusing too little on breadth and depth. Through discourse, geopolitical practice is made meaningful and gets justified: "it is through discourse that leaders act, through the mobilization of certain simple geographical understandings that foreign-policy actions are explained and through ready-made geographically-infused reasoning that wars are rendered meaningful" (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992: 191). Dalby (1990) seems to bypass this quite practical perspective on discourse by rightfully claiming that discourses overgrow systematic ways of speaking or knowing the world (Dalby, 1990: 174). For me, exactly this implicit difference expresses the positive ambivalence of the discourse concept. It both structures systematic practices in everyday-life, while not limiting itself by these systems. Critical geopolitics needs to be aware of the influence of social practice within discourse e.g., needs to transcend the structure/agency dualism and conceive the subject as dissolved into multiple subject positions (Muller, 2008). Hence, this research conforms to the proposal of Ó Tuathail (1989) to reconceptualise the conventional meaning of geopolitics by using the concept of discourse (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992: 192). More specifically by analyzing the role of metaphor as geopolitical representation.

3.3   Post-colonial EU

3.3.1   Material practices of post-colonial societies

Measuring the practical implications of cognitive- and conceptual metaphor in the case of Turkey, is conducted through focussing on the post-colonial character of the representations that are projected on Turkey. At first glance, the step this research takes to discuss geopolitical Turkey as being represented in a discursive way and also claiming these representations to have a post-colonial character, might appear abruptly. Instead, this choice exactly discloses the ways in which geopolitical representations exceed being the harmless textual tools and occupy a position of constructing a (postcolonial) reality. Despite all the different images projected on Turkey, the analysis will show a resembling conformity in the representations of Turkey as the perpetual extension of the 'East' and the image of Turkey being dependent on the benefits and costs for Western actors. The bridge between the EU and Turkey reveals not only to fulfil a

connecting function, but is consciously embedded for being, for example, a filtrating mechanism for migration streams, flowing from the 'East' to the 'West'.

Envisioning Turkey-EU relations in a postcolonial way, explicates the sometimes-odd dynamics of the ways that connection and rapprochement are interchanged with separation and the hardening of difference. Colonial relations are strongly grounded on binary differentiations as 'centre/margin, self/other, coloniser/colonised' and meanwhile contain a 'peculiar intimacy' of the coloniser and colonised (Ashcroft et al, 1995). This situation of ambiguity contains strong similarities with contemporary EU-Turkey relations, which also have this 'peculiar intimate' character. Understanding this EU-Turkey relation requires the deconstruction of the activities of the post-colonial society. Post-colonialism is understood as a process existing out of different linkages and articulations, not being an automatic- nor seamless- and unchanging process of resistance. The linkages and articulations involve a wide range of activities that are complicit to imperial enterprise and form the material practices of post-colonial societies (Ashcroft et al, 1995). Projected on colonial societies JanMohamed (1995) presents these activities as "the imperialist exploring and representing of a world at the boundaries of 'civilization' that has not been domesticated by (European) signification and ideology. The world is perceived uncontrollable, chaotic, unattainable and ultimately evil." (JanMohamed, 1995). Colonial power Europe retrieved its dominant and superior self-image through using the 'native' as a mirror for its own colonial position. Compelling the Other (native) to acknowledge him, deepened the dependence of the Other on his master and amounts the European's narcissistic self-recognition (JanMohamed, 1995). The Other functions as the margin (and without the margin there is no centre, no heart (Minh-Ha, 1995)), becoming an integral part of European civilization and culture (Said, 1995). The abruptness and maybe inappropriateness of comparing the European colonial imperial enterprise with the EU-Turkey rapprochements will outline the Eurocentric and dichotomizing apprehension of EU-Turkey relations. It presents an image of EU 'activities' that do share these post-colonial linkages and articulations.

3.3.2   Centralized Europe instigating and deterring the surrounding world

Edward Said is one of the main critics of the –in this research centralized- Huntingtonian thesis: 'The Clash of Civilizations'. Summarizing his concept of post-colonialism, Said quite grippingly states that: 'European knowledge is colonialism'. Central to this claim of post-

colonialism lies the colonialist motive to incorporate a profound Eurocentric and anthropocentric worldview. In this, non-European territories and the peoples that inhabit them were defined in terms of being 'unused', 'underused', 'primitive', 'less rational' and 'closer to children, animals and nature' (Huggan & Tiffin, 2007: 6). Despite not being a former colony, Turkey is not per definition excluded of colonial behaviour and colonial forces. Mainly, the colonial history of Europe and its defining of 'East' and 'West' creates this breeding ground for post-colonial relations and an insurmountable world division of Us and Them that, colony or not, determines power structures. In Tiffin's (1995) words, the project of post-colonial writing is to interrogate European discourse and discursive strategies, by which Europe imposed and maintained its codes in the colonial domination of much of the rest of the world (Tiffin, 1995). The Eurocentric taste of post-colonialism therefore retrieves relevance because of the Turkish case being possibly subordinate to EU domination. Post-colonial does not mean 'after colonialism' but rather starts with the very first moment of colonial contact. This ascribes a long history to post-colonial writing (Ashcroft et al, 1995) and through this research it will be proclaimed it still has 'a lively presence'. For example, through the parallelism between the Arab revolts (2010-) and the growing amount of representations that claim Turkey to function as a 'role model' and 'mediator' (paragraph 6.3). From a post-colonial perspective, the produce of these representations constructs a relapse of Turkey being the 'Other', i.e. authentic Muslim state. Opposite to democratic and Christian Europe as the focal point of civilization and as continuation of colonial Europe, Turkey fulfils a modelling role to other Muslim states. Brydon (1995) locates this Eurocentrism in the way the evolutionary path of development and the idea of a norm of subjectivity are established by the European Model and that political commitment must be expressed through the ninetieth century European model (Brydon, 1995). The patent of developments is located in European hands. Out of this fixed view, the role of Turkey being a bridge would be delimited to terms of the EU meddling and governing Muslim countries 'because they host terrorists and hardly any democracies'. These are relationships defined in terms of clashing civilizations. This straightforward image of the EU exercising power and thereby locating difference in religious and/or cultural grounds is endorsed and specified by Kuus (2004) who states that EU policy towards central Asia and Eastern Europe is shaped by an Orientalist discourse assuming a lack of 'Europeanness' in its accession partners (Kuus, 2004 in Dahlman, 2004). Similar processes as other countries nominated for EU accession are, in the case of Turkey, strengthened by the additional deeper cultural antipathies towards Muslims (Dahlman, 2004). The peculiar intimacy of centralized Europe both attracts and rejects the surrounding world, arising out of the fundamental dichotomized worldview that post-colonialism disseminates. "The Orient has helped to define

Europe as its contrasting image, idea, personality and experience" (Said, 1995: 87). The post-colonial project of dismantling the centre/margin dichotomy of imperial discourse, focuses on the significance of language and writing, i.e. the construction of experience and the use of subversive strategies (Ashcroft et al, 1995). In this research precisely these functions of language signify the continuation of digital and dependent relations between the EU and Turkey. Approaching the West as centre quite fluently entails the Rest to function as periphery (Sangari, 1995). Especially for Turkey the way EU confines this relation on what is rendered to be inside and outside, is very relevant with retrospect to the Turkey-EU accession. Lingering in the dichotomy of the Christian West and Muslim East simply makes it impossible for Turkey to become a EU member and, despite of any form of rapprochement, still fundamentally exudes (post)-colonialism.

3.3.3   Representations of exceptionality turn into a strategy of resistance

Turkey is not only projected as being a bridge, gate or whatsoever from a European perspective but also exploits these images itself. What does this mean for claiming a post-colonial relation and does the fact of being represented through metaphors in itself have a postcolonial character or is this invoked by the metaphors content? It would be too easy to label all EU policy regarding Turkey to be post-colonial per definition, i.e. overseeing divergence in policy on for example border issues and migrant subjects (Rigo, 2005). More telling in this case is to see which metaphors embrace potential post-colonial use. This to repatriate to the question of power and power inequality, in the sense of the neglect of disjunctive borderline temporalities of minority cultures that are not being valued on the 'same footing' but more out of a non-differential concept of cultural time (Bhabha, 1996). Turkey seems to take the position of minority culture in relation to the EU, not being 'valued on the same footing'. Does metaphor create or epitomizes a certain power relation between Turkey and the EU? And in extension to aforementioned metaphor characteristics, does cognitive and conceptual metaphor channel post-colonial relations and does metaphor thereby not only becomes discursive in use, but also discursive in content? Kramsch (2002) emphasizes on engaging in post-colonial debates and European state theory, "linking the imperial past with it's post-colonial present" (Kramsch, 2002: 174). EU cross-border practices are critically analysed for their stimulation of pan-European values and modes of administrative governmentality, characterizing it to be post-colonial. Unused land plots and primitive human beings are characterized in terms of an EU desire for cohesive, unified territory and in that way the EU manifests the incapacity of the

'native Other' (Kramsch, 2007: 1592, 1593). Because of the mentioned dispersed and indeterminable object, emphasis must lie on post-colonialism in its hermeneutic procedure and above all, style (Ahmad, 1997) –legitimizing this research focussing upon EU policy and documentation. Of importance is to state that the Turkey-EU relationship is not necessarily post-colonial in the way that the representations that are projected upon Turkey, are solely uttered out of an EU perspective. The country in the 'positive margin' has got the power and the ability to shape foreign relations with centre countries (Parker 2008 in Yanik, 2011). Parker claims Turkey to wear the badge of liminality or its 'in-between' status with honour, thereby Turkey reinforces the liminal status. Bhabha takes this to the level that this in-between status forms a certain strategy of the colonized to resist the colonizer (Bhabha 1996 in Yanik, 2011). Something Yanik already mentions; the fact that Turkey has never been colonized creates difficulties in understanding the want for exceptionality solely out of terms of resistance. The ways Turkey itself incorporates this position of exceptionality therefore needs to be understood out of these post-colonial power relations. "The representations of exceptionality turns into a strategy of resistance and paradoxically, a claim of superiority against 'West' as part of the quest to become part of the West" (Yanik, 2011: 83). Deconstructing the image of Turkey in-between two continents, occupying the 'positive marginal position' and having the power and ability to shape foreign relations, reveals the location of power within the representations. In doing so, it proves to create a superficial image of Turkey's exceptionalism, neglecting implicit dependence in the location of power. Turkish embracement of metaphors stressing Turkish exceptionalism, does not exclude EU post-colonial motives in metaphor use.

4 Methodology

Having had the opportunity to introduce the fields of metaphor, metaphor analysis, critical geopolitics and discourse, this chapter focuses on defining metaphor in a way that is suitable for research in critical geopolitics. Influenced by theory on metaphor analysis (paragraph 3.1) a methodology is created for analyzing metaphor with respect to its linguistic and rhetorical functioning. Meanwhile, the methodology makes the meaning of metaphor applicable to the study of critical geopolitics, post-colonialism and geopolitical Turkey. Ultimately, a frame is created in which geopolitical representations of Turkey can be analysed in order to identify its potential discursiveness and post-colonial consequences.

4.1 Defining metaphor

Without digging to deep into the theory on rhetoric's, I want to follow Charteris-Black (2005) by interpreting metaphor as component of rhetoric that can influence meaning and contribute to persuading (Charteris-Black, 2005: 288). The role of metaphor is seen as constructing a cognitive framework of social knowledge (Johnson, 2005). This is in accordance to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) who identify metaphor as ephemeral to a theory but also state it to be among our principle vehicles for understanding our physical, social and inner world (Lakoff & Johnson in Musolff, 2012: 2). In turn, not leading to the apprehension that metaphor loses its linguistic meaning: "we consider metaphors to be linguistic elements, harbouring important cognitive and emotional effects" (Carver & Pikalo, 2008b: 273). Metaphor rather serves as imagery for thought processes and functions as being creative and constitutive for political realities. Metaphors are understood as discursive strategies that contribute to modify discourse, not only by shaping reality but also helping it to gain authority. Further, I want to add the importance of the meaning and consequences these metaphors yield. Metaphors are extremely important sources of ambiguity and therefore useful to manoeuvre while thinking, speaking and making policies, deflecting responsibility as a result (Yanik, 2009). Empirical studies on metaphoric influence show that processing metaphorical meaning often takes no longer than processing literal meaning (Cameron, 1999). Yanik states that metaphors of vision are much more powerful than a mere geopolitical representation. To say country X to form a bridge is not simply the use of some vivid language by policy makers, but the combination of a discursive practice and a geopolitical representation. "Metaphors of vision are discursive

strategies that combine territorial, functional and ideational self-perception with a linguistic practice that furthers and deepens the 'exceptionalist lore' that a state needs to survive and thrive" (Yanik, 2009: 534). It must be understood that the use of metaphor is not necessarily false or discursive; metaphor can be a helpful tool for better understanding certain processes. It is the structure that metaphor both creates and where it is part of, that can become discursive and therefore misleading. Representations in EU policy and documentation can be used in a discursive way, becoming a tool for the conceptual practices. Exactly this function of metaphor is what urges the research to focus upon the Turkey-EU accession debates. What are geopolitical stories that are told as part of these debates and what is the geographical image of Turkey it conveys? How do the borders of Turkey function? I.e. how is geopolitical Turkey influenced and constituted through the use of representations? Where Kuus (2004) displayed how EU-policy towards Central and Eastern Europe was shaped by an Orientalist discourse, a similar process -only with a deeper cultural antipathy towards Muslims- can be rendered for the Turkish case (Dahlman, 2004: 560). This research tries to comply with the position of geopolitical metaphors to possibly transgress discursive language by becoming a tool for conceptual, directing, framing and guiding practices of postcoloniality. By jumping into the gap of knowledge of representations influencing geopolitics, the call to shift focus on the way the construction takes place, will be answered (Yanik, 2011: p. 82).

4.2   Analyzing metaphor

Umberto Eco already bluntly enunciated: "interpret metaphors from the point of view of someone who encounters the metaphor for the first time" (Umberto Eco (1995) in Hülsse, 2006: 404). For the sake of coherence in this research I want to follow Hüllse in structuring the analysis of metaphor, thereby being anticipatory of the criticism on 'critical geopolitics lacking methodological foundations' (Dodds 2001, Kelly 2006) (paragraph 3.2.2). Synergizing the theoretical underpinnings of metaphor analysis and critical geopolitics, led to the choice of combining both the more technical analysis of metaphor (Hülsse, 2006; Musolff's, 2012), with the appliance of critical geopolitics (Ó Tuathail & Agnew 1992; Yanik's (2009). Becoming interdisciplinary on the study of metaphor and critical geopolitics, contributes to creating a more complete image on the role of representations structuring geopolitical narratives. Also it prevents short sightedness on methodological choices. Material effects of metaphor-use will be contemplated by identifying the use of metaphor in EU-policy documents, debates driven by policy, political speeches and media coverage of EU-Turkey matters (paragraph 4.3). An

inventory of used metaphors consequently yields the metaphors that dominate discussions and the ways they are applied.

Using a 'two-dimensional model of identity' (figure i), the metaphors are distinguished by the different means in which they embody geopolitical Turkey in a post-colonial way. The model should be considered being a tool for comparing the different metaphors and their influence, not as a superficial way to quantify the influence and nature of the representations.

(*Figure i*. Two-dimensional model of identity, to (Hülsse, 2006))
Metaphors in the two-dimensional model of identity

		Mode of differentiation	
		Digital	Analog
Source of differentiation	Dependence		
	Equality		

Where Hülsse specified his model for analyzing metaphor to be post-modern, this research compares metaphors to the extent to which they can be regarded post-colonial. This in compliance with Hülsse; first of all by the way the metaphor creates either a binary- (digital) or analog division. The binary division can be labelled post-colonial because of the distance that is created between the Occident and the Orient. Difference is the central concept and it is solidified into two components, not being the West means being the Rest (McLeod, 2000). Digital: is thus a mode of differentiation that constructs the other in total contrast to the self, creating a clear-cut border between the self and the other. Obliviously, in this way it produces very exclusive identities. Contrasting, the analog mode presents differences to be more ambiguous and boundaries as frontiers. The frontier needs to be encountered being the 'in-between space' (Bhabha), in which difference is nuanced and gradual. Between the other and the self are large zones of transition. The analog mode of differentiation is populated by hybrids, which cannot be said to be either inside or outside (Hülsse, 2006: 399, 400). In addition to Hülsse, the second dimension focuses on whether the metaphor reasons from a situation where power is to be obtained or at least where power inequality is implied. For this research this means that representations of Turkey are analyzed in either the way the way they envision Turkish identity to be obtained by the EU (dependence), or in the way the EU-Turkey relations are based on mutual similarities (equality). This distinction is the product of post-colonial literature, where the solidified West and Rest are stated to be not only different, but, more important, are differentiated in equality. Differences are explained from an EU

perspective, while the solutions keep hanging on these differences as their starting point. The narrative of metaphor speaks in a somewhat colonial language, regarding the EU to be the 'Us' and Turkey to be the 'Other'. Often the Orient is described in negative terms or in terms that stress the West's superiority and strength. For example the West as seat of knowledge and learning, and the Orient as the place of ignorance and naiveté (McLeod, 2000). Representations of Turkey do not explicate the EU-Turkey relation in such an irrefutable way, but do seem to resound this narrative through the veil of language. Displaying the metaphors in their possible post-coloniality is enforced by this function of the model to compare the representations in their notions of dependence and their presented hardness of difference.

4.3   Research material

Researching metaphor in EU policy requires a sufficient conspectus of all different policy clusters, debates and discussions. Data will be gathered through the use of The European Media Network 'EurActiv' database. EurActiv presents itself as an independent network distributing EU news, policy (debates), interviews with institutional actors & civil society, reports on conferences, stakeholder positions and analyses from think tanks across Europe (EurActiv.com, 2012d). The goals EurActiv notes to pursue lay in distributing EU news and policy for the sake of broadening debates on EU-policy through displaying the decision making process, prior to Commission legislation. The EurActiv network functions therefore in-between NGO's, EU institutions, countries, regions and cities, industry and unions, professions and press.

Analyzing EurActiv data is of importance: because of the network being a quantity data source, it contributes to constructing an own EU narrative. Furthermore, the way EurActiv claims to fulfil a policy making function, it fully visualizes discursive metaphor use. Studying the EU narrative of EU-Turkey relations, deliberately needs to focus on the ways institutional EU constructs images of these relations. In contrast, composing an image of these relations through individual national newspapers of EU member states would result in an image of the EU position, but this image would change depending on local occurrences and cultures. EurActiv does raises awareness about the divergence in the positioning of member states when it comes to EU-Turkey relations but meanwhile keeps the focus on conceiving the narrative of the EU. The relevance of EurActiv data as an important source is foremost located in the quantity that is being provided, i.e. the ways in which this quantity of articles is

interconnected and therefore quite overtly composes an overarching image. This also brings up the way EurActiv is accessory to the construction of EU-Turkey contemporaries. Claiming to gather their data from 15 capitals and in 15 languages, the EurActiv platform seeks to overstep internal EU barriers of national media and fills-in an unique position of Union Broadcaster. Through this, EurActiv creates an EU identity first of all by taking up the position of overarching EU broadcaster and second by the way in which they broadcast the news and policy debates. Their objectives for actively contributing to EU legislative debates, becoming a source of reference for key EU decision-makers and becoming an important source of information for thousands of journalists enables EurActiv to function as influential network in distributing EU policy debates (EurActiv.com, 2012d). EurActiv institutionalizes the spreading of EU policy and therefore becomes a leading actor in the nascence and continuation of possible discursive metaphor (use). By this, it exceeds the role of spreading information and becomes a major node in the distribution of articles and links, in which discursive geopolitical representations are spread and a narrative of post-colonial ratios can be upheld.

