Turkish nationalism and the Kurdish question

Group 13

Mathias Koue Hansen – 52103

Nadia Nebbelunde – 55454

Julian Lo Curlo – 52786

Mathilde Søvig Bergmann Christensen - 52319

Total number of characters: 124,413.

Abstract

This project focuses on the Kurdish question in Turkey and how the nationalist project of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk has had an important responsibility on the creation of the conflict.

For decades Turkey has been officially fighting for creating a homogenous nation under the principles of Kemalism.

This nationalistic objective has been causing problems when it comes to recognition of ethnic minorities living in the Turkish country. Ethnic minorities have been openly showing signs of rejection to the measures of national assimilation, which have been criticised by human rights NGOs as Human Rights Watch for being considered repressive.

The Kurdish population has been the ethnic minority, which has been, hit the hardest by this sort of measures, leading them to a conflict that has been going on for almost a century.

This project will go through analysing the impact that the Turkish nationalist plan had on the conflict, starting from understanding the theoretical roots of it using Kant's Perpetual Peace theory.

Finally this project will seek to find further solutions to the conflict through analysing the benefits of the construction of a multicultural Turkish state.

Table of content

__Introduction__

Turkey is a vast country of almost 70 million people (Yildiz, 2005), spanning huge areas and two continents. Since the 1960's Turkey has sought to connect themselves to the EU more and have since 2004 been considered a candidate for accession into the EU. This, however, has proven problematic on several grounds, but particularly due to a history of suppressing the large Kurdish minority living in Turkey. The recognition as a people has been completely neglected by the Turkish state, who seeks to make the Turkish population a unisone one. This has resulted in continuous neglect of human rights and a persistent ruthless resistance against numerous Kurdish uprisings (Yildiz, 2005).

The nationalistic project of Turkey started after the revolution led by Atatürk, who wanted to build a common and culturally homogenous Turkey. This nation building idea had the Kurdish population as a main obstacle, since they wanted to maintain their ethnic status as Kurds within Turkey. Atatürk was not able to predict that the Kurdish question would have been the wall that would have stopped his nationalist project.

Through the attempt of nationalistic homogenization led by the Turkish government, tensions were raised within the country, making the solution of the problem even more difficult.

In the late 1970's a Kurdish revolutionary group raised arms against the Government, demanding an independent state of Kurdistan, where Kurdish people could live without being dependent of Turkey. The group was called *Kurdistan Workers' Party* (PKK) and was led by Abdullah Öcalan, who in 1999 was imprisoned for life, after the Turkish Government managed to suppress the PKK.

Contrary of what the Turkish Government considered, the relations between the Kurdish population and the Turkish state did not become better. Even if the Turkish government defeated militarily the PKK, it did not start a process of solving the roots of the conflict, bringing the relations between Kurds and the Turkish government to a state of constant tension.

The constant unrest between the Kurdish minority and the Turkish government has hit the civilian population at large, and made the attempt to live according to Kurdish customs impossible through many years. The Kurds have not been allowed to use their own language and celebrations of Kurdish holidays have been surrounded by unrest and violence.

Though the situation has been persistent for almost a century, Turkey has continuously made attempts to move closer to the Western world and particularly the EU. With this attempt, it has been stressed that the lack of human rights, and especially the incessant violation of them, has made it impossible for Turkey to be included in the European Union so far. Even though improvements on this area has appeared during the last decade, Turkey is still far from living up to the standards required by the EU, and the Kurdish minority remains, at large, one that is marginalized from the rest of the population.

This project will attempt to shed a light on the conflict between the Turkish state and the Kurdish minority that accounts for 23 percent of the Turkish population. We want to look at how the Turkish state project of becoming a homogenous nation based on the Atatürk's ideals (as stated in their second article of their constitution) is having a negative effect on the Kurdish population, as well as looking for possible alternatives to the nationalist solution.

Problem area

Right now Turkey finds itself hosting two different ethnic populations within the same country, and one is dominating the other (Yildiz, 2013). This domination by the Turks has lead to suppression of the Kurds in many ways, including the disregarding of basic Human Rights and massive violations of such (Yildiz, 2013). A state of persistent unrest has been the defining feature of this conflict since the beginning, at times escalating into actual armed confrontations (Yildiz, 2013).