5   Analyzing Representations of Geopolitical Turkey

In the last decade, Turkey has proven to pose a real problem for the EU to get a grip on. The substantial amount of different geographical and geopolitical representations, creates an image of geopolitical relations between Turkey and the EU, where attraction towards each other alternates with deflection. Turkey, or better: 'the images created of geopolitical Turkey', have been changing and developing to such an extent that the dominant 'bridging' metaphor has been altered to a situation where Greece builds a wall on the Turkish-Greece border. The projected possibilities for bridging civilizational differences developed towards blocking connections. Political events prove to directly influence speech use, I will plead the use of speech creates the simplification of reality on the border and the postcolonial relation between the EU and Turkey. The metaphors that are analysed are deeply geographical in form and in meaning. All metaphors create a situation of geographical positioning where Turkey is defined in a very visual way. The difference being embodied through the representations, influences the functioning of borders and constructs images of Turkey where it remains to be the numinous spindle depending on surrounding forces. Characterizing the influence of metaphor and the ways metaphors construct EU-Turkey relations, will expatiate discursiveness in metaphor use and will ultimately outline the postcolonial speech act in which Turkey is put away.

This chapter analyses the different dominating metaphors on their perception of- and influence on the EU-Turkey relations and then specifically on the postcoloniality of these relations. The metaphors that are analysed are both ordered on the image of Turkey they represent as well as on their dominance in presence in discussions on EU matters concerning Turkey. For the sake of structure, the analysis is first of all divided into paragraphs describing the different characters of the images projected on Turkey. Describing the 'character' of the representations is explicated in the degree to which they incorporate a certain 'power to act'. Broadly, the 'initiative' is located in- or outside Turkey, thereby covering the different representations on the base of their dominance within the whole discussion. For example, the gate metaphor is in first glance rendered to have less initiative to act than the mediator metaphor, for the gate is an object that needs to be worked upon while the mediator is more appreciated for its intrinsic capacities to respond on certain situations. The bridge metaphor will be analysed in a separate chapter because of its dominance in the discussions. This

structure should not be regarded intrinsically determinant and exclusively, differences between metaphors are being accounted for. Notwithstanding the dominance of certain geopolitical representations, the diversity of images exercised, requisites this emphasis on the variety of images.

5.1 Bridge

5.1.1 Not solely presented in a uniform way

The most dominant of metaphors used concerning geopolitical Turkey is the representation where Turkey is depicted as the bridge between the EU and the 'East'. This bridge metaphor originated in the aftermath of the Cold War and was actually was conceived in the first Gulf War. The bridge to the East would enable the projection of American power and interest upon the Middle East and beyond (Nocci, 2011: 23). What stands out in EU policy and documentation upon EU-Turkey relations is that the use of the bridge representation is not presented in a uniform way. This is encountered for: the terms of what sites the bridge connects, the way in which the bridge is said to be used, the focus on the transport of the bridge (bridging religion, energy, politics etc.) as well as the role Turkey posits being a positive or negative factor. Where the bridge metaphor strives for representing complexity in a single image, the practical use of the metaphor appears quite capricious. In this research metaphorical implications are outlined and order is created in the ways the bridge metaphor is applied. The most important function of a bridge is its possibility to connect. The separated points that are connected, are split by a certain obstacle, highlighting the boundary (van Houtum & Strüver, 2002). This obstacle is present but is also surmountable, or better: the obstacle can be bridged.

5.1.2 The function of connecting

The function of Turkey connecting two separated parts is mostly being explained in the way that the EU and Turkey should reach out to each other in order to create a connection between the 'West' and the 'East'. Despite the notion of exchange that a bridge implies, the narrative of the connection seems to be constructed in a one-way direction from Europe/EU in Eastward direction. Turkey-EU relations are described in terms of the need for an increase in 'understanding' and the 'levelling of mindsets' between often-undefined actors. Turkey being the bridge thus mediates between these two parties to achieve the better understanding. The

Founding Chairman of the European Policy Centre, Crosswick, for example states that: "Turkey's accession to the European Union will create a bridge of understanding between Western Europe and the Islamic world" (EurActiv, 2004a). An understanding between two parties implies some kind of two-sided exchange of information, nonetheless the documents exclusively focus on the 'East' needing to adapt to the 'West', the EU. None of the publications speaks in terms of rapprochement of Turkey towards Middle Eastern countries. The perception is focussed on Turkey taking place between Christian Europe and the Islamic Middle East. But as it appears, Turkey is regarded more 'Eastern' then 'Western', to such an extend that rapprochement towards the East is no longer necessary. In contrast, it needs to level with the Western EU. The often-heard comment of Turkey being to big and being to Muslim seems to cut wood through the way the bridge metaphor represents Turkey. This seemingly one-way bridge is mainly created in the context of the EU 'bringing democracy'. Turkey's role as democratic bridge to the Muslim world (EurActiv, 2007), (EurActiv, 2004b) has little to do with a bridge of sharing and exchanging but seems to aim at transferring. The connecting function of the bridge is generally considered out of possibilities. This cannot be taken as a surprise since the representation functions as a tool for proclaiming the necessity of a connection and thus calls for using the possibilities for dialogue and unification. The 2004 German Foreign Minister Fischer explicates this presumption, mentioning Turkey as engaging in a process of renewal and meeting European standards to be vital for the EU's common foreign and security policy. "If the modernization process in Turkey is successful, Turkey's much-cited function of a bridge towards the Central Asian states and the Middle East could become a reality" (EurActiv, 2004f). The connection than functions in a way that Turkey needs to meet a certain standard and in reward could obtain a position of becoming a bridge, apparently a desirable role. Striking is the enumeration made by Ismail Cem -the 2001 Turkish Foreign Minister-, where the difficult relationship between Turkey and the EU is interpreted as partly caused by the fact that Turkey is regarded as a bridge. This connection also embodies a reference to difference and has a negative tone, while this by other authors is treated solely in a for Turkey positive understanding.

Former director of The European Policy Centre S. Crossick strengthens the disputed meanings of the bridge image further, through posing the bridge to possibly be two-sided. He describes this in terms of Muslims invading Western society (EurActiv, 2004a). Crossick (2004) does not claim Turkish accession to the EU to result in an invasion of Muslims, but his article does substantiate the bridge metaphor being not as open up as might be presented. The only possible movement from East to West is concretized through pointing at possible unwanted

migration streams. Users of the bridge metaphor all seem to agree that a connection needs to be made between the East and the West and more specifically this needs to find place through Turkey. Underlying reasons for this connection remain vague and appear to be mainly political reasons imbued with religious features. Worth mentioning is that the possibilities for Turkey to fulfil the described connection is only temporarily tenable. Analyzing documentation reveals a turning point within discussions. Prior to the moment of decision whether Turkey should join EU accession talks or not, an increase in the use of the bridge metaphor is noticed. Upward 2009 the bridge metaphor is used in past tense. The question arises whether other scenarios then Turkey as a bridge should be put forward (EurActiv, 2009b) and whether the bridge can still be salvaged (EurActiv, 2010).

The bridge representation is used in different comprehensions of, on the one hand Turkey as a particle for achieving a goal and on the other hand as an uncontested state of being that is already comprised. This knowledge further buttresses the image of a geopolitical representation, which implies a solidness and firmness but is used in many different ways. The alternating use of metaphor is not limited to the discursiveness of combining different metaphors, but also proves to interpret a single representation in different ways. Profound comparison of metaphors shows that the interpretation of the bridge representation differs strongly, something possibly considered inconspicuous. Most applied is the bridge as an uncontested attribute that can be summoned and used: an available bridge ready to use for creating an Eastern European market (EurActiv, 2009b), spreading democracy (EurActiv, 2007), unifying the world (EurActiv, 2005c) and levelling religious disparity (EurActiv, 2001). Discordant are the images of a Turkey that needs to take steps towards becoming the bridge. This can be reached when Turkey becomes part of the EU and thus 'reaches a certain level of 'modernization'. "As a functioning democracy in a predominantly Muslim society, Turkey could inspire neighbouring countries and thus increase the prospect of democratic reforms being implemented there" (EurActiv, 2004f). Crossick (2004) entrances the accession also from the viewpoint that, EU membership would lead to a situation where it is only the question if Turkey will find itself in the position of a bridge. Remarkably, the bridge metaphor seems to derive an image of Turkey that determines politics but meanwhile turns out to be temporarily and interchangeable. This variation of rigidity and changeability of metaphor, endorses the applicability of Ó Tuathail's (2006) claim regarding metaphor to be 'visioning', 'frame working' and 'picturing', e.g. to transform the opaqueness of world affairs into an apparent clear picture and therefore to construct geopolitical storylines (3.2.3).

5.1.3   Two separated points

Where the different articles, speeches and interviews agree upon Turkey being or becoming a bridge, the way in which this bridge needs to connect, is much more disputed. Corresponding is the discursiveness around the exact place. The points that Turkey needs to connect are on one side: the West, EU, Europe and/or Christianity and on the other side: the East, Asia, the Middle East, the Caucasus and/or the Islam. In a conference on the 19th September 2001 regarding the investment in candidate countries, British politician Lord David Owen stated: "The EU has a unique opportunity to bridge the Christian-Muslim divide if Turkey becomes part of the Union" (EurActiv, 2001). The opposing positions of Christianity and Islam by Lord Owen, implies an possible unity within both religions, implies difference that needs to be bridged and brings up a supposed interchange ability of the terms EU and Christianity. Considering the date of the conference being only a week after the 9/11 happenings, certain sentiments towards Christian and Muslim divides may have been nourished. However, it must also be understood that each of these implications made, can be labelled arguable. Divergence of this order, under the surface of particular judgements, seems to be the rule rather than the exception and is also used by Turkish politicians. On March 25th the Turkish foreign minister Ismail Cem claims Turkey to be the bridge between Europe and the Islamic world (EurActiv, 2002). This statement is in itself not that striking but it signals a situation where geographical and religious classifications are compared with each other and with political and organisational classifications like the EU. Thereby it creates antagonisms instead of connections. In line with this erroneous use of categorisations grounded on religious differences, geographical regions and governance institutions are compared as equals and more ponderously, as united. This is manifested in the use of the geographical Middle East as denominator for the Islamic world represented in the confound use of geographical (Middle East) and institutional (EU) terminology, where religion appears to be the aspect that needs to be bridged (EurActiv, 2004f). Conflicting with this image are the ways in which the bridge metaphor is used to reclaim required connections between the East and the West and between Europe and Asia and thus not solely focuses on bridging Christians and Muslims. Again the metaphor is presented as a bridge to connect with the EU but now this privilege is rewarded to Central Asian states (EurActiv, 2004f). This range can be further broadened when there is not spoken in terms of Middle East or Asia but under wider categorisation of the East. Discussions on unity and dominance of religious or political aspects, than turn out to be entirely irrelevant.

5.1.4   Bridgeable obstacle

A religious-based lack of democratic development seems to be at the heart of the main separated points that need to be connected i.e. East vs. West, Islam vs. Christianity. The reasoning operates following the idea that, countries in which the Islamic religion is pre-dominant have a low level of democracy. Since Turkey is a pre-dominant Islamic country that is relatively close to the EU in both geographical distance and level of democracy, Turkey can bridge this discord. The emphasis on religion as most basic issue of difference could then logically lead towards the conclusion that the bridge should focus upon a certain understanding of another's religion or it should have a certain missionary-load. In contrast with this, the religious difference does not lead to this adapting or taking over religious values but is explained in terms of varying 'democratic values', civilizational differences, cultural clashes etc. Aforementioned one-way adaptations of 'the East' to 'the West' keep being mentioned.

The exception on the religion-based differences is noticeable when perusing the speech of former European Commission member Patten (2004), elaborating on Istanbul being the bridge between 'worlds' and therefore the EU should 'hold out a hand' to Turkey. The term 'worlds' used by Patten can be analysed as the geographical difference based on the world of the EU in opposition to some other world that is separate. Whether this other world concerns the Middle East, the larger East or something else, is left untreated. Besides this, Patten refers to different worlds not based on geography but based on cultures, in compliance with the Huntington thesis. Highlighting Turkey's exclusiveness lays bare where- and how difference is defined. Patten's speech 'Islam and the West at the Crossroads' literally claims to counter the looming fulfilment of Huntington's thesis of a clash of civilisations. He thereby precisely counteracts this effort by conserving the civilizational speech act of differences (Kilinç, 2009).

In many of the articles and speeches, the EU perspective is characterized in political and geographical terms where 'the EU, Europe and West' need to gap differences with 'Islam'. This gap between 'the West' and 'the East' is defined on a fundamental religious character whereupon practical political consequences are built. Democratic deficits of 'Eastern' countries are intertwined with these countries being Islamic. Where differences are defined by religion, solutions focus upon political measures. This relation turns out to be applied quite indisputably when in a 2007 survey, European Commission accredited journalists are asked whether they think that 'Turkey's role as democratic bridge to the Muslim world and its

strategic location' is among the major advantages of EU membership (EurActiv, 2007). In a very direct way democratic development and Islamic religion are presented as a dichotomy. Former United States ambassador Rockwell Schnabel confines the obstacle to be bridged, to lie in the Islamic religion. Schnabel implies all different kinds of things like 'an Islamic world, 'a Western world', unity, difference and a role for Turkey in-between this all. German Foreign Minister Fischer (2004) refers to this renewed emphasis on different civilisations, as a change of paradigms caused by the 9/11 happenings. Germany backs Turkey-EU accession because a bridging function answers to the challenges of a growing gap between the 'East' and 'West'. In contrast, Germany simultaneously commits itself to the religion-based definition of difference, stating that: "Turkey should modernize into being a functioning democracy in a predominantly Muslim country, this could inspire neighbouring countries and thus increase the prospect of democratic reforms being implemented there" (EurActiv, 2004f). Hereby, it complies with the paradigm of religious differences funding democratic deficits. The obstacle that needs to be bridged can comprise of democratic deficits, differing civilisations or a geographical chasm but time upon time leads back to religious differences. Surpassing the textual meaning of the different articles, the representation of Turkey being a bridge is strengthened by the way EurActiv complements many of the articles with an image of the bridge across the Bosphorus. The photo (figure ii) displays the bridge that crosses the Bosphorus connecting the European and Asian part of Istanbul. The picture is taken out of such an angle that in the front the Ortaköy Mosque is prominently shown. Thence, it envisions Turkey as a bridge and further centralizes the role of religion, in a very physical way. This image strongly complies with very literal understandings of Turkey as a bridge and leaves little space for interpreting this metaphor as 'just one of many representations' or as 'only a single facet of the Turkish identity'. Using the image for different articles on Turkey –also ones not addressing one word to Turkey being a bridge- links the articles to each other. Applying the photo of the bridge as marker or logo for Turkey, connects certain propositions and viewpoints to a larger narrative. The bridge in a very lively way connects Europe and Asia but the prominent position of the Ortaköy Mosque suggests the bridge to make a connection with Islam. Regardless of Europe having a dominant religion (which is left untreated), envisioning the bridging function of Turkey by the Asian presentation of the mosque, identifies religion as an important denominator. Furthermore, the image seems to take for granted the implicit consequences; the binary opposing of East and West. The intrinsic value of Turkey is diminished to being particle of a larger Muslim Asia. Asia, in its turn is defined by the Islamic religion and thus pops up the question whether non-Muslim Asian countries would belong to

this Asia. Thereby, the whole act of connecting seems to recuperate a very modernist worldview.

Figure ii. Reprinted from ['Bosphorus bridge and Ortaköy Mosque'] (n.d.). Copyright 2004-2013 by EurActiv. Retrieved from http://www.euractiv.com/enlargement/turkey-help-eus-soft-power-ambit-news-223250

5.2   Turkey as object of use

A substantive amount of geopolitical representations that involve Turkey, have in common that Turkey plays only a supporting role. This paragraph analyses Turkey presented from the viewpoint that the initiative appears not to lie in the reach of Turkey. Instead, Turkey is represented as an object, useless without acted upon. This concerns the metaphors of Turkey as a gate(way), key, hub, litmus test, buffer, shield and sick men. The distinction made on the basis of where the initiative is located emphasizes the dependence of the utensil on the user. It does not mean that Turkey is not important. The representations will further be differentiated on their notion of having a positive or negative connotation and on their dominance within EU policy documentation.

5.2.1   Gate, key and hub

5.2.1.1   Inconsistency in the presentation of metaphor

Similar to the bridge metaphor, the gate, key and hub have a connecting function through Turkey, meanwhile highlighting differences and expressing or creating boundaries. Where the bridge and hub primarily maintain this connecting function, the gate and key more explicitly embody the possibility to exclude and to lock up. The character of difference is upgraded to a possible notion of blocking and permitting the effects of the border (van Houtum & Strüver, 2002). The defining of 'Us and Them' within the gate, key and hub metaphors, is ambiguous. Whether the representations describe energy issues, economical gains or spreading of democratic values, the bordered parties differ again and again. Besides the fact that the variation in treated subjects logically asks for multiplicity of actors, the simplifying form of the geopolitical representations often proves to be discursive. The gate opening up towards the 'East', 'the Caucasus', 'Central Asia' and the entire 'Middle East' or merely 'the Middle East', advocates the inconsistency of the representations causing disarray instead of order.

5.2.1.2   Shifting initiatives depending on modes of exchange

Where the gate, key and hub metaphor represent an object that derives its purpose from being used, the interpretation of the Turkish role still differs. In terms of connecting, Turkey seems to fulfil a role of dependence on the EU in the hub image. Interesting is the way in which Turkey itself lobbies to this function. In the 2006 Turkey-EU-week, Turkish industries sought to charm EU delegates with economical arguments for Turkish accession to the EU. Ömer Sabanci, President of Turkish Industrialists and Business Association (TÜSIAD), consciously steered on proclaiming Turkey to function as a great economic hub for Europe (EurActiv, 2006b). Comparable claims were made by professor Pflüger, from the European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS), who focuses on the role of Turkey to function as energy hub for Europe (EurActiv, 2011a). The way in which the hub metaphor is applied can be labelled more practical and specific in comparison to the bridge metaphor, to which is referred in several themes and on several levels. EurActiv's reports on Turkey as a hub focus mainly on the specifics of energy politics e.g. strategies around the Nabucco pipeline and the position of Turkey relating to gas (EurActiv, 2009c). The role of Turkey in the hub and gate metaphor is comparable in the ways that both representations have an economic accentuation and highlight the position of Germany. Turkey as a gate or gateway addresses the function of Turkey to enlarge Europe's hinterlands and to appoint the already strong economic bonds between Turkey and Germany. German foreign minister Fischer in the Turkish Policy Quarterly (2006) contends the importance of Turkish accession to the EU. Germany's motives

lie in the Turkish strategic security position and in Turkey being an important economic partner for Germany. Besides this large domestic market, Turkey joining the EU could open up a gateway towards countries in the Caucasus, Central Asia and the entire Middle East region (EurActiv, 2004f). Economically seen, the obstacle to overcome does not seem to have any conflicting religious, linguistic, i.e. cultural characteristics. The gateway opens up a large hinterland where differences are transmuted into economical possibilities. Fischer remains a bit vague on the role Turkey needs to fulfil next to being recipient of German goods. Mentioning Turkey as the most significant business partner at least implies the gateway to lead to growing interests of Turkey in the EU, notwithstanding the need for the Turkish economy to reform (EurActiv, 2004f). The influence of Germany within this discussion is also put forward in the 2005 claims of Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi. Persuading German conservatives (CDU) to back Turkey's EU bid, Berlusconi claimed that Turkey on the border of Europe functions as a gate to the east and thereby notifies the economic possibilities to be amassed (EurActiv, 2005b). Michael Geary (2012) creates a deviating understanding of Turkeys global gate position and spreads the scope to Turkey as a diplomatic and cultural gateway to the Middle East. This gate then functions in a larger whole of the EU, promoting its democratic values beyond its borders (EurActiv, 2012c). The economic gate towards the east imagined an eastern world somewhat undifferentiated, open and attainable. Cultural and diplomatic connections appear to focus primarily on the Middle East and disregard the Caucasus and Central Asia. The gate metaphor already creates an image of a certain site –on the border of Europe- and a certain actor having control –the EU. The representation regards the connections made, to be depending on the object of transport. Economic exchange imagines a more open gate than the transport of democratic values being envisioned in a one-way connection.

The key representation seems to create more space for Turkey becoming an actor, without depending on outside initiatives. The key is by definition indispensible and that is exactly the way in which the representation proposes itself, it being mainly disseminated through Turks. Turkish foreign minister Davutoğlu (2009) concretizes this posture on the strategic security position Turkey posits. Without Turkey's initiative and internal power, the EU would remain having little leverage in a number of conflicts where Turkey plays the role of 'honest broker' (EurActiv, 2009d). Turkish Germany ambassador Acet also speaks of this image of Turkey occupying a key position in conflict areas and extends this position appointing that there are many interests in the area of Turkey with regard to geopolitics, migration and energy (EurActiv, 2010a). Out of Turkish interests the apprehension of Turkey taking some kind of

irreplaceable position seems to be of more importance than struggling against predominant notions of cultural and civilizational differences. It can be imagined that instead of focussing on which civilization or culture it belongs to -thereby becoming a passive object of use-, Turkey emphasizes on inoculating Turkish identity on the EU and their indispensableness regardless of being used. Reinforcing Turkey's key role in conflict mediation, president Obama -in his 2009 visit to Ankara- highlights the strong relation between Turkey and the US: "Turkey is also seen by Washington as a key player in the Middle East conflict" (EurActiv, 2009a). This strategic notion of Turkey being a key is also brought up at the 2008 Vienna forum on 'World disorder and the role of Europe'. The desire of Princeton dean Slaughter and –again- German foreign minister Fischer for Turkey to join the EU, leads them to expressing their emphasis on the regional importance of geopolitical Turkey. "Turkey is key to the region. If it is not us, Russia and Iran are waiting with open arms" (EurActiv, 2008a). The accentuation of the other important actors in this case, pushes initiative towards Turkey. The image of Turkey choosing the open arms of Iran and/or Russia creates a situation in which Turkey is valued because of its geopolitical position. More important, it exchanges the image of Turkey as passive and acted upon for a notion of intrinsic and independent legitimacy. Although described as a utensil, the focus of initiative lying with Turkey calls for more than simply embarking on Turkey.

5.2.1.3   Potential for blocking and filtering

Focussing on the mutual differences lays bare important implications the representations individually betoken. Next to the important function of the gate and the key to open-up and to connect, the gate and key have the possibility to close of, shut down and block. The precise location of the gate, key and hub remains indistinct. The representations reason from the knowledge that Turkey as a whole functions as a key player, and to a lesser extent concretize this position on a specific site. Exceptions can be found in the hub metaphor, which directly focuses on the Turkish gas supplies and the Nabucco pipeline. Berlusconi (2005) in his speech, positions the gate at the east, on the Turkish borders. Difference is concretized on the borders of Europe and there the gateway could function in various shapes. Important feature of the gate representations seems to be that on the border of the EU, connection can be called on when convenient or, more drastically, the gatekeeper is in charge to open and close the gate when needed. Conspicuous in the case of Turkey being a gate is the question whether it also possesses the function of being the gatekeeper. Central in this is the discussion of Turkey-EU accession. Turkey already functions as an economic gate towards the Caucasus, Central Asia en

the Middle East but needs to be opened up towards the EU (EurActiv, 2004f), (EurActiv, 2005b). The EU as a gatekeeper then decides about opening or closing the gate. Contrary to the bridge –when built fully operational for exchanging- the gate often has a role of selection. The EU deciding on what can- and cannot cross the border, leaves little to Turkey's individual ownership. Locating the gate on the border (EurActiv, 2005b) could be sensitive to this selective opening of Turkey-EU relations and does fit in the deterring posture of the EU towards Turkey. Representing Turkey as a gate then turns to a way of disguising opening, instead of maintaining the possibilities to monitor traffic. This proactive role of the EU in opening up Turkey is substantiated in the comments of Geary (2012), who notifies that a custom union would provide the gateway to the Middle East (EurActiv, 2012c). Using the gate metaphor could be appealing because of the possibilities for the EU to keep closing down connections with Turkey. The gate can be operated upon when convenient and can be closed when considered necessary.

Turkey to a larger extent holds control over its position in terms of being a key. First of all, the key metaphor seems to have less to do with Turkey being a key, but more with Turkey holding a key position. I reckon it to be important to stretch this linguistic difference because of its practical implications. In the first case the key is the object, in the second case the representation lies emphasis on the position of the key as something to be acted upon. Returning to geopolitical Turkey, this means that Turkey has not got the key to –for example- the solution to the conflict between Israel and Palestine (EurActiv, 2009a), but does take up an important position through their relations with both parties. This difference in detail, leads to a situation where the key metaphor is not an object to be used, but more as inevitably present and therefore of importance to be incorporated. This role emerges in both the report of the Turkish diplomat (2009) indicating Turkey to be a key regional player in a number of conflicts, as well as in the report by the Turkish ambassador (2010) stating Turkey will always play a key role in geopolitical, migration and energy matters. Furthermore, this is mentioned in the same way in the statements on the 2008 Vienna forum. Capabilities of blocking and closing down directions running through Turkey are potentially located in Turkey, despite of influential third parties. The strategic position of Turkey concerning energy reveals different images of where the power is located. The energy hub of mainly gas lines running through Turkey, could endorse the centralized power of having neighbouring countries in dependence of Turkey. Although the strategic position cannot be denied, the conclusion would then be to simplified and transitory of influential actors like the Russian gas monopoly Gazprom. Indeed, Gazprom has great influence on Turkish energy (EurActiv, 2009c). The hub and key representations

affirm the image of the influential force field that strongly affects Turkey but meanwhile promotes the image of Turkey having internal value, instead of total dependence.

5.2.2 Metaphors characterized by their negative connotation

The majority of the metaphors used to position Turkey operate from a situation where it has a positive connotation. Apart from the underlying structures of dependence and position at the margins of Europe, Turkey is presented as valuable to Europe and the EU. The narrative of the images focuses on the possibilities of connections. This paragraph depicts representations of Turkey that lack this positive connotation. They represent Turkey either in a way of conserving the difference between the West and the East or by describing Turkey to be a burden to the EU. Without becoming repetitive we must be strict in recognizing the representations to be upholding the dissent of Europe/EU on the one side and the 'rest' i.e. the East on the other side. The representations analysed in this paragraph all view Turkey from a point where initiative and power to act is located outside Turkey. However, these metaphors can be distinguished in their ways of doing that.

5.2.2.1 Turkey the buffer and shield

Sharing an elemental view on Turkey and Turkish-EU accession in terms of problems, the representations of Turkey being a buffer and a shield can be regarded more determinate. They replicate an image that is uniform and strict in defining and locating differences. The buffer and shield are quite clear in their way of expressing that Turkey functions as a protective body of the EU. In the book of former EU single-market commissioner Bolkestein and in the statements of EU enlargement commissioner Füle on Turkey being a buffer, an image of Turkey is created in which Turkey is indispensable for the EU to block a third party. Füle assured Turkey -on a 2010 joint news conference with Turkish ministers in Istanbul- that the European Union was committed to Turkey becoming a full member. Turkish members reacted with suspicion. According to them, "membership would mean the EU losing a buffer between itself and the Middle East" (EurActiv, 2010f). As early as 2004, Bolkestein claimed that Turkey should be excluded from the EU for this precise (EurActiv, 2004a). In terms of connection, the buffer seems to be a little more permeable than the shield but it nevertheless focuses primarily on blocking of. This image functions as a tool for protecting the EU from the Other, which Bolkestein identifies as Syria, Iran and Iraq (EurActiv, 2004a). The focus here thus lies at danger

of unstable, dictatorial and/or Islamic regimes with whom Turkey nourishes contacts. The images of an unstable outside party requisite Turkey to fulfil the role of protecting the EU. The shield metaphor also anticipates on this force field, claiming "Turkey to be a strong shield against waves of instability, which could come from these unstable regions" (EurActiv, 2004b). It thereby aims at the strategic security and energy position Turkey holds. These buffer and shield representations display the discursiveness around metaphor, trying to simplify the world through digestible images. Where both representations frame the importance of Turkey protecting the EU from outer dangers, the solution of them turns out to be completely contrary. The shield that protects from the waves of instability needs to be achieved through EU accession, "making it much easier to defend Europe", says Turkey's EU ambassador Demiralp (EurActiv, 2004b). The shield and buffer function as comparable blocking and filtering mechanisms, but the buffer craves to keep Turkey out of the EU, while the shield opts for the need for Turkey to become EU member.

The -in some cases-, opposing outcome of buffer and shield in relation to EU enlargement, may be traceable on the external borders of the EU. Control of the border in the buffer representation, is maintained by keeping Turkey outside the EU. A perception of the border is created where it does not only function on the perimeters of the EU, but is extended to the whole of Turkey buffering outside forces. Meanwhile, the buffer functions as somehow permeable. In contrast, the shield -and thus Turkey joining the EU- would mean the EU external borders lie on the external borders of Turkey. From this position, border control over separating the 'unstable regions' and Turkey, can hypothetically be hardened and will lie in EU hands. Apart from this emanation of contradictions, questions arise about the value of Turkey when there is nothing to buffer or shield. Turkish value is thus based on EU worth and consolidates the image that, having a certain intrinsic relevance does not necessarily leads to an increase of independence.

5.2.2.2   Turkey the sick men and litmus test

Less direct and uniform ways of representing Turkey can be found in the metaphors of Turkey as 'sick man' and 'litmus test'. Claiming a direct role of dependence between the EU and Turkey, the metaphor of Turkey: 'the sick man', has a conspicuous history. This circumscription of being a sick mean leads back to the Ottoman Empire and its deterrence. Losing its territory and lacking the European standards of education, industry and army

strength -within an imperial world-, created the image of 'inferior Turkey', strongly dependent on –mainly European- surrounding forces (figure iii and iv). Figures iii and iv, originate from the time of the first and second Balkan war, where the Ottoman Empire suffered substantial losses. Both images present the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire: Abdul Hamid II, in the struggle of the Empire's geopolitical positioning. Figure ii displays the Sultan reading a prospectus on the division of the Ottoman Empire in order of European powers. Figure iii images the Shah of Iran encouraging the Sultan to step into the 1908 'second constitutional era'. Without digging to deep in these historical happenings, both figures clearly present an image of 'weak Turkey' depending on the decisions made by leading European countries (figure iii) and Persia (nowadays' Iran) (figure iv). Returning to the position of the sick man; this was assigned to Turkey at the end of the nineteenth- and beginning of the twentieth century and replaces Turkey in a position of lacking initiative. Thereby it openly discusses Turkey and overtly neglects the revolutionary changes Turkey ran through in the twentieth century. Again using the image of Turkey the sick man, the Islamic Turk in the middle of surrounding forces, puts Turkey away as doomed and rudderless.

Figure iii. Sultan. "Make me into a Limited Company? H'm-Ah-S'pose they'll allow me to join the board after Allotment!" Reprinted from 'Turkey Limited' (1896). Copyright by the Project Gutenberg License. Retrieved from http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30678/30678-h/30678-h.htm

Figure iv. Shah of Persia. "Go in, Abdul-just for the look of the thing. You can always come out if you don't like it." Sick Man of Europe. "Yes, I know. But one gets so wet!". Reprinted from 'The Salt Water Cure' (1908). Copyright by the Project Gutenberg License. Retrieved from http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30678/30678-h/30678-h.htm

Concerning contemporary Turkey, the position of Turkey as a sick man refers to some kind of authentic Turkey that is not able to live up to the standards of being an EU member. Turkey fails to achieve a certain level of basic human rights and freedom of thoughts and persists in suppressing minorities, according to Turkish political commentator and writer Ali Birand (EurActiv, 2002f). Turkey is imagined as having continued troubles in positioning itself in relation to its neighbours. The state of the Turk is one of reconfiguring their deteriorating position. Following the sick man as presented in the figures, Turkey is once more forced to deliver itself from European forces. Nowadays, the Turk is not reading a prospectus on the reorganisation of the Ottoman Empire or stepping into the wet constitutional waters, but reconfigures and reforms in order to reach EU accession. Despite the negative connotation of Turkey being the sick men, both Colakoglu (The chairman of the Executive Committee of Istanbul's bid for the title of Cultural Capital of Europe in 2010) and Sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein remark that Turkey is still focussed on Europe, which is rendered something

positive. "Even at the worst times of the Ottoman Empire, it was called the sick man of Europe, not the sick man of Asia or something else", said Wallerstein in the Turkish Zaman newspaper (EurActiv, 2004e). Two different discussions can be distinguished here. First is the question whether Turkey is a 'sick man' or not. Second, where is Turkey aimed at, in this description of a 'sick man'? Translating this to geopolitical Turkey the claim is made that geographically, Turkey can be seen as European and therefore it legitimately can lay a claim on EU membership. The way in which representations are used and deployed to construct a story is evident. Regardless of the connotation of being the sick man, the representation is used to substantiate that Turkey and the EU are in need for each other. The assertion that Turkey has left the position of the sick man through their young, rapidly growing population creating a very strong economy, emphasized the need for the EU to take on the bonds with Turkey (EurActiv, 2010e). The impregnated divergence concerning representations on geopolitical Turkey becomes visible. Under the label of the 'sick man', different perceptions and positions are represented, seemingly implicating only one similarity: the dependence of Turkey. This, in sharp contrast to statements of the German Foreign Minister Fischer positioning 'conflict solving and economically potent Turkey' in equality to the West. Thereby, Turkey is finally taken seriously as a partner and is no longer viewed as a Western client state (EurActiv, 2010e).

The dynamics of EU membership accommodate most of the use of Turkey being a 'litmus test'. Again, little conformity on which party- and in what role this party would be a litmus test can be found in the use of this representation. The focus of the image is on Turkey functioning as a test to measure the strength of the Turkish accession-bid or to measure the strength of the EU accession politics in general. It follows a notion of depicting the Turkish weaknesses. More practical, the case on which the accentuation than lies, is the Turkey-Cyprus conflict in which a resolution will be a litmus test for Turkey-EU relations (EurActiv, 2002b). Also, the question whether Turkey is seriously committed to freedom of expression and reforms forms a litmus test (EurActiv, 2005d). Turkish Foreign Minister Cem and Reiterating Enlargement Commissioner Olli Rehn express their feelings of discontent concerning contemporary Turkey missing the connection with the EU. They qualify practical situations as 'being the last chance for Turkey', rather than speaking in terms of possibilities. Research director of the Center for European Reform, Grabbe puts forward an exception on the emphasis of Turkish deficiencies. Claiming Turkey to be a litmus test for the EU, she contemplates on EU enlargements and puts EU credibility on the line by stating that Turkey's accession to the EU is essential for a stable EU (region) (EurActiv, 2002a). In general, the sick man and litmus test compose an image that lacks a strict notion of difference. The appliance of a larger context of Turkey being a litmus

test or sick men proves to be simply useless because of this lack of similarities within these representations. A unified characterization of Turkey being a litmus test, is therefore impossible to create in a justifiable way.

5.3   Turkey incorporating initiative

Previous chapter highlighted the representations of Turkey in which it functioned through, towards or upon other parties. This chapter focuses on the metaphors that at first sight reclaim more initiative and focus at an intrinsic value of- and independent Turkey. Fraying the ways in which these metaphors present themselves and maybe more important, the ways in which they are represented, enlarges the knowledge on metaphor and the Turkish case. The metaphors that are analysed are first of all, Turkey as a crossroad, pillar and pivot. Consequently a paragraph is ascribed to Turkey as a role model and mediator and a second to Turkey as a regional power, major player. The distinction made between the paragraphs is based on the divergence in empowerment the representations embody. First are analysed the metaphors that still contain a notion of needing to be used (crossroads being an object). Second, the images that represent Turkey from its unreserved qualities (regional power) are discussed.

5.3.1   Turkey the crossroad and pivot

Different representations enhance different views on Turkey and alter in the way they comprise the world. As became apparent in the buffer metaphor, the same image cannot be rendered uniform in imagining geopolitical Turkey or at least cannot be rendered the same in their appliance on situations. Where both the 2004 'countries at the crossroads' report of Freedom House and the 2008 interview with the president of the Istanbul Chamber of Commerce Murat Yalçintas entitle Turkey in terms of crossroads, they depict this image in a deviating way. The differences can be understood through the perspective of Turkey being a crossroad or standing on crossroads. Presumably because of his position, Yalçintas first focuses on the energy i.e. the strategic economical-possibilities of Turkey's geopolitical position. The road for transporting goods from the East to the West, leads through Turkey and thus creates a position where Turkey is a crossroad of transit (EurActiv, 2008b). Initiative and dependence can both be designated in this representation. Turkey will always be the large country on the Anatolian plate, being the most direct connection between countries on the Arabic peninsula

and Eastern Europe and therefore will always have this innate value. On the other hand, the earlier made comment on the value of being an important transport crossroad does still depend on the ones transporting. This position of connecting different parts of the world for transportation, in the vision of Yalçintas, is not limited to the economical content. Yalçintas claims Turkey to be also located on the crossroads of different cultures, having European and Asian characteristics (EurActiv, 2008b). In this representation of a crossroad, the most dominant function is to exchange. In a more global sense, the crossroad entails a connecting position, of Turkey in-between different worlds –as the torn state in-between the civilizations. By this, it pertains to the more common notion of the crossroads, as the need for Turkey to make choices in what direction to head for. The 2004 report on countries at the crossroads remarks on this specific need for making choices and in line with these choices, making reforms. Through constitutional changes the power of the (Islamic) state needs to be bounded, progressing to a state of freedom and democracy (EurActiv, 2004f). This article locates coherence between the more Islamic character that develops in Turkey and the lagging constitutional reforms. Difference is seldom directly pronounced but can be found by reading in-between sentences. The crossroad here manifests itself in being Turkey's bipolar choice of, on the hand progressing to the EU and on the other hand turning towards a more Islamic state that would rule out reforms.

As the point of rotation, the pivot is in comparison to the hitherto described representations; at first glance the metaphor where power is most clearly located in Turkey itself. The articles claiming Turkey to be a pivot do not limit themselves to a single topic but describe Turkey pivoting the Cyprus conflict (EurActiv, 2002g), gas supplies (EurActiv, 2012b) as well as the whole of Turkeys strategic position (EurActiv, 2002e). The pivotal role seems to be pointed towards noting Turkey to have a regional importance, rather than being specific on in what way this position would be pivotal. With regard to the supply of gas, Turkey possesses a position in which Europe would be less dependent of Russia for their gas supplies, when Turkey would maintain there position of transiting Iranian gas. Pivot Turkey than constitutes out of being an important factor within this energy discussion but leaves Turkey in the middle of European and Iranian energy politics. Thereby not differing so much from other metaphors describing Turkish exceptionality in relationship to the West and the East. The 2002 CEPS article on Turkey-Cyprus relations, presents Turkey as pivotal but also immediately takes away this aloofness on the centralized position of power. Notifying the importance of the EU to act upon the Turkish-Cyprus situation through 'anchoring Turkey on the path of political and economic reform' (EurActiv, 2002g) appears somewhat contradicting. Mentioning the

'nonsensical rhetoric of the clash of civilizations' and meanwhile posting the need for Turkey to be an example for the 'troubled neighbourhood, locates difference on the Turkish borders and reinforces (civilizational) differences. The 'anchoring' of pivotal Turkey on the need for progressing EU reforms, actually extracts the initiative from Turkey and lays the initiative with the EU as the central point, with Turkey rotating around it. Once again the supposed connections highlight differences and dissimilarities. Discussions concerning economic and energy issues are up fronted through- and permeated with cultural differences that consequently are mainly justified through religious differences.