It is true that in the last five years Turkey has made some advances on the area of Human Rights, and have started a peace process with the PKK, but those advances are still limited and the implementation of policies on this level tend to be poor and badly coordinated (Barak, 2005). The conflict has been ongoing for almost a century and Ataturk's attempt of building a monotone society representing one united ethnic Turkey has proved to be filled with tensions that will not

turn tranquil as long as the state of Turkey refuses to realize the multiculturalism of their realm (Yildiz, 2013).

Recurring conflict between the Turks and the Kurds, also known as the Kurdish question, has revolved around the nonexistent recognition of a Kurdish minority within Turkey (Barak, 2005). No ethnic minority is acknowledged within Turkey, and the expression of the wish to be acknowledged has led to multiple situations of unrest and collisions between the state and the Kurdish minority, especially with the Kurdish political party PKK, who have sought Kurdish political representation within the government through many years (Barak, 2005). It has so far not been possible to solved the Kurdish question, and thereby create peace between the Turks and the Kurds. However it can be imagined that the conflict could be solved through a peace process, and we have thereby chosen the "Perpetual Peace process of Immanuel Kant, which contributes with consideration upon why conflict occurs in a given society, (Kant, 1792). this will be implemented in our working question, and further described throughout our theoretical framework, and in our analysis.

It can be assumed that the tension between the Kurdish and the Turkish population is caused by the lack of recognition of the Kurdish as a people and a minority, it is very relevant to look to the constitution of Turkey to get an idea of how they are presented. It is evident from the start that the state of Turkey is built upon the notions of Atatürk and clear nationalistic ideas (Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, 1961). It is also clear that there is no mentioning of any ethnic minorities. In fact, there is no mentioning of minorities throughout the entirety of the constitution. All persons within the state of Turkey are awarded fundamental rights and freedoms through article 12 (Constitution of the Republic of Turkey 1961), but throughout the constitution, it is also evident that these rights and freedoms can be immediately restricted with reference to national security. It is this derogation from rights and freedoms of the people of Turkey that seems to be the grounding of the regularly occurring infringements on the rights of the Kurds, especially in regards to their expression of wishes of recognition (Yildiz, 2013).

The history of modern Turkey has been characterized by the implementation of nationalistic notions that, basically, wipe out the multitude of cultural backgrounds of the region (Yildiz, 2013). Since Atatürk's accession into power, what was the multicultural and –ethnical Ottoman

Empire has become the monotone and confrontational state of Turkey seeking to eliminate minority culture and maximize the unity and strength of the Turkish state (Yildiz, 2013).

Our interest lies both in understanding to what extend Turkish nationalism is in the roots of the conflict and how it could be possible to amend it through the creation of a multicultural state.

Research question

To what extend has Kemalist nationalism incited the Kurdish question in Turkey and which solutions can multiculturalism contributed with?

Working questions

1- How can Kant's "perpetual peace process" help us understand the roots of the of the conflict?

2- To what extent has Kemalist nationalism had an impact in the conflict?

3- What solutions can multiculturalism bring to the conflict?

Concepts

In the following, we will outline the main three concepts we are using in our project: ethnicity, nation-nationalism and multiculturalism.

Ethnicity

The term 'ethnicity' is used to describe a group of people who share a common history, language, the same cultural and religious background. These are the key features of defining a person's or a group's ethnicity. There is no distinction between an ethnic majority and an ethnic minority in terms of defining features, as they both exhibit the common characteristics revealed above. It should be noted that all ethnicities are unique, as well as the composition of "ethnic features" shown by any specific ethnic group. An ethnicity is a cultural or social phenomenon, and therefore is not something you are born with, but rather something you "learn" or "experience" during your upbringing. In the same way, the level of connection an individual feels to his or her ethnicity varies from person to person. Some may feel strongly about their ethnic origins, while others may not.