5.3.2   Turkey the role model and mediator

Throughout the last decade Turkey is repeatedly represented as a role model. However, a boost in the use of this representation can be distinguished in 2002 and after February 2011 and seems to be sparked by respectively the 9/11 happenings and the Arab uprisings. As further will be mentioned, civilizational speech acts were reinforced because of the 9/11 happenings. Strikingly, the acute efforts of dismantling tensions between 'the Western world' and 'the Islamic world' led to the endorsement of differences, grouped under the civilization label. The conjecture of the synchrony between the political happenings and the dominance of metaphor is mounted through the articles. It directly underpins the need for a role model in times of volatility. Turkey needs to fulfil the position of a role model for the Muslim world, 'elevated upon the pillars of a functioning democracy, a prosperous market economy and secularism' (EurActiv, 2002d). Something comparable is said in the EurActiv article on Turkey-US relations (after the Turkish prime minister Ecevit visiting Washington in January 2002). It claims Turkey to -once again- be a model country for the Muslim world because of its democratic and secular regime. A similar movement and speech act can be recognized in the stir aroused by the Arab uprisings, where Turkey is seen as the democratic model that Islamic countries ought to follow, as different speakers proclaimed on a conference in Istanbul (EurActiv, 2011b). Furthermore, UK Deputy Prime Minister Clegg, emphasises this modelling role for Turkey as the living proof that democracy and Islam are not incompatible (EurActiv, 2011c). The instability of both periods leads to several assumptions on Turkey as a stable role model, the supposed Islamic world in need to change with Turkey as their as a model, democracy and secularism being the main means to reach the goal of stability and so forth. Through these assumptions resonates the continued projecting of difference from civilizational terms, it

locates stability and the patent on development in 'Western' proprietary, not withstanding the generalizations made.

5.3.2.1 Turkey the secular Muslim country

Several articles focus on Turkey as the predominant Muslim country that obtained a certain level of democracy. Turkey the role model is the 'Muslim country with a non religious state', a model for Arab countries that seek change. It is also the living proof that democracy and Islam are not incompatible (EurActiv, 2011c), (EurActiv, 2012a). The role model representation embodies a certain underlying characteristic. In the case of the bifurcation of the Muslim world, Turkey and the Western world –the Muslim countries need to adapt to something, for which Turkey is presented as a model. The 'something' is described as democracy, secularism and the market economy and originated in EU and US domains. Difference is created between the democratic developed 'West' and the Islamic 'East' and in-between Turkey is located, a situation showing great resemblances with Huntington's Clash of Civilizations. Present actors within the discussions around Turkey as a role model highlight this engineered bipolarity of religion and secular democracy. Both the EU and the US are in the different articles seen as the unified democratic and secular block, opposed to the Muslim world. The separation of both the East and the West shows divergence in defining difference. Committing to the grouping of a democratic world on the one hand and a Muslim world on the other, preserves a disrupted image of a unified Muslim community that is unstable throughout (regarding the unrest in several Arabic countries) and that seeks (or should seek) reconciliation (needs to dissociate from 9/11 happenings). Shaking the foundations of humanity appears to relapse relationships to a fundamental dissimilarity of religion, which can be softened but will never be overcome. Being the role model entails that Turkey is seen as presumably European in behaviour and organisation of institutions but that it still originated in the Muslim world. Possibilities to transform a Muslim country and let it adapt to EU norms, thereby diminishing the civilization borders, is thus possible. However, it retains in the act of reconciliation of fundamental religious differences and makes them determinant. The border of difference in terms of religion lies between the EU and the Muslim world and Turkey is a central component in this as a country with a Muslim majority. Additionally, the articles emphasising on Turkey as a role model imply the border to lie between Turkey and the Muslim world and thus base the definition of the border on a certain standard of democratization. EU-membership seems to be the last step for Turkey to make the switch of civilization. Or does Turkey need more profound

changes when difference is based on religion, because Turkey will always be rendered the Muslim country?

5.3.2.2 Locating the initiative to act

Predominant and proactive actor in the articles concerning the role model is Turkey. Notable is that the parties that need to undertake action or that are directed towards action, are primarily the 'other' Muslim countries. The position of role model then contains the simple being and maintaining of the current position, which severely differs from representations focussing on Turkey to reform and to progress their level of democracy. The initiative, the power in a sense, lies more in the hands of Turkey in the way that they do not have to reach a certain goal or level but are valued for their intrinsic being. Turkish character is arisen out of centuries of Turkish historical development and is therefore not to be compared with recent developments in some Arab countries (EurActiv, 2011d). In this sense, Turkish character is something obtained by Turkey and through Turkey alone. Focussing on this indigenous value, why Turkey is being a role model is because of their similarity towards 'Western' norms of democracy. And why Turkey is being centralized in these articles is because of the need for the Muslim world to reform towards more 'Western' norms. Turkey again acts in the role of gaining value trough 'third parties'. This could be a reason why former German ambassador of Turkey, states that Turkey must be vary careful to call herself a model country (EurActiv, 2012a), because it does little right to Turkish history. Regarding future developments of the role model position and the practical implications of for example Turkey-EU membership, British 2011 prime minster Clegg explicates the importance of Turkey committing to the 'path to EU membership' (EurActiv, 2011c). Combining the importance of intrinsic geopolitical Turkey and besides commemorating on the path that Turkey needs to follow for damping the gap with the EU, symbolizes the recurrent relation of disparity in all different forms and ways.

Here, I want to introduce the mediator representation. This role also in a strong sense comprehends this value based on dependence, while still differentiating on the basis of religion. More than the role model Turkey, the mediator representations moves Turkey away from the passive role, into a position that its active efforts are needed, in most cases concerning conflicts. Turkey can function as a mediator between the EU and the Muslim world (EurActiv, 2006a), between Iran and Britain, China, France, Germany, Russia and the United States (EurActiv, 2010g), between the EU and Russia (EurActiv, 2008b) and in conflicts

concerning Israel and Syria (EurActiv, 2011e). Similar to Turkey being a role model, Turkey is - on the bases of its connections to the EU and its Muslim character- seen and called upon as lubricant in all different kinds of conflicts and relations. On a theoretical level, this role as a mediator illuminates the Turkish dependence on surrounding processes to be purposeful. Different articles nonetheless put forward an image of Turkey deriving privilege and uniqueness from the role of being a mediator, a role they actively obtained and is not allocated. Moreover, concerning the Turkey-Israel relations, doubts on Turkeys rhetoric hurting its unique role as mediator (EurActiv, 2011e) are expressed and locate initiative in Turkish domains. The 2008 interview with president of the Istanbul Chamber of Commerce expands the meaning of being a mediator to Turkish influence on different issues, simply for the sake of emphasising Turkish uniqueness. Yalçintas (2008) uses the terminology of the mediator to comment on the importance of Turkey in regard to conflicts in Israel and Syria. Simultaneously he presents Turkey as an economical gateway standing on cultural crossroads and comments on it being 'a must' for a stable world (EurActiv, 2008b). Here, the use of the metaphors simply notifies the whole of Turkey as unique, not emphatically creating an image of dependence but locating versatility. Uniqueness that is presented on a local level, is shown in Turkey noticing Asian countries wanting to invest in Europe and therefore locate their headquarters in Turkey, so they can use Turkish labour and meanwhile have the possibilities to enter the European markets more easily (EurActiv, 2008b). Turkish initiative applied to join the European Union and meanwhile cultivated its eastern neighbours to consolidate its position as a link between Europe and the Middle East and Central Asia (EurActiv, 2010g).

5.3.3 Turkey the regional power and major player

Arranging the analysis of metaphors by the way the different metaphors can be positioned in the field of power, brings us lastly to the 'regional power and 'major player' representations. Where the mediator and role model metaphors implied the need for an additional actor to act upon Turkey, they also embodied a notion of intrinsic importance of Turkey. The regional power and major player extend this level and, at fist sight, locate initiative in Turkish hands and make surrounding powers face- and focus on Turkey. The regional power metaphor most dominantly emerges in the late 2000s and early 2010s and seems to embody a shift in power balances. It thereby presents some kind of new situation in which Turkey leaves behind its functioning in dependence of others. The adjusted representations appear to be fanned by a sentiment of the West losing her grip on Turkey. Political changes in form of the emergence of

the AKP (Justice and Development Party) cause fundamental changes in Turkish foreign policy, "new Turkey wants to be- and is, acting as a regional power with a global agenda" (EurActiv, 2010c). The vision of the party and thereby the policy of the country is no longer one of Turkey as a country fully integrated- and instinctively aligned with the West (EurActiv, 2010c). The AK party, known for its focus on Islam and therefore fundamentally altering the Turkish foreign policy (EurActiv, 2010c), supposedly induced this trend and thus cooperates itself in locating difference on a religious basis. The thread of religion influencing the ways in which the representations encounter and determine themselves in subdividing civilizations, can also be assigned to its influence in the posture of Turkey moving towards the East. Turkey the regional power with her Islamic characteristics functions as an inspiration to her neighbours (EurActiv, 2012a). In these conceptions Turkey moderately alters to previous representations of the role model and mediator. The strong tendency and movement towards the East seems to epitomize why Turkey has developed into being assigned regional power. The different articles delineate a situation where Turkey advances to (Middle) Eastern countries by contributing to solving conflicts and through being an inspiration because of its stable democracy and successful economy. Becoming a regional power, seems not to coincide with the West and the EU and is even stretched to the notion that this movement away from the West inherently means that Turkey seeks rapprochement towards the East; the Muslim East. This posture of the EU is grounded on the surmise that Turkey will always belong to-, and fall back on their Eastern neighbours and religious equals. 'In-between Turkey', retains a telescopic view from its minarets, to the Muslim East (figure v) and is therefore thought not appropriate to become EU-member. The way the figure (that was published in the Economist) presents a situation where Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan focuses on the East whilst turning his back to the horizon with the contours of known European buildings and monuments on the background, again exposes the dual nature of Turkey-EU debates. The watchman in de tower clearly needs to make a choice whether to focus on the West or the East and by making this choice he automatically loses sight of the other wind directions. Where in-between Turkey could finely function focussed on the EU and connecting with the East, a reversed posture is presented as problematic and undesirable. Opening up towards the East is presented as a backlash. Placed in the context of the additional Economist article, the image mainly focuses on growing Turkish economic interests in the 'Middle East' and North Africa and the way Turkey meanwhile tries to still fill-in the 'bridge function' between the EU and her Eastern neighbours. The sharp edge that the image seems to conceive of Turkey turning its back to the EU is only mentioned in the way of Turkey becoming to close with Gaza and/or Iran. The

Eastward focus in economic terms, once again, opens up Turkey as a borderland. Point of friction is located in the connection to Iran.

Explicated by the chairman of the Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies, Sinam Ülgen, articulates the becoming of a regional power as 'the end of a Turkey and West partnership' (EurActiv, 2010c). Even without officially labelled as an EU member state, Turkey is part of the Western civilization, or at least at moments there can be referred to as such. Turkey as a regional power is noted and conceived of as a loss for the West. Turkey cannot be 'governed' any more. The supposed movement towards the East, highlights this demise of the Turkey-West partnership and thereby lingers on the civilizational discourse determined by religion. In what way would the partnership between Turkey and the West deter, knowing Turkey has never been a member of the EU and only develops in becoming a stronger trade partner? Is not the advantage of the West-Turkey partnership mainly based on Turkish dependence? The strong interconnectedness of Turkey with the West and, more specifically the EU, is certainly not only prompted out of EU initiatives. Turkish foreign minister Davutoğlu claims that although Turkey is an important regional player, it should access the EU for contributing to the continuation of the EU on the international stage (EurActiv, 2009d). Despite the fact that this exception of the regional power representation does not necessarily means that Turkey turns its back to the West, interpretation of non-Turkish actors do agree upon this deteriorating relationship with the West. Possible victim of this 'new' Turkey as a regional power is Israel that worries about the future relationship with Turkey. Shlomo Ben-Ami, former Israeli foreign minister and vice-president of the Toledo International Centre for Peace, raised attention to the changing power structures indicated by the 2010 deadly fiasco around the Turkey-led 'peace flotilla' to Gaza. For Ben-Ami these happenings revealed underlying reasons for Turkey's shift away from the West towards becoming a major player in the Middle East (EurActiv, 2010d). Again, Turkey is not ascertained to be a regional power and major player, scheduling its own future, but instead is rendered to move away from the West towards becoming more eastern. Different inferences can be traced in this reasoning. First, Turkey until then is seen as fully integrated- and aligned with the West. Second, becoming a regional power does not coincide with progressing towards the West (EU) and could even mean the end of a Turkey-West partnership. Third, Turkey is seen as a fully-fledged party -i.e. the comments seem to indicate a new geopolitical position with extensive consequences. The different actors discussing the role of Turkey as a regional power once again appear diffused in locating the uniqueness of the movement towards interdependency. In these discussions they often remain at the level of establishing this regional power by virtue of others. A 2012

interview with German ambassador of Turkey, Wolf-Ruthart Born, locates the essence of Turkey as a regional power in the movement away from the West and dismantles the need for a binary opposition. The ambassador interprets the policy movement away from the West as natural development after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union. Development into a regional power did not solely originate in religion, he states, but is also credited to "Turkey's geographic-strategic position, neighbourhood, history, culture, religion, internal economical- and political development under the AK Party and Prime Minister Erdoğan, as well as political and economic interests and ambitions in a globalised world" (EurActiv, 2012a). Born hereby expresses a wider vision on developments concerning geopolitical Turkey and stays away from hasty and immediate reflexes to civilizational divides.

Figure v. Reprinted from 'Looking East and South (2009). Copyright by 'the Economist'. Retrieved from: http://www.economist.com/node/14753776

6 The discursive postcolonial notions of EU-Turkey relations; dominant actors and periods

The analysis in chapter 5 mainly focussed on describing the different categories of metaphors based on their characteristics, forms of representation and the different consequences this has for geopolitical Turkey. This chapter focuses upon recovering the central narratives within the different representations, determining in what way the different metaphors construct postcolonial Turkey-EU relations and how this affects the Turkish case. Based on theoretical underpinnings, the deconstructed metaphors will be ordered in their specifics of how they represent Turkey, the periods and trends the representations affect/are affected by and the way they incorporate a postcolonial tone.

6.1 Metaphors presented in a conscious way

6.1.1 Shifting ratios in a post-Cold War world

The ways in which Turkey is represented in a more positive or negative posture, can be discussed. When for example looking at the representations of Cold War USSR, a contextual narrative was assembled in which the Soviet foreign policy and Communism recurrently were described in a negative way as a Red flood. This image coincides with different terms linked to fluid boundaries and the possibility of the forward bursting power to bring death to all that are covered by it (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992). Tuathail and Agnew are concerned that this imaging of the Soviet threat as a flood, constitutes a geography of containment that legitimizes firm and vigilant containment along the Soviet border. With regard to Turkey, the 'threat' being displayed most of all focuses upon the Islamic Middle East and the Islamic identity of Turkey. The images of Turkey as a tool contain this direct negative connotation but in a much more concealed way. The key, gate and hub representation embody opening up as well as closing down in quite an adverse way, revealing Turkey in terms of potential and dangers. At the foot of the metaphors having a more positive or negative connotation, unmistakably lays the hardening of difference, whether this is highlighted in terms of possibilities or impossibilities. The shown ambivalence of the representations, in the view of Yanik, can be traced to the disappearance of the Soviet 'enemy' of Europe and the West. This situation of repositioning, led to the questioning of Turkey's role in various 'Western' institutions, i.e. Turkey's place in 'Western' identity (Yanik, 2011). The new Turkic republic had to redefine its role towards

Europe and the West, while the West had to justify and explain policy to the Turkic states. Appertain to the representations being more positive or negative, the focal point must be related to the authentic identity of Turkey that needs to be blocked and the newly found road towards the EU that needs to be tread. The representations that are directly negative, the sick men and litmus test, embrace this authentic position by referring to the situation in the breaking down of the Ottoman Empire. The litmus test specifies these authentic Turkish values in the acknowledgement that changes and reforms need to take place, towards more European notions. Representing Turkey in more positive terms of opening-up and embracing enhances the possibilities concerning energy politics, conflict solving and economical potential. This is in contrast with the blocking and highlighting of difference, mainly focussing on the 'third party beyond'. The repellence of Turkey appears to be located in its shared identity with other states that are predominantly Islamic and wherefrom the EU needs to be shielded and buffered. Aligned with this image are the everlasting notions of Turkeys' Muslim population leading to the apprehension that Turkey is more part of Asia and Africa than of Europe, German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt (Dunér and Deverell, 1997 in Dahlman, 2004) states. So are the statements that claim Europe to be a civilizational project in which Turkey had no part to play (Drozdiak, 1997 in Dahlman, 2004).

6.1.2   Diversity and inconsistency

Important implicit fallacy that is cultivated centres on the homogeneity and uniformity of geopolitical Turkey and the Turkish identity. Discussing geopolitics in terms of states and comparing these states, creates the pitfall of merging the different actors into defined, demarcated and delineated entities. The same point can be made with respect to the overarching level of civilizations. It thereby leads back to the gaps in civilizational theory with Huntington ignoring the multi-layered politics and multi-ethnic tensions, e.g. the complexity of Turkish civilization and politics (Dahlman, 2004: 562). Despite the fact that Turkish politics explicitly distance themselves from the thesis of the clash of civilizations, claiming to see the EU not as Christian club or cultural group, both in Europe and Turkey the geopolitical narratives homogenize internal differences and position themselves based on religious and cultural difference, in opposition to each other. "There remains in Europe, as in Turkey, a cultural politics of accession, partly informed by the 1990s discourse but also resonating from the effects of migration" (Dahlman, 2004: 562). Apart from the mutual differences of the representations, by no exception the metaphors treat Turkey homogeneously. Whether the

representation is valued negative or positive, it sure has a deficient and restrictive effect on Turkey's complex regional power. Next to the content of the ways in which Turkey fabricates a homogenous Turkey, the different metaphors are highly inconsistent in the ways they elaborate this uniformity. The bridge representation as the most common one, disperses a highly differentiating image of Turkey in the way it connects, the places it connects, its appliance and so forth. The uniformity of represented Turkey can only be located in the civilizational divides the images conceive, being indistinct about the functioning of the Turkish bridge.

Apart from the context being more positive or negative and aberrant in presented form and demarcation, the position of Turkey towards the EU is also displayed in an either more active or in more passive manner. Something reckoned distinctive for power relations. Chief foreign policy advisor Ahmed Davutoğlu (2001, 2004) articulated the need to embrace Turkey's potentiality as 'central state'. Bilgin (2007) denominates this as ironical, since the call that Western schemes plotted against Turkey, actually led Turkey to appeal to the authority of 'Western' geo-politicians (Mackinder's heartland theory) (Bilgin, 2007). I rather presume the irony to lie in the myth that metaphors ascribing a central function or role to Turkey inherently incorporate and mingle this function with the location of power. Davutoğlu - endeavouring to locate power in the centre of Turkey- for example applied, next to the representation of Turkey being a central state, the key metaphor and describes Turkey as an 'honest broker'. The act of representations centralising attention to Turkey must not be confused with actively controlling and influencing local and regional initiative. Even the regional power, major player and intrinsic power representations retrieved their regional power by virtue of others and by moving towards the EU. Davutoğlu claims this role of the regional player to should instigate the EU accession, meanwhile deterring the 'centralness' of the Turkey as a central state. The way the representations initiate the need for Turkey to take steps to achieve a certain level, differs between representations but also in the appliance of a single representation. As commented on in paragraph (5.1.2), the bridge metaphor is both presented in a way that Turkey needs to achieve becoming a bridge and in a way that already contains this position. An occasion in which Turkey ostensibly posits the initiative to act is when the 2008 Vienna forum discusses the key role of Turkey to be of importance to keep, because otherwise Turkey will fall in the arms of Russia and Iran (EurActiv, 2008a). Comparable is the pivot metaphor, locating the point of rotation in Turkey itself. It however strongly depends on third parties in its elaboration, as for example Turkey pivoting in the Cyprus conflict, calls for the EU to act. The active role of Turkey delimits to the presence of essential

characteristics, but from the vision of the EU needs to be aroused and stimulated to keep under control. Turkish initiative is therefore delimited to dependence on third parties.

6.2 Dominant actors

The ways Turkey is represented through metaphors is not limited to political rhetoric but also finds its way in policy think tanks trying to tackle the Turkish-EU accession case in an appealing and manageable way. This can be recognized first in the way Director Founding Chairman of the European Policy Centre, Crosswick, emphasizes on Turkey as a bridge of understanding. Furthermore in the way the Centre for European Policy Studies discusses the Turkish-Cyprus relations where Turkey occupies a pivoting role. Third, in the way the European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS) refers to Turkey as an energy hub. A more lobbying position seems to be taken up by the Turkish Industrialists and Business Association (TÜSIAD), calling upon the Turkish economic hub position. In reference to the political actors deploying the different metaphors to describe Turkey, the think tanks could be rendered analyzing and describing the geopolitical region footloose of EU interests. Although probably not for intentions of sketching the dependence of Turkey –claiming the aim of the Turkey monitor to 'present objective and in-depth evaluations of developments in the relations between Turkey and the European Union, and Turkish policies undertaken with a view to EU membership'-, the CEPS Turkey in Europe Monitor presents working papers titled 'Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead' that do delimit and depict geopolitical Turkey.

The fact that the geopolitical representations are not only projected on Turkey by EU politicians can be concluded from the number of Turkish actors raising- and elaborating on the metaphors. Most dominant in the distribution of representations concerning geopolitical Turkey are Turkish (will be further explicated in paragraph 6.3.2), European and US politicians. The fabrication of Turkish exceptionality is enhanced by political dignitaries in Europe, Turkey and the US and works in both negative and positive ways. Lord David Owen for example claims in 2001 that Turkey has the opportunity to bridge Christian-Muslim divides, Turkish foreign minister Ismael Cem emphasizes on the bridge between Europe and the Islam, and EU commissioner Frits Bolkestein states Turkey to be the protective body of the EU. Out of all these political actors I want to focus upon the remarkable role of Germany and the US because of their dominance. The importance of Turkish-German relations is put forward in the way German politicians comment on Turkey using many different

representations, seemingly from a uniform intention. Former German foreign minister Joschka Fischer mentions Turkey to be a bridge towards Central Asia and the Middle East (2004), an economic gateway (2006) and a key to the region (2008). The dominance of Germany seems to be mostly defined by the intertwined economic bond of the countries. "Further opening Turkey's large domestic market can only lead to a larger hinterland all the way towards the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Middle Eastern region", says Fischer (EurActiv, 2004f). The differentiation in appliance of representations seems to depend on the category that is discussed. From a German perspective, the bridge and gate metaphor are used around the opening up of Turkey for both economical exchange as well as the modernization of standards and thus focuses upon the role of accession. The key representation -that could be rendered as having more similarities with the gate than the bridge- is mentioned concerning Turkey's role in the Middle Eastern conflict. Proceeding to the 2012 German ambassador of Turkey, the regional power representation gained influence and locates this regional power in the movement away from the West. Considering moving away from the West means becoming a regional power, what would the consequence be of bridging between Turkey and the EU - derogation of the regional power? The personal role of Fischer can be marked as peculiar, taken in consideration his role as advisor of the Nabucco pipeline project (Gas transportation route through Turkey), appointed by the German energy sector. This shows that the lines between political influence and business profits can be very thin. The framing of language is used to represent Turkey in a strategic discursive way. The so-called Western block is mostly defined as consisting of the EU and US: the democratic and modernized world opposing the (Middle) East. The US, despite the lack of direct geographical attachment to Turkey, posits a dominant position in the different articles on geopolitical Turkey. Having a limited interest in economical bonds with Turkey, the comments from US actors focus mainly on Turkey being an ally in a contentious area in which the US has several stakes. Possibly therefore, and because of the religious disparities that dominated the after 9/11 debates, the US mainly refers to Turkey as a bridge of democracy- (EurActiv, 2007) and as a model country for the Muslim world (EurActiv, 2002d). Obama calls upon Turkey's key role in the Middle East conflict (EurActiv, 2009a). It thereby enhances this research' assumptions, that the interference with- and portrayals of Turkey are mainly constructed for the sake of non-Turkish parties.

6.3 Trends and important periods

6.3.1 9/11

Metaphorical representations as cognitive and discursive tools could be suspected of responsiveness to trends and events that influence the Turkish geopolitical position. This paragraph elaborates on the notions of the 9/11 happenings structuring a civilizational narrative around geopolitical Turkey and designates further trends in EU-Turkey relations and parallel metaphor deployment. Müftüler and Baç (1998) mark the end of the Cold War as being of influence in the way that it launched the questioning of "Turkey's role in various security and non-security institutions of the 'West' and thus Turkey's place within- and its identity as part of the 'West'" (Müftüler and Bac 1998 in Yanik, 2011: 83). The ending of the Cold War and the renewed situation of power relations poked new geopolitical theories and also invigorated critical geopolitics in deconstructing these trends. Concerning Turkey, next to the influence of the ending of the Cold War leading to a renewed emphasis on geopolitical Turkey, the 9/11 happenings seemed to fully alight a period of focus upon Turkish exceptionality. 9/11 and the following positioning of the 'Western' world, created fertile ground for the Huntingtonian thesis to locate certain civilizations and differentiate them on cultural and religious grounds. Sozen (2011) comments on the clash of civilizations thesis to be readily available for wide usage after 9/11, thereby becoming one of the -if not the most- dominant paradigms of world politics. Turkey, in this paradigm features a truly exceptional case (Sözen, 2011), (Dalby, 2003). As will be outlined, both devotees and adversaries positioned themselves in the narrative of metaphorically representing Turkey.

As already mentioned in 5.1.4 and 5.3.2, an increase in the use of metaphors can be noticed in the aftermath of 9/11. It lays ground for the disguise of representations that seek the connection between cultures for advancement of own standards. Within this process rapidly drawn conclusions lead to assumptions such as: radical Islam that attacked the US is exclusively located in the Muslim world, democracy and secularism would redeem the Muslim world from radical Islam and Turkey as a Muslim country functions as a contact point (EurActiv, 2002c). The 'global fight against terrorism' under the denominator of the need for dialogue between the 'East' and the 'West' acquired unprecedented significance in the post-9/11 era. Turkey in the position of role model for the Muslim world 'elevated upon the pillars of a functioning democracy, a prosperous market economy and secularism' (EurActiv, 2002d). The mentioned essentialism in understanding and dividing the world on basis of religion in a

disorienting way affects Turkey by representing Turkey both moving towards the 'Islamic East' as well as standing in the middle of civilizations. The 9/11 happenings featured in constructing (or relapsing) the defining of Turkey by its basic characterization: a Muslim state. The European Policy Centre for example states that in 2002 due to the September 11 attacks and the impending war in Iraq, tourism is reeling in Turkey (EurActiv, 2002e) thereby implying and trying to prove that the 9/11 attacks and Turkey have a causal connection.

The reinforcement of the civilizational discourse through the 9/11 attacks is further intensified by the emerging 'reformed Islamist' AKP (Justice and Development Party). The situation occurred in which next to the known post-Cold War Turkish hybrid features (Turkey being in-between two continents), religion was introduced into the discourse through politics (Yanik, 2009). The image of Turkey standing in the middle, shifted towards a notion of Turkey as a spokesman for Islam, coherent with the images that the different policy- and political actors disperse. Turkish foreign policy simply reacted by committing themselves to the rhetoric of the clashing civilizations. For example, by initiating the 'Meeting of Civilizations' forum, that both in form as in content constructed the reproducing and reinforcing of East-West divides. For the sake of justifying Turkey's continued usefulness for Europe, a basis is created for continued dependence and marginality (Yanik, 2009). Without taking in consideration the representations creating dispersed images of Turkey, this renewed role that religion fills-in, can be found in the different EurActiv sources that dichotomize religion and democratic progress. Both directly and indirectly comparisons were made, defining geographical regions on basis of religious dominance, creating a situation in which the institutional EU contrasts the 'Muslim world', 'the Middle East' and 'the East'. It thereby consolidates nearsighted images, lacking attention for internal differences, depicting a certain political unity through religion, envisioning incompatibility of religion and democracy and so forth, notwithstanding the consequences for the EU and Europe irreversibly imagined as unified in religion, history and democratic values. The post 9/11 era is characterized by articles representing a total and utter diffusive and discursive image of geopolitical understandings. East is presented as opposing West, the EU opposing Islam, Christianity opposing Islam and Europe opposing the Islamic world.

6.3.2 Neo-Ottomanism

The, from origin 'Western' introduction of religion in geopolitical discourse, renewed and refuelled notions of civilizational divides and Turkish exceptionality. Still, the hardening of civilizational differences cannot be rendered emanating only from external forces. In Turkey, different waves of 'neo-Ottomanism' enhanced the position of exceptionality. Similar to the assumed increase in positioning of geopolitical Turkey after the Cold War and 9/11, neo-Ottomanism was introduced in the early 1990s and was again brought to the attention in the early 2000s. Neo-Ottomanism was defined being "the renewed interest in the former territories and people of the (Ottoman) Empire, which include Muslims who were part of that Empire". It helped the Turks to see themselves once more at the centre of the world rather than at the tail end of a European world (Yanik, 2011: 84). This trend of neo-Ottomanism can be taken both declarative as well as incongruous considered their influence on the representations of geopolitical Turkey. Declarative in the way that when looking at the early 2000 period (the second wave of neo-Ottomanism), an increase in representations of Turkey can be noticed, distributed by Turkish sources. For example, Turkish State Minister for Foreign Trade Toskay, Turkish Foreign Minister Cem and the Turkish Industrialists' and businessmen's association TUSIAD, were, among others, responsible for distributing the metaphors of the bridge, litmus test, role model and pivot. This is compliant with the civilizational narrative of divergence that was spearheaded by the neo-Ottomanists. Incongruous because the 'second wave' known architect Ahmed Davutoğlu, seemed indecisive on the ways Turkey was to be represented. Where Davutoğlu first projected the bridging function on Turkey, he subsequently shifted to propagate that Turkey should be acknowledged as central country, not as solely connecting or on the edge of civilizations. This retrieved a notion of Ottomanism that quite paradoxically lead Turkish politics to commit themselves to the essentialist narrative of cultures, just as their 'Western' counterparts. Moreover, this posture seems to derive opposite consequences by deploying the representations for centrality, accentuating dependency.

Professor Davutoğlu became Turkish foreign minister in 2009 and retrieved the image of Turkey as central state through the use of different representations. He did not construct a contradicting narrative but rather counteracted this image by emphasising the versatility of geopolitical Turkey. Davutoğlu spoke in 2009 in Brussels about the role of Turkey considering EU accession and presented Turkey as becoming a major player on the international stage: a key regional player, an honest broker in conflicts, a mediator regarding the Middle-East

conflict, the Caucasus and regarding ongoing tensions on Iran's nuclear program (EurActiv, 2009d). The neo-Ottomanism flow seems to take shape by Davutoğlu becoming Foreign Minister in 2009, he intentionally enacts his focus upon centrality. Developments in the early 2000s were limited to focussing on exceptionality, it was supposed to be more important to centre Turkey in the middle of attention instead of being critical on the images raised. Centralized power was ought to be important, and developed into a dominant representation. Interestingly, this image of increasing awareness in Turkish politics is manifested in the presence of the regional- and major player representations, raised from Turkish politics. Standing out is that the articles of EurActiv in the post 2009 period present the bridge, hub, key, gate and buffer –with some exceptions- from EU actors and are not acted upon by Turkish politics. With respect to the occurring regional power and major player representations, mainly Turkish actors act upon these images. Former German ambassador Wolf-Ruthart Born underlines this trend by mentioning Turkey to be very careful in calling itself 'role model' or 'model country'. He prefers the image of Turkey as the regional power with a considerable influence in the region (EurActiv, 2012a). It seems as if he developed this stance throughout the years.

6.3.3   Influential dates

Next to the influential role of the 9/11 happenings and the ways in which neo-Ottomanism created potential for the distribution of different representations, parallelism between influential happenings and the emergence of several clusters of metaphors can be recognized. As mentioned in 5.3.2, after the beginning of the Arab uprisings, an increase in imaging Turkey as a 'model' or 'mediator' can be located. The role model representation is in the years previous to the Arab uprisings only applied occasionally. In February 2011 EU enlargement commissioner Štefan Füle directly connects the role model representation to the Arab uprisings. On an Istanbul conference against a background of the unfolding revolutions in the Arab world, Füle claimed that Turkey could provide a democratic model for Islamic countries (EurActiv, 2011b). So does the April 2011 EurActiv Turkey article, claiming Turkey to be a role model for Middle Eastern countries experiencing the process of change (EurActiv, 2011d). Furthermore, UK Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg states Turkey to be a role model for Arab countries because Turkey would be the living proof of the compatibility between democracy and Islam (EurActiv, 2011c). A basic stock of representations is tapped into, dependent on the result wanted; on the image that needs to be derived.

Similar trends can be recognized when taking into account important happenings such as the period before the EU and Turkey agreed to start accession negotiations on December the 17th, 2004. Depending on the actor being pro- or contra, different representations are used. This versatility is represented when, for example, Faruk Sen in the Turkish Policy Quarter emphasizes on Turkey being the strategic bridge between Europe and Asia. Also, he states Turkey to be treated like a stepchild and Turkey as the pillar of NATO's southeast defence system (EurActiv, 2004h). On the basis of these representations Sen articulates the importance of Turkey for the EU, oblivious to any structuring of Turkey-EU relations based on dependence, whatsoever. Discussions concerning Turkey in 2004 focus upon the possible accession to EU membership. Articles, interviews and conferences thus chiefly concentrate on this substantive question of 'Turkey-EU: yes or no?'. The bridge representation once again fulfils the position of pro EU accession, providing external stability to the countries of the Middle East because of Turkeys' politically stable and modern democracy. The precedence of Turkish EU accession seeks to overcome differences by claiming a bridge role and thereby explicitly seeks to abolish the Huntington thesis. 'Turkey becoming EU member would prove the fallacy of the Clash of Civilizations' (EurActiv, 2004b) and 'The EU having a good chance to counter the looming fulfilment of Samuel Huntington's thesis of a clash between Christian and Muslim civilizations' (EurActiv, 2004c). With respect to the actors and articles having a more negative stance towards EU accession, the representations of Turkey being a buffer for the EU is applied by EU commissioner Bolkestein (EurActiv, 2004a). As already mentioned, this is quite paradoxically, followed by Turkey's EU ambassador Oguz Demiralp, who presents Turkey as a shield (EurActiv, 2004b). There arises an image of Turkey and the possible EU-accession, which on the one hand shows a highly differentiated image of actors emphasizing Turkish' potentialities. Meanwhile the representations depict an image commemorating the (mutual) dependence between Turkey and the EU and the rescheduling of Turkish exceptionality. In all the comments on Turkey during this eventful period, the tenth issue of the CEPS Turkey monitor stands out because of, Centre for European Reform Steven Everts, claiming Turkey to be short-changed by the model and bridge representation. According to him, Turkey presents a unique case for its long-standing ties with the West, its secular state structure and transformation of the political elite through the prospect of EU membership and therefore cannot be a model for the wider Middle East. Further, Everts claims that the ambivalent relation of Turkey with its neighbours aggravates the need to tone down the 'Turkey as a bridge' argument, and avoid the model rhetoric (EurActiv, 2004d).

7 The discursive postcolonial notions of EU-Turkey relations; modes- and sources of differentiation

7.1 Modes of differentiation

7.1.1 Turkey as borderland

Gaining a thorough understanding of EU-Turkey relations that have a post-colonial focus, this paragraph concentrates on the ways in which the different articles, speeches and conferences represent difference and (thus) how they assemble the borders of Turkey, the EU, the East and the West. As is introduced in paragraph 4.2, to understand these border representations and their intonation of geopolitical relations, a distinction is made between defining differences in a more digital and analog way. Hullse (2006) described the digital border to construct the other in total contrast to itself and thereby creates a clear-cut boundary between the Occident and the Orient. From the analog perspective, the other is different in degree rather than in kind creating large zones of transition and overlap (Hülsse, 2006: 400). From this understanding I want to elaborate on the image conceived by the different representations. Borders are interpreted as being the physical boundaries that divide the world into states, characteristic of the Westphalian system (Ruggie, 1993 in Hülsse, 2006). Moreover, they are seen as the ways in which difference between Us and Them is shaped.

In the representation of Turkey as a bridge, the whole frontier/overlap zone, seems to be located in Turkey. The representation focuses upon the image of democratically highly developed Europe, democratically reasonably developed Turkey and democratically underdeveloped 'East'. On first sight the bridge, hub, crossroad and buffer representations seem to envision Turkey to lay in this overlap zone where difference with European countries diminishes and authentic bonds and relations with Eastern countries persist. Connecting an entire Europe on its democratic, religious and economic characteristics, creates a situation where on the outskirts difference may be only fundamental in the way states are organized. For example differences between Germany (the West) and Saudi Arabia (the East). But, in-between these states a large overlap zone lies, with gradual alterations. Turkey the frontier zone seeks connections for energy politics and economical possibilities by deterring borders and softening religious differences by highlighting the compatibility of religion and democracy (EurActiv, 2001b), (EurActiv, 2011c). Dahlman (2004) expresses the versatility of the field where Turkey is located by notifying its strategic frontiers for Western security interests, its position of energy and trade corridor with its regional neighbours, its functioning as a diplomatic

bridge between the EU, US and the Muslim states of the Persian Gulf and fourth, for providing a buffer between Europe and the Middle East (Dahlman, 2004: 564). The buffer representation for example does not state the filtering of difference to find place on a precise location but describes the whole of Turkey to fulfil this zone of transition (EurActiv, 2004a). And the crossroad metaphor displays Turkey to connect Asian and European transport routes of goods (EurActiv, 2008b), retrieving an image of a larger network of transport routes not limited by borders. Despite of these images steering Turkey to a somewhat more transitional zone, I reckon all the different representations to create a digital imaging of the geopolitical region because of the way in which difference is defined on basis of binaries. Through the elaboration of the Turkish transition zone, the geopolitical reasoning of separate spaces, 'here and there' 'us and them' still strongly resounds. The bridge symbolizes a certain development and diminishing of difference and thus borders, while still deriving its relevance from the East-West, Christian-Islam, and rich-poor dichotomies. That is why the bridge of understanding, which is brought up by the need for understanding between Western Europe and the Islamic world, possibly leads to a situation where the bridge of understanding ends up in Turkey. In this way, it functions as a bridgehead for a large number of Muslims invading Western society, as commemorated by European Policy Centre founding chairman Crosswick (EurActiv, 2004g). This image can be rendered expressive for the ways in which the representations image themselves. For the sake of the EU, differences in economic progress and democratic development are explained in terms of openness, more permeable borders and connections. The tone of the message turns when looking at Christian-Muslim divides, migration and in fact every movement of the 'East' towards the 'West'. The gate and key metaphor display this evidently in describing Turkey as an economic gate, which can be controlled by- and opened up towards the EU. The gate is by definition only of worth in a situation where, next to the gate, a strong border is realized. Turkey in this way is still some kind of overlap zone between the EU and the countries to the east. But, instead of projecting a frontier on the whole of Turkey, the external borders of the EU just seem to shift towards a controllable and hard-cut border between Turkey and its neighbours. Difference is concretized on the borders of Europe and thus leaves little place for a more gradual notion of 'Europeaness'. This is even more so, when not leaving Turkey to develop its own transitional position, but trying to convert Turkey to EU desires and thereby hardening the difference between EU and not-EU.