(Bunar and Valentia, in Aakvaag et al. 2012)

An ethnic description of the differences and similarities between the Turks and Kurds

To further elaborate on the concept of ethnicity, we find it necessary to give a picture of what we see as distinctions between the Kurds and the Turks.

Although they do share some common history in their connection to the Ottoman Empire, Islam being the dominant religious creed and both having an origin as nomadic steppe culture (Kia, 2004), there are undoubtedly people from both Turkish and Kurdish (or people with both) ethnic backgrounds that do not identify themselves as neither ethnically Turk nor Kurd (Kocher, 2007).

It is also important to stress that it is technically impossible to pinpoint a certain ethnic distinction that all people from an ethnic group can agree upon. The individuals from the Turkish or Kurdish ethnic group might all agree that they are Turkish, but there might be many different opinions on what constitutes the ethnic composition of being Turkish or Kurdish. People might put more or less emphasis on the different components of the given ethnicity. While some may be secular, others might be religious, some might have left-leaning political standpoints while others have right-leaning ones, some might feel very nationalistic, while other might have a cosmopolitan outlook on life. Variations can also be noted between different social classes, the list of variables goes on almost indefinitely (Hutchinson & Smith, 1996). In order to at least have some comprehensible characteristics to distinguish one group from another by, we have chosen the common features put forward by Bunar & Valenta, "Language and religion, a common ancestry, culture and emotional attachments are among the most important." (Bunar & Valenta, 2012)

So to try and give the reader an understanding of what we consider characteristic for the respective group, we will give a description of Kurdish and Turkish ethnic identities using the notions from the common feature, mentioned above.

Starting with language, there is definitely a difference between the Turks and Kurds. The Turkish language is part of the Turkic language family, which is member of the Altai family of language, which also includes several central Asian languages (Slobin, Dan I., Zimmer, Karl E, 1986).

Kurdish on the other hand is part of the Indo-European language family, with Kumanji (also called Northern Kurdish Dialects group) being the main dialect spoken by the Kurds in Turkey (Kurdish Academy of Language, 2014). Both for the Turkish and the Kurdish population, the Sunni muslim denomination as the majority religion (CIA World Factbook, 2014). The last criteria is a bit more difficult to prove in relation to our project, as there are many different opinions or narratives on the common ancestry, culture and emotional attachment of the Turkish and Kurdish people.

They both stem from nomadic tribes who arrived to Anatolia and Kurdistan (Kia, 2004) and they both have a mutual connection to the Ottoman Empire, where the Turks formed the elite upper class, with the Sultan being a Turk, and the Kurdish population were living in a rather autonomous but insignificant part of the fringe of an empire with a multitude of ethnic groups. This setup in the modern Turkish republic changed, with the Turks still forming the political elite and the Kurds becoming the biggest minority in Turkey (Kia, 2004). There is also a cultural difference between the two groups, and the Young Turks created a unique and exclusive culture that rejected the Kurd's, living within Turkish borders, culture and made efforts to culturally assimilate the Kurds.

Nation - Nationalism

The concept of a nation is shaped by three main aspects, cultural, political and psychological factors. Meaning that in order to describe a nation these three aspects is indispensable (Heywood, 2014). A nation is hold together by people who share common values, languages, religion and traditions (Smith, 1998). However in order to create a nation, it is not essential to only share values, languages, religion and traditions, it is furthermore essential to have a community who aims to gain political power, and thereby create a sovereignty political state (Smith, 1998). Nations I build upon nationalism, and nationalism is thereby based on some of the same factors and values, as nations are (Smith, 1998). There is different terms of nationalism, which will be described in the theoretical part (Smith, 1998).

The concept of a nation is shaped by three main aspects, cultural, political and psychological factors. Meaning that in order to describe a nation these three aspects is indispensable (Heywood, 2014). A nation is hold together by people who share common values, languages, religion and traditions (Smith, 1998). However in order to create a nation, it is not essential to only share

values, languages, religion and traditions, it is furthermore essential to have a community who aims to gain political power, and thereby create a sovereignty political state (Smith, 1998). Nations I build upon nationalism, and nationalism is thereby based on some of the same factors and values, as nations are (Smith, 1998). There is different terms of nationalism, which will be described in the theoretical part (Smith, 1998).