7.1.2   East vs. West

Further, I want to focus on the way in which the representations imagine the 'other to be different in degree, rather than in kind'. Of importance is first of all whether from an EU perspective, Turkey is seen as the 'other'. Or -if this position of the other is projected on other parties- if Turkey is treated as in-between or hybrid. Representing Turkey conceives different ways of describing Us and Them and seems to leave little space for some kind of gradual developing identity. Remarkably, despite of the metaphors having either a positive or negative nature, and are based on either equality or dependence, they all reason from a binary divide between 'an East' and 'a West'. The classifications made through the representations transcend regional deviations and similarities to the level of categorizing nations under labels such as: "EU", "Europe", "Asia", "Middle East", and "Islamic states". This leads to an ungraspable bifurcation of the East and the West. Depending on the subject treated, the composition of the different actors change. Knowing this, makes worth noting that in the few times the representations claim some kind of link with 'Asia' -the Caucasus and Central Asia-, this solely occurs when speaking in terms of Turkey opening-up in economic terms (EurActiv, 2008b), (EurActiv, 2004f). When the East is mentioned this chiefly needs to be understand in terms of the Middle East or the Islamic Eastern countries. Although the terminology of connecting with Asia thus enhances some positive economic bonds, the way Asia is represented, retrieves an image of an 'uncultivated cash cow'. Turkey is than put away under the label "Asia" for its economic potentialities and not for its economic powers, possessing the natural road to Central Asia and its oil riches (EurActiv, 2001a). This is also shown in an old image of the ever 'impecunious Turk' (figure vi), where Turkey for punishment is put in the corner of the Asian minorities by teacher Europe. The image still holds relevance for EU-Turkey contemporaries, despite the figure was created in the 1913 Balkan-Ottoman Empire war. Projected on present ratios between Turkey and the EU, the 'Balkan Question' acts on the level of EU-membership and border crossings between the EU and Turkey. Europe remains the acting party deciding Balkan countries to join. The EU and leaves Turkey in dependence on whether the EU enacts on the Turkish economy and whether Turkey is authorized to access the EU, i.e. retaining Turkey in the corner of Asian minorities.

Figure vi: Dame Europa. "You've always been the most troublesome boy in the school. Now go and consolidate yourself." Turkey. "Please, ma'am, what does that mean?" Dame Europa. "It means going into that corner—and stopping there!" Reprinted from 'Turkey Limited' (1913). Copyright 2013 by the Project Gutenberg License. Retrieved from http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30678/30678-h/30678-h.htm

Paying attention to the actors joining the discussions concerning geopolitical Turkey, geographically seen -the odd man out is the US. If we can speak of a region connecting Europe through Turkey with the Middle East and the Caucasus at all, the US has no such geographical connection with this supposed region. Nonetheless, the US as important ally to both the EU as well as Turkey plays an important role by deploying a certain terminology. Within the used articles the US together with the EU counts as one bigger West. A unity of the EU and the US is based on similar conceptions of democratic development, secular state structures and -a bit more indistinct- shared religious backgrounds. Apparently, all the different metaphors commit to this image of the EU and the US as a unified entity and thereby pose the need for constituting a counterpart, the East. Clear definitions of the West and the East are not provided and force us to construct our view on presumptions and empty shells. Terms as Europe and EU are used in a discursive way. For example in the opposing of the EU to the Middle East (EurActiv, 2004a), which entangles the institutional EU with the geographical

Middle East. And what about Crosswick (2004) claiming cultural and religious unity in geographical Europe, using the label of 'Western Europe' as basis for 'Western Europe's need to connect towards the Islamic world'? Does this than mean that there is something else than Western Europe and does this contain Turkey? Within this world order, what about atheism, various movements of Christianity and foremost: what about Muslims –in all their diversity- in European societies? The European and the Western identity are primordialized on some inherent characteristics of collectivity, which makes it quite impossible to acquire afterwards, by for example Turkey (Hulsse, 2006).

Where the Western world is framed in terms of the congruence between an institutional unity and certain shared principles, the East is manifested as a unity through shared religion. Geographically, the countries west to Turkey, of which almost all are EU members, could legitimize the use of the label 'the West', hanged upon EU countries. The label 'the East' –all countries east of Turkey- is mostly restricted to Islamic states, and thus the Caucasus and Central Asian countries do not fit in this notion. The discursiveness that arises leads to the situation that the majority of actors locate Turkey in-between 'the West' and 'Islam' thereby possibly unwittingly defining difference by religion. The East has become synonymous for Islam and the Middle East, and through this notion metaphor can suddenly be known for bridging to the Muslim world, leaving out other Asian states. When Turkey is characterized as regional power that through her Islamic identity functions as an inspiration to its neighbours (EurActiv, 2012a), this excludes Turkey's non-Islamic neighbours. 'The East' is exploited for delineating a certain Islamic world where Turkey is indisputably part of. For Turkey this means it is extremely vulnerable for negative imaging of the Middle East. The noticed increase in the use of representations following 9/11 and the Arab uprisings can be traced to the shared Islamic identity, which leads to the inference that Turkey is part of this unified East.

In terms of gradual difference, the analog difference and border interpretations create a situation where -apart from Turkey being gradually Eastern or Western- the border between East and West is assembled through the simple defining of the West and East. Berlusconi claiming Turkey to lie on the border of Europe and thereby functions as a gate, thus alleges on geographical Europe to have some sort of hard discernable border (EurActiv, 2005b). He captures the essence of the analog veil hiding the digital difference and border. At first sight, Turkey seems to be the embodiment of the overlap zone of analog difference in its ways of bridging, connecting, mediating and role modelling the East and the West. However, the acts of connecting prove to engage in an act of highlighting and hardening difference between East

and West. The way in which difference is defined by religion, assembles the situation that 'the other' in European mind is 'Eastern', and that 'Eastern' is 'Turk' or actually 'Islamic' (Ikiel, 2011: 657). The crux of the whole narrative concerning geopolitical Turkey's position, seems to come down to the point that Turkey is conceived as overlapping difference in degree of being secular and democratic but meanwhile as the state where the Islam is the dominant religion. Turkey is restrained by religion as the denominator of difference, repeatedly condemned to be different in kind, namely as not being able to shed the essentialism around religious characteristics.

7.1.3   Religion as denominator of digital borders

In the distinction between analog and digital definitions of difference, Hülsse claimed that through the analog notion of difference, 'hybrids' populate the frontier zone (Hulsse, 2006). Central claim of this paragraph is that Turkey as the hybrid, the in-between, collides with the defining of difference by religion. Apparent analog differences and borders are solidified through differentiation on basis of religion, differentiation that resounds through the applied metaphors. The definition of the analog notion of Hülsse, can, to a certain extend, be applied on the case treated in this research and would comprehend Turkey as the place where the self and the other overlap. Turkey is the actor that cannot be rendered either inside or outside (Rumelili 2004 in Hülsse, 2006). The centralizing of religion is both called upon in an explicit and active- as well as a more implicit and concealing way. German Foreign Minister Fischer (2004) refers to Turkey's position as a bridge, as a functioning democracy in a predominantly Muslim society. Therefore, Turkey is inspiring to neighbouring countries and could increase the prospect of democratic reforms implemented there (EurActiv, 2004i). The bridge transports democratic reforms towards neighbouring Muslim countries. Lord David Owen even more explicitly claims the EU to have a unique opportunity to bridge the Christian-Muslim divides when Turkey becomes part of the Union (EurActiv, 2001b). Positioning Christian democratic EU across underdeveloped Muslim Middle East, raises the question in what way Turkey can be some kind of overlap zone when it is a dominantly Muslim country itself. It must be noted that this way of reasoning leads to the conclusion that religion needs to be bridged (EurActiv, 2001b). In this way, religion is considered as an elementary cultural source of political and economical difference and disparity, revolving in quite a fundamental digital border between Christianity and Islam. The growing fear of the Turkish state becoming more Islamic and the additional incompatibility with the EU, highlight the digital divide and the impenetrability of religious divides. Remarkably, the initiatives of EU actors to seek connection with Turkey and

'the East', through comparing geographical and institutional Europe with the Muslim East, creates antagonisms rather then connections.

The contradiction of the effort of building a tool for connecting different worlds, ending up in highlighting the differences between these worlds, comes out in a very strong way through the bridge metaphor. Although this contradiction is not a privilege, it resounds in all the different ways in which Turkey is represented both in direct as well as in more concealing ways. The representations that posit Turkey as some kind of example for other countries, the key, role model and mediator, assign this role to Turkey because of it having a shared religious identity with some of its neighbouring countries. That is why Turkey is called upon as a key figure in mediating different regional conflicts. The 9/11 happenings and the Arab revolts were noted to have structured the use of these representations. Religion in both, forms the demarcation suddenly calling upon Turkey to take up its position in modelling and mediating its Muslims (EurActiv, 2002d), (EurActiv, 2011c). Representations that were characterized by the way in which they harden difference, the shield and buffer, do this by demarcating the EU and the Middle East through Turkey. The party to be blocked is presented as 'the Middle East'. Despite of remaining vague in defining the need for blocking the Middle East in terms of 'unstable regions' and 'waves of instability', the denominator of 'the Middle East' can be interpreted as united in its identity of dominant Muslim states (EurActiv, 2010f) (EurActiv, 2004a). Although EU-membership could be rendered to be the last step for Turkey to switch civilizations; its Muslim character will remain the main differentiator and upholds difference between Muslim and non-Muslim.

The images derived from analyzing the different representations and their understanding of classifying the world, have a strong congruence with Huntington's civilizational divide. The fundamental position of religion in demarcating worlds strongly resounds in the representations. Despite of being often directly disproved, religion does form a base underneath representations of geopolitical Turkey. German Foreign Minister Fischer in 2004 claims that no longer the quest of opposing systems is relevant, but a clash of civilizations between the Islamic Arab world and the West, which poses an even greater danger. (EurActiv, 2004f). Fischer directly links 9/11 as focal point of a world order, to determine Germany's posture towards Turkey, claiming 9/11 to be the context to which Turkey's possible accession of the EU must be seen (EurActiv, 2004f). Ironic are the ways in which different actors detach themselves from the image of clashing civilizations but meanwhile contribute to constructing a geopolitical narrative of different worlds based upon religion. US Vice President Joe Biden

reiterated US President Obama's desire to steer away from the 'clash of civilization' theory (EurActiv, 2009a). The Centre for European Policy Studies emphasizes that Europe's existential priority is to avoid the clash of civilizations, 'so Turkey cannot be ignored anymore' (EurActiv, 2005a). However, in their so-called effort of leaving the civilizational speech act, they fail gloriously, by immediately characterizing Turkey as a dominantly Muslim country. Despite of Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan referring to the disapprovement of the clash of civilization thesis, claiming: "not to see the EU as Christian club or cultural group. We believe that it is a unity of strategic and political values", in Europe there remains a cultural politics of accession, informed by the careless discourse of the 1990s (Dahlman, 2004: 562). Lastly, these determinant civilizational interpretations of geopolitical Turkey can be recognized in the representations of Turkey as the regional power and major player. The main fear from an EU point of view is that Turkey will detach from the EU and will turn towards 'the East', encouraged by religious motifs, compliant with the image of figure v and vi. Political changes in the AKP, stronger emphasizing on the roots of political Islam, is regarded as indisputably moving away from the EU (EurActiv, 2010c). Regardless of it being true, this indicates the reflexivity of the binary and digital relation between Islam and the EU. Turkish politics transgressing Islamic identity is interpreted as a step away from EU to 'the East', anchoring the main source of (political) differentiation between 'the East' and 'the West' in religious grounds.

7.1.4   The presentation of Turkey's physical borders

The representations of geopolitical Turkey can all be rendered to remain inconspicuous in the ways they represent the physical borders. Despite of the fact that the imaginations of Turkey very much appoint the ways in which the borders should function, explicitness on border politics remains reserved to the en-passant defining of difference. The manners in which metaphors construct a more or less digital difference, serves as an indication of border dynamics. When deconstructing these civilizational narratives, manifested borders are expressed in a very physical way. The narrative derived from EU representations, image the EU as opening up to the East, thereby manifesting a one-way connection that takes place through Turkey. On the border between the EU and Turkey and maybe more important (when Turkey would join the EU) on the border of the EU with Turkey's neighbours, the EU needs to control whatever gets exchanged. The economic sector seems to be the exception that proves the rule, fulfilling a function of exchange. The transport of for example energy through the Nabucco pipeline (EurActiv, 2009c) to the EU and in opposite direction the transport of goods to the

Turkish and further Asian markets (EurActiv, 2004f), image a very open notion of the border between the EU and the East with Turkey forming an overlap zone of trade. These economically open borders between the EU and 'the East' through Turkey must not be regarded as one of completely free exchange. The ways in which the gate and gateway representations portray Turkey's economic opening-up, reveal the need for the EU to keep a certain control of their outer borders. The typical characteristic of the presented gate and gateway having the possibilities of closing down the border seems to have an attracting effect on the EU. Being the gate watcher permits to control whatever is exported and, maybe more important, what is imported. The most dominant representation, the bridge, imagines selectivity in the most comprehensive way. The border, from an EU perspective, with Turkey and through Turkey with the further East, is one of transferring reforms considering economy, democracy and secularism (EurActiv, 2004f) (EurActiv, 2004g). Transports across the bridge are focussed on a one-way direction and when taking into account the opening-up of borders in terms of Eastern movements towards the EU, this exchange is imagined in negative terms of migration streams (EurActiv, 2004g). Further focussing on this fear of movements, the metaphors that have a negative connotation help us to understand how this need for controlling borders is substantiated. Turkey as a litmus test and sick men, foremost focuses on the dynamics of Turkey's EU-accession transcending the level of national boundaries. The buffer and shield very strongly create the idea of Eastern forces that need to be blocked. Turkey forms a protective body for the EU. Not being clear in defining the force that embodies the danger, Bolkestein (2004) first refers to the buffer as the Middle East, then Syria, Iran and Iraq. The shield is presented for blocking waves of instability from unstable regions (EurActiv, 2004b). Although both the buffer and shield representations focus on protecting the EU from Eastern forces, the interpretation of where the border needs to function still differs. The shield is presented in the way that Turkey accesses the EU and through that the external borders of Turkey can be controlled and solidified. The buffer imagines Turkey to form this analog, grey overlap zone, which can be used to buffer outside forces, while preserving the borders of the EU, between the EU and Turkey. Especially the shield representation displays the ways in which Turkey can simultaneously access the EU, as well as strengthen borders. Taking into account the way the gate representation figures in the role of the border, a similar situation can be noticed. An encountered opening towards 'the East', through forming an economical and political gate, at the same time enables possibilities to control border crossings. Thereby retrieving the implicit message that mainly the EU needs to gain from opening up borders, while having the possibility to control opposite movements.

The representations where 'the initiative to act' was said to lie in Turkey, create a less digital character of the physical borders and also ask for a deepened interpretation of difference to locate the conceived borders. The crossroad representation presents a similar understanding as the gate and the bridge; one of dependence on subject of exchange. Turkey at the crossroads of transport routes enhances an image of diminishing borders for the sake of developing trade (EurActiv, 2008b). Meantime, the image of Turkey standing on cultural crossroads, exactly considers the need for Turkey to make a choice between political reforms or political Islam. It thus much more emphasizes the difference that is demarcated by the EU border. The role model and mediator representations reason out of the assumption that Turkey and Middle Eastern countries function in a similar system, because of their religion. From this way of thinking, Turkey is seen as exemplary for Middle Eastern countries. The exchange between the EU and Turkey, the EU and the Middle East and Turkey and the Middle East, thus finds place on the level of exchange of knowledge about democracy and secularism and than mainly in the way of the EU being the attainable level for both. Lingering on this rooted perception of difference seems to have little influence on physical borders, for being a role model and a mediator not necessarily asks for the opening of country borders. The narrative of Turkey sharing this assumed package of equal descent with the Middle East and because of it is called upon by the EU, creates the image that there is a larger obstacle on the border between the EU and the East than on the border between Turkey and the East. The image of Turkey as a mediator remains on the same level of exchange ideology but in practice results in very tangible border implications. The mediating role Turkey is supposed to fulfil, for example with regard to its instable neighbouring countries Iraq, Iran and Syria maybe appears to linger on a certain theoretical bases, but in recent trends leads to the appearance of large refugee camps in Turkey for fugitive Syrians. The current mediating and regional player position is one of being on the borders of the so-called 'unstable countries'. It therefore experiences the troubles of war and unrest by the border crossings of refugees and the protrusions of war that are not constrained by country borders. Mainly the manifestation of the border in these roles, are completely contingent of whether Turkey would become EU member or not. It can only be imagined what influence the strict external border politics of the EU would have on the streams of refugees from Syria. In a general way it can be concluded that the movements from the East to the West from an EU perspective need to be blocked, except for economical movements. Turkey's borders are only perceived valuable when having control over them. Opening-up Turkey, in whatever way, creates an image of tearing down borders but not without raising new ones.

7.2   Source of differentiation

7.2.1   Turkey deriving power initiative by moving away from the EU

A central notion that permeates the claims made on geopolitical Turkey, is that with regard to Turkey-EU relations, the EU attitude is one of assuming a lack of Europeanness in Turkey. Irrespective of the fact that representations create various images of Turkey, the central notion is situated in the representations imaging Turkey in a position of dependence and in reflection of EU counties. Defining the Turkish position in terms of EU standards cannot be regarded remarkable because of the Turkish rapprochement to EU membership. Nonetheless, the analysis of the spectrum of representations projected on Turkey does image a relationship of deeper layered tactical motives where the thread is adjusted to stretching a power imbalance. The need for Turkey to achieve a certain level is undisputedly present in the EU posture. The EU policy towards Asia and Eastern Europe, shaped by an Orientalist discourse, as Kuus (2004) claims, is inoculated on this assumption of a lack of Europeaness. Within the representations applied to Turkey this is constructed in several ways. Turkey is portrayed as enabling different kinds of streams in-between the West and the East. The character of the subject that is exchanged proves to be determining for the ways relations would function; either as an exchange or as an adaption.