Multiculturalism

We will be using Fleras explanation of the concept of multiculturalism, which he describes as "*a set of principles, policies, and practices for accommodating diversity as a legitimate and integral component of society*".

Methodology

We have in our project chosen to use a deductive approach, in order to outline the relationship between our theories and our research (Bryman, 2013). We can justify our use of the deductive method, due to the fact that our theories are the foundation of our project, and we have thereby constructed our research around the theories. Our research question is based upon our theoretical framework, and the theories should thereby help us answering our research question. The theories we have based our research around are: nationalism, multiculturalism, ethnicity and Kant's Perpetual Peace theory. We have based our hypothesis on our theoretical approaches, meaning that we have constructed our hypothesis upon our theoretical findings. Our hypothesis is stated as follows: *"at the root of the conflict lies the lack of equality created by the Kemalist nationalist approach of the Turkish state, that can be solved by the construction of a multicultural state."*

Furthermore we have implemented theories that go in depth of how nationalism has affected the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds. Kemalism has especially been taken into account, in order to understand the terms of nationalism within Turkey and to gain a fundamental understanding of the lack of equality between the Turks and the Kurds.
In order to understand the equality problems that exist in Turkey we have chosen to go in depth in the concept of ethnicity, as ethnicity has a vital role in the theory of nationalism.

On the basis of the aforementioned we are aware that the theories could help us to gain knowledge on the reasons of the arisen of the conflict.

According to our hypothesis we find nationalism and especially Kemalism as the creators of the conflict, while we consider multiculturalism as a potential solution, if there is any solution to be find.

Kant's Perpetual Peace theory is important to our project as we have investigated whether or not it is possible to gain peace through the perspectives Kant's theory is based on. We have used our findings and our empirical data, to determine whether or not our hypothesis is correct.

As stated before the first approach within our project was to gain knowledge about our theoretical framework. however have we acknowledged that the theory written by Kant is two hundred years old, and even though it is still useful, we is aware of the necessity of examine other theories, in order to gain an indication of whether or not the theory of Kant could still be sustained by more modernized theories. Furthermore our theories required assembly of data that could reject or support our hypothesis.

Our scientific foundation is based on a constructivist ontological view, meaning that we find social phenomena to be continuously accomplished through social as well as external factors (Bryman, 2013). In relation to our research question it is possible to assume that the knowledge gained from our theories can be used as a tool to accomplish a solution of the conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish population, and at the same time consider if the nationalism really are the funder of the conflict. Furthermore our epistemological considerations conclude a perspective approach, meaning that knowledge should be interpreted, perceived and foremost be understood within the context it is produced (Bryman 2013:27). In relation to our epistemological approach we have analysed our theoretical framework, in order to understand the knowledge it has given us.

Content and document analysis

We have chosen to use the content analysis as our main qualitative method, is based upon our deductive approach.

Content analysis is a method to analyse written, verbal or other forms of communication of messages (Satu & Helvig, 2007). The content analysis is also known as a method to analyse documents, the analysis of content allows the researcher to test theoretical issues to enhance understanding of the data (Satu & Helvig, 2007). Content analysis is primary used in order to gain insight and thereby knowledge upon the gathered data (Satu & Helvig, 2007).

As mentioned before, we have chosen to use a deductive approach in this project, due to the fact that we decided to gather data about our theoretical framework from the beginning of the research, consequently we built our findings around our theories. If we instead had based our theoretical framework upon our findings it would have been necessary to use an inductive approach within methods (Brymann, 2012). The aim of the content analysis of documents is to gain enough knowledge and thereby understand the data completely in order to prepare the work of the analysis (Brymann, 2012).

The content document analysis will be based upon our, already described, deductive approach. The approach can be used to withdraw information from the content of text data, which is important in order to answer our research question, and thereby test of hypothesis (Satu & Helvig, 2007).

The goal of using a document analysis is to gain further knowledge about the chosen theory and our empirical data. Meaning that in use of a directed approach to content analysis, it becomes possible to extend or validate further on a theoretical framework (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005:5). The directed approach has therefore been helpful in order to answer our research question. The directed content approach can help predictions about the variables of interest or about the relationship among variables, which can help to determine the initial coding scheme or relationship between codes (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005:5). Coding can provide overview in order to sort out the irrelevant data we might have been collected.

In our project have we used several data such as books, articles, interviews and reports. In our project have we therefore used coding in order to find relevant data, especially in our empirical data has coding been beneficial. The empirical data we are using are reports, which are conducted with essential knowledge. In order to connect our analysis with our theoretical

framework, we have used coding to find the relevant keywords and concepts in our empirical data. Within nationalism have we highlighted the passages which could be "nationalism" orientated, in order to connect the theories with our findings. In the beginning of our project where we centred around human rights, and by using coding in a human rights oriented way we discovered some new concepts, such as individuality, equality and ethnicity which became very important in the development in our project.

Our project is based on a current topic, which means that there has been a lot of data available, which has been at times confusing and ideologically biased.Coding has thereby contributed to create an overview upon our collected data, and thereby make it more manageable to define whether or not it is important to our research question.

However it is necessary to make sure that the coding process does not become bias, if so, it is difficult to determine whether or not the text is relevant.

It has been particularly challenging not to appear biased in our research, due to the fact that a lot of our research, and especially our empirical data shares the opinion that the Turks has acted wrong regarding the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds in Turkey. In order to maintain our objectivity we have used data which has taken the Turkish side of the conflict, and the Kurdish side as well. In this way we have been able to create a more objective opinion of the data we have collected.

Especially the theories of nationalism provided us with very different points of view on the subject, which has made possible to find our own standpoint through the analysis on whether or not nationalism has had any impact on the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds.

Advantages of content document analysis

Regarding our project and our data collection, the main advantage of the content analysis method, has been the revolving around existing data and theory that has been extended and supported.

Regarding our deductive approach the content analysis has been helpful, in order to find data which has helped us to form our hypothesis and later helped us to either reject or confirm it. Through the use of content document analysis our project has gained essential sources and

concepts we might had neglected if we had used another approach within methods. The approach has provided our research with structure and we have created a better overview upon how our research should be conducted in our project.

Disadvantages of content document analysis

Whilst the directed content approach does not pose any disadvantages or challenges to the naturalistic paradigm, the usage of theories has some inherent limitations, due to the fact that a researcher approach a given subject with an informed but, nonetheless notable bias (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005:7). Meaning that the researcher has a tendencies to gather findings that are supportive to the chosen theory. However it is important to be critical and thereby be capable to come up with findings that might as well are non-supportive as supportive to the theory. Furthermore, it is important to be aware of the fact that the structure of the theory and our data might guide us in a specific direction.

Choice of theory

Our choice of theory is reflected in our methods. Our theories are the foundations of our research question, and it should thereby make it possible for us to describe and elaborate upon our theories, in order to use them in our analysis. The fundament of our analysis is based upon our findings, our empirical data and our theories. During our analysis we will analyse how our theories can be implemented with our empirical data. The discussion will be based on the advantages and disadvantages by implementing our theories and or analysis regarding the conflict in Turkey, which we will argue for and against. At least will we use our theories, analyses and our discussion to conclude whether or not our hypothesis sustains.

The first theory applied in our assignment is the perpetual peace theory by Immanuel Kant, the theory describes the theoretical bases of peaceful societies. The theory has helped us to gain understanding upon what are the motives of the Kurdish question and whether or not it is possible to gain peace between the Kurds and Turks in Turkey. We have used the theory to outline how it is possible to gain peace, according to Kant, substantially has the theory implemented with knowledge regarding peace processes.

The second theory is the theory of nationalism, which covers primordialism, modernism and Kemalism. The theory of nationalism is applied in our project to answer whether or not nationalism has any impact on the conflict.

In the nationalism part we will reference to Benedict Anderson, Andrew Heywood and Anthony D. Smith.