Creating 'understanding between the East and the West' (EurActiv, 2004g), (EurActiv, 2007), comprehends that the East needs to adapt to Western notions of a good functioning civilization. The bridge aims at transferring and has not a single intention to share or exchange. These claims even become quite avowedly at times, like claiming that Turkey needs to meet a certain standard through meeting European standards for the sake of a modernization process (EurActiv, 2004f). Turkey is treated as the country that, in comparison to the rest of 'the East', is the most near to the EU. Distance in this, is not geographical but acts on the level of 'sharing a same understanding', i.e. 'elevated upon the pillars of a functioning democracy, a prosperous market economy and secularism' (EurActiv, 2002d). The model metaphor is ultimately grounded on this notion of inequality between the West (the EU) and the East (Muslim countries). Turkey -as fellow Muslim country- is a model for a level of modernization that should be achieved by these Muslim countries. In this role, Turkey is not the independent, intrinsic relevant and legitimized state but functions as hybrid in the running of becoming further elevated upon the pillars of EU modelled democracy. The ramification of the West-East divide, becomes fully visible in the analysis of the representations claiming the Turkish role to be one of regional power and major player. The

development of Turkey becoming a regional power, developing an independent notion of political leadership and choosing to take an individual stance in conflict situations, leads to the comprehension of Turkey as moving away from the West and drawing closer to the East. Becoming an internally legitimized state that more and more focuses upon its own vision of development, apart from surrounding forces is interpreted as a movement away from the EU. In line with this knowledge, it can be concluded that the former relationship with Turkey as a bridge, gate, model, buffer and so forth, indeed functioned by the grace of Turkish dependence towards this EU.

Samuel Huntington in his 1993 article 'If not civilizations, what?' claims the dead of European colonialism and the erosion of Western culture (Huntington, 1993). The interpretation of European colonialism distilled from the notion that EU neighbours lack Europeanness and define difference by religious and cultural grounds (paragraph 6.4.2 and 6.4.3), still or again is very relevant concerning EU-Turkey and EU-'East' relations. Interesting is that the colonialist notion of Turkey as the perpetual hybrid and middle can be notified. So is the Orientalist notion of Turkey as inherently Muslim and solidifying the civilizational, cultural and religious gap of the other, who is less modern and less developed. These stands centralize Turkey in a way subservient to EU's forbearance. Negligence of mingling statements and claims on Turkey's position considering the EU, rejects Turkey of becoming an equal partner. The pivotal role Turkey is said to play in gas supplies becomes part of the same narrative of Turkish exceptionality as the image of Turkey neglecting its role model position, because of its handling of journalists. Whether representations enumerate on Turkey in a positive or negative way, the main salience lies in the ways the inability of Turkey is central. The only images presenting a state that internalized power, is Turkey moving away from the EU. This leaves the discussion on whether the representations of Turkey needing to adapt or not, to the sobering knowledge that its adaption would never prove to be sufficient.

7.2.2   The fundamental need of being in control

Locating Turkish exceptionality inside Turkey, or instead more in 'something that derives its value through the use of an outside actor', helps understanding the Turkish role of being subordinate. Turkey has been endeavouring to occupy a position in which its 'indispensableness' for the EU is not depending on whether Turkey is called upon by the EU, but to have some internal value, regardless of being used. The representation of Turkey as the

key player conceals the indefiniteness of both. As outlined (paragraph 5.2.1,) the key metaphor spans over Turkey that serves a comparable tool as the gate for opening-up to the East. On the other hand, Turkey holds a key position as an influential partner, playing a major role in several energy and security issues. The representation locates the internal strength in Turkey and not so strongly in terms of adaption to the West. Nonetheless, Turkey the key, for example in the gas transportation between European and Asian countries, needs to be somehow activated. German foreign minister Fischer and dean of the Princeton University Slaughter addresses 'key' Turkey, on the 2008 forum on 'World disorder and the role of Europe', as a requisite party that asserts to this position. 'If not us, Russia and Iran are waiting with open arms' (EurActiv, 2008a). First of all, this claim implies a world (dis)order based on a highly hostile force field (with Russia and Iran as main bogeymen) to postulate the need to act upon Turkey. The discord in EU conception consists of either agreeing to the large Muslim country becoming member of the EU, or witnessing Turkey falling into dangerous Iranian claws. Second, this leaves Turkey as the hybrid that although having some internal worth totally depends on surrounding forces. This role of 'called upon when convenient' can be found in several of the representations. The gate representation may be the most evident one, in the way that the gatekeeper can filter interaction through the gate. Although Turkey is presented as a gate, in the light of Turkey-EU accession, the role of gatekeeper is allocated to the EU. The Turkish pivot needs to be anchored in political and economical reform, through the EU (EurActiv, 2002g). Most recent proceedings of Turkey developing into a country with a young and rapidly growing population and the strong economical progress that is has been going through, seems to adapt this image of Turkey in need for an outside party to fully evolve. Contrasting with his role in previous discussions, Fischer (2010) stretches that Turkey must no longer be treated as Western client state but as a serious partner (EurActiv, 2010e). Although this can be characterized as Turkey being treated less as a tool in the hands of the EU, the discourse of the EU as a template for modernization is still strongly emphasized. Turkey the model for the EU –fanned by the Arab uprisings and the Neo-Ottomanists- takes in account the developing and modernizing Turkish state, in terms of its intrinsic value, but is highly reflexive of a blueprint of development: 'the EU'.

The difficulty of linking these EU-Turkey relations to a postcolonial notion lies in the lurking messages veiled by the representations. Where the post 9/11 representations brought up quite a clear image of Turkey as the tool in EU hands, the early 2010s comprehend an image of Turkey as a more or less regional power which 'needs to be acted upon' instead of which 'acts upon'. In that case, non-European Turkey is not directly treated as 'unused, underused, primitive, less

rational and closer to children, animals and nature' (Huggan & Tiffin, 2007), but the Eurocentric worldview is upheld in the way the EU performs as model for modernization and development. Critical is the role that Turkey self fulfils in spreading and often even founding the representations. The neo-Ottomanists (paragraph 6.3.2) in their endeavour of highlighting Turkish exceptionality choose to do this by approaching Turkey in light of the EU. Turkish politics seem to become more and more aware that for achieving a centrally organized notion of power, the profiling of its Muslim identity proves to be quite counterproductive. It therefore is very careful in calling itself 'role mode' or 'model country' (EurActiv, 2012a). The ways in which this relation between the EU and Turkey is enforced by Turkish actions, can certainly be acknowledged but whether this detracts from the postcolonial relation between the two, can be argued. The posture of Turkish actors and Turkish neo-Ottomanism originates in the early 1990s, where renewed ratios captivated world orders. Turkish reaction to this period of renewed world orderings –whether or not categorized on bases of civilizations- led to the desire to level with EU and its degree of development. The situation of renewed power balances and Turkish rapprochement towards the EU built the foundations of a relationship of inequality. The representations became part of a larger narrative of Turkey needing to adapt to EU needs. Power was in hands of the EU and Turkey, in part oblivious of its dependence on the EU, became a component of this discourse that lasted and lasted. More recently, in Turkish politics there developed awareness that the patent on development does not exclusively lies in EU domains. Turkey-EU relations cannot be labelled colonial per definition and the Turkey-EU accession can neither. The speech act surrounding discussions, engaging in ongoing discussions of Turkey needing to be acted upon, can be.

7.2.3 Centralized because of the unbridgeable gap of religion

To recap the way in which Turkish inequality with regard to the EU is manifested, Turkey in the first half of the 2000s was described in terms of a tool for the EU and this image developed into a notion of Turkey as more of a role model and a regional power. Certain used metaphors prove to be so firmly established that they keep occurring in Turkey-EU discussions, this in particular counts for the bridge metaphor. Influential happenings as 9/11, the official start of Turkish-EU accession negotiations (2004) and the upcoming Arab uprisings (2010), can be marked as turning points of certain trends. First of all, 9/11 created a speech act of the need to connect with the Muslim world. Second, 2004 embraced a plurality of representations describing Turkey's exceptionality both in positive as well as in negative terms. And third, the

Arab uprisings started the debate on the appliance of the role model-, mediator- and internal power representations. In the substantial amount of representations applied to geopolitical Turkey, a narrative of dependence on the EU continuously arises. Even though a development through time can be noticed in which the representations to a larger extent lay initiative in Turkish hands, or at least try to. Exemplary of this are the mediator and role model representations that ascribe to Turkey a strategic position on several aspects: economically, politically, in conflict situations and on the level of energy transports. More than in a bridge, gate or whatever tool, Turkish' exceptionality is placed internally and is not depended on the ones crossing the bridge or opening the gate. Meanwhile, the representations are described in the ways of Turkey filling in the position of mediator for- and role model of a third party. Whoever this third party may be, it always serves EU's interests. A situation occurs where role model Turkey is praised for its position as a Muslim state with a democratic and secular character. In that position it models for surrounding Muslim countries (EurActiv, 2011c), (EurActiv, 2011b). Simultaneously, a demarcation is drawn between Muslim East and democratic West. A situation is created in which this Muslim East can somehow learn from, and should adapt to this EU level of democratic development. The level of adapting varies from mere seeking for administrative similarities with the EU, to gross changes with regard to its Muslim character. The upcoming movement of Neo-Ottomanism clarifies the broaching of a certain group of metaphors and makes the role of Turkey self-reinforcing metaphor use more understandable. The 'renewed interest in the former territories and people of the Empire' for the sake of 'seeing themselves as the centre of the world' led to the Turks being the impellers of liminal Turkey. They were unaware of the fact that their efforts could possibly turn against them. Under command of Turkish foreign minister Davutoğlu the Neo-Ottomanists imagined Turkey in the 90s and early 2000s as a highly functional and diverse country for EU use. This idea developed into the understanding that this position only strengthened Turkish dependence. It needed to locate the initiative to act in Turkey, because the way it maintained its versatility vacated the need of a third party to be useful. Turkey does not function irrespective of surrounding countries, institutions and so on. Nonetheless, the trends of representations projected on geopolitical Turkey, despite of developments to take up a more independent position, all strongly focus on its functioning with respect to the EU.

As Sozen (2011) already commented on, 9/11 makes available a wide usage of the Huntingtonian language. This research proves this to be convincing. Renewed notions of civilizational divides became apparent by describing Turkish' liminality and featured as a hatchery for a whole speech act of Turkey as pigeonholed. Quite ironically, the different actors claiming Turkey to

be a regional power substantiate this by presenting an image of independent and strong Turkey that moves away from the West. Becoming a regional power, here ultimately means 'moving away from the West', while all former representations imagined Turkish power in its connections with the West. The only way Turkey is treated as a valuable EU-member is through the maintenance of control of EU occupation. Moving away from the West on its turn means moving towards the East (EurActiv, 2010c). The bridge of connection is envisioned as a treadmill, in the context of accession (figure vii). This reaffirms the discursiveness around metaphor and still has the ability to transform this position into a notion of Turkey in the in-between situation, which Bhabha (1996) claims to be inherently post-colonial. Defining difference on religious and cultural grounds creates a situation in which Turkey can never become an EU-member (Bhabha 1996 in Yanik, 2011), (Kuus, 2004). The secular Turk that draws to the European waiting with open arms, symbolically wears the Fez on his head as a symbol for its unalterable Islamic identity that keeps him walking and walking but remaining in his liminal position (figure vii). The recycled differences are defined on basis of religion and culture, even though the socio-historical context has changed dramatically (Turkey's developments since the early 1990s). The attempted production of continuity in geopolitical reasoning, by the incorporation of 'strategic terms', can definitely be retrieved in the Turkish case. Behind imaging Turkey as 'raw' and 'unedited', lays the assumption of a power of appropriateness by using relatively fixed terms and phrases (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992). Terminology around geopolitical Turkey originated in the post-Cold War period and thickened in the 9/11 after math. Although different trends and developments can be noticed, it never came loose from this fundamental and essential character assigned to religion. Ultimately, the importance of the distinction between the representations fades, when cultural and religious barriers limit connections between Turkey and the EU. The ways in which connection is represented adjusts and maybe softens but the essence of difference remains unbridgeable. With regard to the analogy of the representations, Turkey becoming a regional power and major player focused on the movement away from the West to the East. The image of Muslim Turkey is so thick and decisive, that the reduced focus on the West is interpreted as a movement 'back' to the East and functions as the self-fulfilling prophecy of repelled Turkey.

Figure vii. Reprinted from Alla Turca: The Turkish Sisyphaen task (2011). Copyright holder unknown. Retrieved from http://studentthinktank.eu/blogs/alla-turca-the-turkish-sisyphean-task/

7.3   Postcolonial Turkey

Turkey's neo-Ottomanists embrace the focus on Turkey as the central state through instigating different kinds of representations describing the uniqueness of the Turkish state. Analyzing the different metaphors on their underlying and deeper meaning, reveals that becoming the central subject of discussion must not been confused with achieving central legitimization. As central subject, Turkey is represented as a tool for the EU, waiting for it to give its approval on the attained level of Europeanness that is supposedly needed for accessing the EU. The central, internalized power and the initiative to act, proves to be only achievable through Turkey moving away from the EU. From an EU perspective, Turkey returning to the 'East' must be understood in the way that Turkey becomes a centralized state and a regional power. Bilgin (2004) justly discusses the ways in which the Turkish policy makers themselves resort to the discourse of civilizational geopolitics. 'Whilst criticising their EU counterparts for erecting walls between European and Islamic or Western and non-Western peoples, Turkeys policy makers at times engage in similar 'boundary-drawing practices' between Turks and other 'Islamic' and/or 'non-European' peoples' (Bilgin, 2004: 271). Contrasting to this image of Turkey itself enhancing representations and exercising comparably on other non-EU countries, is the way in which the narrative of Turkey-EU relations is based upon a reaffirmed Eurocentric view that could possibly have become so thick that Turkish policy makers assumed it to be indispensable for retrieving their centrality. The disputable geopolitical reasoning around Turkish exceptionality from Turkish as well as EU sources creates a reality

that is used for political goals. Turkish policy makers focussing on tightening bonds with the EU, determine power relations between Turkey and the EU. Envisioning the most feasible way to encounter centrality is through the EU and thereby Turkey is committed to this Eurocentric worldview. Eurocentrism and EU-Turkey relations are to such an extent colonial that Turkey in its desire to effectuate a central Turkish state, interpreted reaching out to the coloniser as a prerequisite. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the inducement of Turkish policy makers to take up the narrative of exceptional Turkey, arose from the civilizational speech act that was persuaded by the Huntingtonian taxonomy of differences and classifications (Kilinç, 2009). It influenced and even led Turkey to be 'subsumed' into Huntington's civilizational thesis (Dahlman, 2004), leading back to the civilizational divides of Huntington. He claims Turkey to be a torn-state and manifested 'the West'; locating development and modernization as Western property demarcated by civilizational divides (Huntington, 2011). In sight of this knowledge, Turkey and its efforts for attaining EU-membership can be characterized by the dynamics of rapprochement and rejection. Eurocentrism and Turkish dependence are essential and continuous elements in the relationship between the EU and Turkey. This is something that not only structures Turkish identity but also is essential for the EU. Exclusion and Othering of most notably Turkey, is reminiscent of national identity and could therefore be best described as supranationalist (Hulsse, 2006). The EU does not directly claim land plots to be unused and humans to be primitive, but 'characterizes an EU desire for cohesive, unified territory and in that way manifests the incapacity of 'native Other' (Kramsch, 2007: 1592,1593), e.g. in this case the incapacity of Turkey. The ideological process of constructing spatial, political and cultural boundaries demarcating domestic EU space separately from the Other- the East-, takes place by an ongoing narrative of Us and Them. Although there is a substantive amount of different representations reviewing the Turkish situation as one of being in transition, difference based upon religion creates an insurmountable binary gap. Defining Turkey as belonging to a different social, ethnic, economic or religious group than oneself is in, creates a border separating the self from the other. The 'here-there' and 'us-them' cut-off points are not always displayed as physical and visible walls and fences. They may be as invisible as they are tangible and, equally, as merely perceived as they are real. (Newman, 2006: 177). Furthermore, the inducement of several discussions concerning the Turkey-EU accession, feeds this binary relation. Regardless of accession negotiations and Turkey being an official candidate member, in the end, countries either are- or are not EU members. This binary, hard border relationship also stretches to the ways EU-Turkey borders are realized and embody the definite and restorable fault lines of Huntington's civilizational divide. In the representations exchange is imagined but a further look shows that this exchange solely

focuses on economic exchange and transfer of modernization and EU ideologies. The attitude of Eurocentrality within the EU inherently results in the upcoming of a non-EU identity. As mentioned, the differences that are brought up by EU sources, confined to EU norms, often provide a basis for policymaking. Whether Turkey is hailed for being a democratic and secular model for Middle Eastern countries or is blamed for its lack of freedom of press, clearly some essential EU and non-EU identity is assumed to exist. Turkey as the close neighbour to the EU that focuses on EU-accession is regarded as containing governmental and democratic potential for achieving a similar identity as the EU. Turkey turned from an overlap zone, into indisputably 'Eastern', despite possessing some democratic and secular characteristics. The global space of Turkey is labelled 'Eastern' and 'Muslim' and through that, metaphors are deployed and images are used in the process of constructing world politics (Ó Tuathail, 2006). On the one hand Turkey developed in the hybrid country between the 'East' and the 'West', on the other hand, religious and cultural differences were solidified creating a hard line between the two supposed worlds. The position Turkey occupies, creates a conception of the EU as one seeking connections with Turkey but only when the EU can maintain a dominant position. Turkey proves to be dependent on outside parties and mainly on the EU, as the template for modernization. The construction of Turkish exceptionalism for the sake of re-emerging at the centre of the world, rather than being at the tail end of a European world (Fuller, 1992 in Yanik, 2011), results in a regained and perhaps new form of post-colonial relationship between the EU and Turkey.

8 Conclusion

The 1997 live performance and cd-recording 'The Dance' of British-American pop-rock band 'Fleetwood Mac', features the song 'temporary one'. The album and the song embody the return of the band after years of quarrel. The come back resulted in the band's most successful line-up and was received with great praise. The chorus of the song 'temporary one' describes two people in different continents being physically far apart. Despite of the sea lying between them, their ongoing love makes this sea to be a temporary one that will be bridged and will reunite the lovers:

> *"The river goes on and on*
> *And the sea that divides us*
> *Is a temporary one*
> *And the bridge will bring us back together" (Fleetwood Mac, 1997)*

In this research the song has proven to be a pleasant support when writing, but furthermore it shines a telling light on Turkey-EU relations in their ongoing efforts of bridging the sea that divides them. In this conclusion I plead that the representations that are projected on Turkey function in a discursive way in constructing post-colonial EU-Turkey relations. The inducement of researching influence of civilizational discourse on EU-Turkey relations was caused by the confusing mingling of terminology on plate tectonics that became synonymous for civilizational divides. The question rose that Huntington's Clash of Civilizations possibly invoked a certain speech-act within geopolitics. The theoretical chapter gradually constructed a framework that incorporated the linguistic metaphor in the post-modern and post-structural studies. This resulted in a conception of metaphor as cognitive and conceptual tool that constructs geopolitical story lines.

Playing a central part in the construction of reality, the metaphors describing geopolitical Turkey display a highly differential and strongly incoherent image of Turkey. As a principle vehicle of understanding, the representations muddle their clarifying and explanatory character by entangling in ways of defining the places and means that need to be connected or blocked. Metaphor use is in a conscious way orchestrated by- and depended on certain actors, trends and political sequences (Yanik, 2009). Metaphor having the cognitive and conceptual ability of constructing a narrative, combined with the guiding character of representations of

Turkey, found the determining images of Turkey on a basis of controlled capriciousness. Clarifying instruments construct strongly divergent and determining images of Turkey that often are very contradictory. Depending on the author, time frame and goal, the images of Turkey as bridge vary: it connects Europe and Asia, Christianity and Islam, the EU and Central Asia and any other possible division. Their commonality lies in the way Turkey is described as subject to surrounding actors. The expected clarifying function of metaphor is presented as describing pivotal Turkey lacking any form of centralized power. It deters the image of Turkey as a role model and mediator, in dependence of periods of unrest like directly after the 9/11 happenings and after occurrence of the Arab uprisings. Seeking to create some definable image of in-between Turkey, leads to different labels agreeing upon the need for Turkey to connect or foreclose different worlds. Meanwhile, it tangles in what needs to be connected or disclosed. The metaphors as tool for simplifying and imagining, instead functions very much as confounding and dispersing.

The role of using metaphor for the sake of creating a certain perception turns indisputably discursive when notifying the post-colonial charge the metaphors hold. Deconstructing the apprehension of difference and the location of borders regarding EU-Turkey relations, reveal insights that, despite of speaking in terms of connection, point to difference presented in a digital way. The Fleetwood Mac song describes the difference between two places that needs to be bridged. Although the separated lovers feel very much connected, the sea that divides them in a hard way depicts the division line between two places. In the one place the moon rises where at the other place the sun still shines:

"Where are you darlin', when my
Moon is risin', and your
Sun is shinin' down" (Fleetwood Mac, 1997)

At the basis of metaphor use to describe Turkey-EU relations, notwithstanding a positive or negative connotation, unmistakably lays the hardening of difference. Despite of the images steering Turkey to a more transitional zone, I reckon all the different representations to create a digital imaging of the geopolitical region because of the way difference is defined on basis of binaries. For the sake of the EU, economic progress and democratic development are explained in terms of openness, more permeable borders and connections. The tone of the message turns when notifying on Christian-Muslim divides, migration and practically any movement of the 'East' towards the 'West'. Borders of the EU are reconstructed when there is a notion of

adaption, transferring or exchange. Important factor for this apparent unchangeable difference between the EU and Turkey is the way the EU defines difference by religion. In the appliance of the metaphors the East has become a synonym for Islam and Middle East. Turkey as a state with Islam as dominant religion is indisputably part of this Eastern world. In a certain automatic reflex Turkey is called upon its functioning as Muslim country with a reasonably democratic and secular government. This reflex repositions Turkey from standing in the middle to Turkey as the spokesman for- and of Islam. Turkey is characterized as regional power and role model that through its Islamic identity functions as an inspiration to its neighbours. This can be rendered as a typical example of an, at first sight, positive image of Turkey that in the end operates in the construction of a cultural religious barrier. Ultimately, the importance of the distinction between all the representations fades when connections lead back to a relation between Turkey and the EU that is limited by a cultural, religious barrier. The in-between frontier position that Turkey posits seems to diminish difference and hard borders but is grafted upon dichotomies. The way Turkey is described as the in-between, the overlap zone and the connection, proves to be nothing less than a self-affirmative circular reasoning. Through highlighting the Turkish exceptionality, the Turkish liminal position is upheld. On the Turkish borders these binary conceptions of difference are expressed by EU norms and standards, concerning border crossings and the ways exchange between 'the East' and 'the West' should be shaped. This results in borders that might open up for economic exchange but should remain to have the possibility of control maintenance, preferably by the EU.

Postcolonial interferences in EU-Turkey relations can be further noticed in the way the representations take up a Eurocentric posture. Where in the shining sun of the one continent, the EU acts solely out of its own interests; on the other continent the rising moon instigates Turkey's awareness:

"What are you doin', are you

Busy with your world?

Well I wish you were busy with mine" (Fleetwood Mac, 1997)

Turkey-EU relations are fundamentally influenced by the comprehension that the East needs to adapt to the West. European values are understood as some kind of social, economic and cultural standard. 'Inferior Turkey' is imagined as strongly depending on surrounding forces, mainly European ones. The tenacity to civilizational differences, reiterating on EU supremacy and 'Eastern' subordination, postulates a discourse of Turkish dependence on the EU and the

West, whereof the different metaphors form a stock (Hulsse, 2006). Although the stock of metaphors represent Eurocentrism and Turkish dependence in varying degrees, connection is never presented in a way of Turkish development following its own regional strategies. Quite ironic is that the different actors claiming Turkey to be a regional power, substantiate an image of independent and strong Turkey that moves away from the West. Becoming a regional power is projected in a way incoherent with drawing to the EU. Former representations imagined Turkish power with respect to its connections with and dependence on the West. Independent and strong Turkey is treated as a threat. Simultaneously it is interpreted in a way that its centralized power would result in a movement Eastwards, which is somehow viewed as its authentic home. The way Turkish independence is portrayed as a loss for the West, strengthens the assumption that former Turkey-EU relations were valuable for the way Turkey acted in dependence on the EU.

The sea dividing Turkey and the EU is presented as a temporary one that can be overcome. The posture of the EU to found its relations with Turkey on an ongoing relation of inequality, based on religious difference, turn these metaphors of connection into myths that reinforce unbridgeable difference. As already imaged on the late nineteenth- and early twentieth century caricatures (figure iii, iv, vi), Turkey-EU relations seem to continuously develop following the construction of indestructible civilizational borders. The Turks are justified to question themselves what the EU is doing being busy with the importance of their world, instead of deriving their image of Turkey from the legacy of civilizational divides. The complexity and uniqueness of the Turkish state is neglected in the simplifying, controlling images that are projected on Turkey.

"The irony of practical geopolitical representations of place is that, in order to succeed, they actually necessitate the abrogation of genuine geographical knowledge about the diversity and complexity of places as social entities." (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992: 202).

9 Bibliography

Achar, G. (2005). The Clash of Barbarisms. In G. Tuathail, S. Dalby, & P. Routledge, *The Geopolitics Reader* (pp. 270-274). London: Routledge.

Ahmad, A. (1997). Postcolonial Theory and the Post-Condition. *Socialist Register*, 351-381.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1995), *the post-colonial studies reader*. London: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1996). Culture's In-Between. In S. Hall, & P. du Gay, *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 53-86). London: SAGE publications.

Bilgin, P. (2004). A Return to 'Civilisational Geopolitics' in the Mediterranean? Changing Geopolitical Images of the European Union and Turkey in the Post-Cold War Era. *Geopolitics*, , 2 (9), 269–291.

Bilgin, P. (2007). "Only Strong States Can Survive in Turkey's Geography": The uses of "geopolitical truths" in Turkey. *Political Geography* (26), 740-756.

Brown, T. (2003). *Making Truth, metaphor in science.* Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Brydon, D. (1995). The White Inuit Speaks. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin, *the post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 136-142). London: Routledge.

Cameron, L. (1999a). Operationalising 'metaphor' for applied linguistic research. In L. Cameron, & G. Low, *Researching and Applying metaphor* (pp. 3-28). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, L. (1999b). Identifying and describing metaphor in spoken discourse data. In L. Cameron, & G. Low, *Researching and Applying Metaphor* (pp. 105-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, D., Mearill, H. (2007). Bordering Humanism: Life and Death on the Margins of Europe. *Geopolitics* , 248-264.

Carver, T., Pikalo, J. (2008a). In T. Carver, & J. Pikalo, *Political Language and Metaphor, interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 1-11). Abingdon: Routledge.

Carver, T., Pikalo, J. (2008)b. Interpreting and changing the world. In J. Walter, & J. Helmig, *Discursive metaphor analysis* (pp. 119-130). Abingdon: Routledge.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Dahlman, C. (2004). Turkey's Accession to the European Union: The Geopolitics of Enlargement. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* (45), 553-574.

Dalby, S. (1990). American security discourse: the persistence of geopolitics. *Political Geography Quarterly*, 171-188.

Dalby, S. (1991). Critical geopolitics: discourse, difference, and dissent. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* , 9, 261-283.

Dalby, S. (2003). Calling 911: geopolitics, security and America's new war. *Geopolitics* , 3 (8), 61-86.

Dalby, S. (2008). Imperialism, Domination, Culture: The Continued Relevance of Critical Geopolitcs. *Geopolitics*, 413-436.

Dalby, S. (2010). Recontextualising violence, power and nature: The next twenty years of critical geopolitics. *Political Geography* , 280-288.

Dismorr, A. (2008). *Turkey Decoded.* London: Saqi.

Dodds, K. (2001). Political geography III: critical geopolitics after ten years. *Progress in Human Geography , 3* (25), 469-484.

EurActiv. (2001, 19-September). European business lends strong support to enlargement. Brussels, Belgium.

EurActiv. (2002a, 26-March). Turkey calls for start of negotiations on EU membership. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2002b, 08-November). All Change in Ankara. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2002c, 13-December). Cyprus and Turkey: Europe's historic opportunities - Part II. Turkey. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2002d, 01-Januari). Enlargement puts EU credibility on the line - Turkey is the litmus test. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2002e, 15-May). Limits of Turkey's "strategic" partnership with the USA: Issues of Iraq, democratization and the EU. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2002f, 12-November). Reforms and disappointments: Turkey's bid for EU membership. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2002g, 26-September). The "Day After" in Iraq: An Ally's Perspective. Brussels, Belgium.

EurActiv. (2004a, 08-March). Bolkestein: Turkey should be excluded from EU. Brussels, Belgium.

EurActiv. (2004b, 28-October). Turkey: Bridge or bridgehead? Brussels, Belgium.

EurActiv. (2004c, 24-May). Turkey membership will test pluralism of EU, says Patten. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2004d, 16-November). CEPS Turkey in Europe Monitor. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2004e, 16-December). Countries at the crossroads 2005: Turkey. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2004f, 12-April). Interview news Turkey's EU ambassador: Membership will disprove "clash of civilisations". Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2004g, 29-October). The impact of a Turkish entry in the EU. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2004h, 25-October). Turkey in Europe? Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2004i, 28-October). Turkey's European perspective: the German view. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2005a, 27-May). Commission: Enlargement schedule will remain on track. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2005b, 10-February). EU enlargement and the flood-tides of history. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2005c, 22-July). Turkey and democratisation in the Middle East. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2005d, 16-December). Turkish novelist's trial adjourned until February. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2006a, 24-February). EU to encourage dialogue with muslim nations. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2006b, 04-October). Turkish business pushes the case for EU accession. Brussels, Belgium.

EurActiv. (2007, 15-November). Survey: Brussels journalists expect Turkey to join EU. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2008a, 11-July). Turkish businessman: Reform process counts more than actual EU accession. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2008b, 22-January). Vienna theatre stages high-level discussion on Europe. Vienna, Austria.

EurActiv. (2009a, 30-July). Ukraine deputy PM: 'We chose a realistic path to EU integration'.

Euractiv. (2009b, 06-April). Obama stresses Turkey's role in 'civilisation' outreach. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2009c, 21-August). Russia Gazprom unveils strategies for Turkey. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2009d, 05-October). Turkey rides on Irish 'yes' to promote EU entry. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2009e). *www.euractiv.com/EUpriorities*. Retrieved 2012- 27-november from www.euractiv.com

Euractiv. (2010a, 24-December). Ahmadinejad visit shows Turkey's diplomatic emancipation. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2010b, 19-January). Ambassador: 'Turkey punished over Cyprus'. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2010c, 28-January). Eyebrows raised as Turk gets top European job. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2010d, 14-July). Füle: Turkey should have 'zero doubt' about EU's commitment. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2010e, 01-June). Turkey and the West: The end of a partnership? Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2010f, 28-June). Turkey's rise and the decline of pan-Arabism. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2010g, 02-July). Who 'lost' Turkey? Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2011a, 15-February). EU and Turkey reach 'stagnation point' at wrong time. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2011b, 03-March). EU hoists its sails as Arab winds of change grow stronger. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2011c, 11-Januari). Scientist: World heading toward 'energy imperialism'. London, UK.

Euractiv. (2011d, 11-april). Turkey tests 'soft power' in Arab world. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2011e, 12-September). Why crisis between Turkey and Israel is hurting everyone. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2012a, 05-October). EU preparing to ban gas imports from Iran. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2012b, 31-August). German diplomat: Turkey has no illusions about its EU bid. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv. (2012c, 15-October). The EU's Nobel Peace Prize: Better late than never. Brussels, Belgium.

Euractiv.com PLC. (2012d). *http://static.euractiv.com*. Retrieved 2012-01-October from www.euractiv.com:

Gee, J. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis theory and method.* New York: Routledge.

Glucksberg, S. (2001). *Understanding figurative language: from metaphors to idioms.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Graaf, E. (n.d.). [Bridge over Bosphorus river] [Photo]. Retrieved from: http://www.euractiv.com/enlargement/turkey-help-eus-soft-power-ambit-news-223250

Huggan, G., Tiffin, H. (2007). Green Postcolonialism. *International Journal of Postcolonial Studies, 1* (9), 1-11.

Hülsse, R. (2006). Imagine the EU: the metaphorical construction of a supra-nationalist identity. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 9*, 396-421.

Huntington, S. (1993). If Not Civilizations, What? *Foreign Affairs, 5* (72), 186-194.

Huntington, S. (2011). *The Clash of Civilizations.* New York: Simon and Schusters Paperbacks.

Ikiel, C. (2011). A country put aside and perceived to be "the other", yet still alluring. I*nternational Journal of Human Sciences , 2* (8), 653-658.

Inglehart, R., Norris, P. (2003). The True Clash of Civilizations. *Foreign Policy, 135*, 62-70.

JanMohamed, A. (1995). The Economy of Manichean Allegory. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffith, & H. Tiffin, *the post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 18-23). London: Routledge.

Johnson, E. (2005). Proposition 203: A Critical Metaphor Analysis. *The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 1* (29), 69-84.

Kaya, A., Kentel, F. (2005). *Euro-Turks, A Bridge or Breach between Turkey and the European Union.* Center for European Policy Studies. Brussels: Center for European Policy Studies.

Kelly, P. (2006). A Critique of Critical Geopolitics. *Geopolitics* , 24-53.

Kilinç, R. (2009). Turkey and the Alliance of Civilizations: Norm Adoption as a Survival Strategy. *Insight Turkey , 3* (11), 57-75.

Kramsch, O. (2007). Querying cosmopolis at the border of Europe. *Environment and Planning A* (39), 1582-1600.

Kramsch, O. (2002). Reimagining the Scalar Topologies of Cross-border Governance: Eu(ro)regions in the Post-colonial Present. *Space and Polity, 2* (6), 169-196.

Kumar, M. (2000). Postcolonial Theory and Cross-culturalism: Collaborative 'Signposts' of Discursive Practices. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 1* (2).

Kuus, M. (2004). Europe's eastern expansion and the reinscritiption of otherness in East-Central Europe. *Progress in Human Geography*, 472-489.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony, *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lesser, I. (2006). Turkey, the United States and the Delusion of Geopolitics. *Survival, 3* (48), 83-96.

Lobe, J. (2012-08-05). Retrieved 2012-15-05 from www.dewereldmorgen.be: http://www.dewereldmorgen.be/artikels/2012/05/08/relatie-vs-turkije-aan-grondige

McLeod, J. (2000). *Beginning Postcolonialism.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mc Vie, C., Quintella, E. (1997). Temporary one. The Dance Fleetwood Mac [cd]. Burbank California: Warner Brother Studios.

Megoran, N. (2004). The critical geopolitics of the Uzbekistan– Kyrgyzstan Ferghana Valley boundary dispute, 1999–2000. *Political Geography* (23), 731-764.

Minh-Ha, T. (1995). No Master Territories. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin, *the post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 215-218). London: Routledge.

Moisi, D. (2007). The Clash of Emotions Fear, Humiliation, Hope, and the New World Order. *Foreign Affairs, 8.*

Muller, M. (2008). Reconsidering the concept of discourse for the field of critical geopolitics: Towards discourse as language and practice. *Political Geography*, 322-338.

Musolff, A. (2012). The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1-10.

Newman, D. (2006). The lines that continue to separate us: borders in our 'borderless' world. *Progress in Human Geography, 2* (30), 143-161.

Nocci, N. (2011). *Turkey's European Future, behind the scenes of America's influence on EU-Turkey relations.* New York: New York University Press.

Noxolo, P. (2008,). 'Geography is pregnant' and 'geography's milk is flowing': metaphors for a postcolonial discipline? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 1* (26), 146-168.

Ó Tuathail, G., Agnew, J. (1992). Geopolitics and discourse, Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy. *Political Geography, 2* (11), 190-204.

Ó Tuathail, G. (2000). The Postmodern Geopolitical Condition: States, Statecraft, and Security at the Millenium. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 166-178.

Ó Tuathail, G. (2006). Thinking Critically about Geopolitics. In G. Tuathail, S. Dalby, & P. Routledge, *The Geopolitics Reader* (pp. 1-14). New York: Routledge.

Ó Tuathail, G., Dalby, S., & Routledge, P. (2006). *The Geopolitics Reader.* New York: Routledge.

Ogozlu, H. (2002). The clash of security identities The question of Turkey's membership in the European Union. *International Journal*, 579-603.

Ponterotto, D. (2000). The cohesive role of cognitive metaphor in discourse and conversation. In A. Barcelona, *Metaphor and Metonym at the Crossroads, a cognitive perspective* (pp. 283-298). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Powel, B. (2009). A clash of norms: normative power and EU democracy promotion in Tunisia. *Democratization, 1* (16), 193-214.

Rigo, E. (2005). Citizenship at Europe's Borders: Some Reflections on the Post-colonial Condition of Europe in the Context of EU Enlargement. *Citizenship Studies, 1* (9), 3-22.

Said, E. (2005). The Clash of Ignorance. In G. Tuathail, S. Dalby, & P. Routledge, *The Geopolitics Reader* (pp. 146-149). London: Routledge.

Sandikcioglu, E. (2000). More metaphorical warfare in the Gulf: Orientalist frames in news coverage. In A. Barcelona, *Metaphor and Metonym at the Crossroads, a cognitive perspective* (pp. 300-357). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sangari, K. (1995). The Politics of the Possible. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin, *the post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 143-147). London: Routledge.

Schrank, P. (2009). [Prime minister Erdogan looking Eastwards] [Animation image]. Retrieved from: http://www.economist.com/node/14753776

Sözen, A. (2011). A Paradgim Shift in Turkish Foreign Policy: Transitions and Challenges. *Turkish Studies , 1* (11), 103-123.

[Turkish boy put in corner]. (1913). *Settled* [Image of sketch]. Retrieved from: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30678/30678-h/30678-h.htm

[Turkish man in swimwear]. (1908). *The Salt-Water Cure* [Image of sketch]. Retrieved from: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30678/30678-h/30678-h.htm

[Turkish man on treadmill] *Alla Turca: The Turkish Sisyphean Task* [Animation image]. [ca. 2010]. Retrieved from: http://studentthinktank.eu/blogs/alla-turca-the-turkish-sisyphean-task/

[Turkish man reading prospectus]. (1896). *Turkey Limited* [Image of sketch]. Retrieved from: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30678/30678-h/30678-h.htm

van Houtum, H. F., Strüver, A. (2002). Borders, Strangers, Doors and Bridges. *Space & Polity, 2* (6), 141-146.

Yanik, L. K. (2009). The Metamorphosis of Metaphors of Vision: "Bridging" Turkey's Location, Role and Identity After the End of the Cold War. *Geopolitics, 3* (14), 531-549.

Yanik, L. (2011). Constructing Turkish "exceptionalism": Discourses of liminality and hybridity in post-Cold War Turkish foreign policy. *Political Geography,* (30), 80-89.