The Theories will propose a discussion on the development of nationalism, and how it aroused from primordialist to modernist thinking.

The last theory we have implemented in our theoretical framework is the theory of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism will be focusing on, how to gain peace in a given society which includes multiple cultures.

Multiculturalism will thereby give us the necessary knowledge of how it is possible to create a multicultural society.

Theory of multiculturalism can be seen as the opposite to the theories of nationalism, and especially kemalism (Heywood, 2014).

As mentioned before will kemalism be applied in our theory part, we are aware that kemalism is more an ideology than a theory. However is the ideology of kemalism essential in order to do our analysis.

Stated before is our hypothesis created out from the knowledge and the perspectives our theories can apply with. Furthermore have we based our project upon the knowledge we have gain from the theories

Use of empirical data

The empirical data employed in this project is mainly based on reports, which we have used to gain knowledge in order to elaborate on in our analysis. In the following we will describe how we employed the different empirical data and how we will process them. The documents we have used in our project and analysed as empirical data are: the constitution of the republic of Turkey, Human Rights Watch report on human rights in Turkey of 2014 and the European Commission Progress Report of Turkey of 2014.

The constitution have been used to gain understanding of how the Turkish state is build, and which norms, traditions and cultures they value in the constitution. Furthermore the constitution has allowed us to gain knowledge within the applicable laws and regulations in Turkey. We have especially based or second part of the analysis upon the constitution, due to create understanding of the current form of nationalism. As we will describe in the second part of our analysis, the constitution is based on the fundaments of Kemalism and it has therefore an important impact on the constitution. The constitution has provided us with information that has been useful, particularly in our analysis. Furthermore the constitution has been essential in order to understand the rules of different majorities and ethnic groups in Turkey, and has thereby created the fundament of how the theory of nationalism can be applied in our analysis.

The reports of the Human Rights Watch and the European Commission Progress Report, has both been used to gain knowledge upon the conflict in Turkey, but especially in order to understand the laws which has been implemented regarding different minorities (Human right watch). Both of the reports will be used in part of the analysis, in order to elaborate on why the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds has yet not been solved, and how human rights can be helpful in order to gain peace. The two reports will especially be used in our analysis of multiculturalism. We have used the reports to understand what our concepts included, meaning how we for example defined an ethnic group, or how do we defined equality.

<u>Delimitations</u>

The main limitation regarding our research and collections of data, is the limitation that occurs when we have only implemented written data. Meaning that we have based our entire project upon theories, books, articles and reports. We have thereby written our analysis, discussion and conclusion upon directions of theorist and academics, and not from the citizens actually living in Turkey. The lack of gathering data from elsewhere means that we have not been provided with opinions from citizens of Turkey, neither Turks nor Kurds. It could have been a possibility to gather data from books or articles written by citizens of Turkey. Furthermore could it have been a possibility to do interviews with representatives from each of the groups, in order to gain insight in how the conflict is seen from each of the representatives. The main limitations of not

taking interviews into account, has been the possibility to gain knowledge upon how bad the conflict has been, and how it is, seen from to different and thereby important perspectives.

Another limitation is that we have not been taking generations into account. Meaning that we could have taking into account how it has affected the different generations. And hypothesis could have been, that the elder generation is appropriately more affected by the conflict, than the younger generation is. we can imagine that the younger generation has become more integrated than the older generation. it can therefore be argued that the older generation is still attaches to the Kurdish culture, whereas the younger generation might been raised in accordiance with the Turkish culture, due to the changes that have occurred over the years.

As we have chosen to use a content document analysis, we are aware that we might become bias in form of choosing side in the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds in Turkey. We have mentioned the biasness before, and defended it by chosen different data, in order to avoid being bias. However we do still see it as delimitation, due to the fact, that it became clear, early in the project that most of our data has been supportive about the Kurds, and thus accusatory against the Turks. In order to avoid being to bias have we used a lot of time reading different articles, reports and books which has delayed out process of writing, we saw it as a necessity to gain all the knowledge about our topic, but we could defiantly have been more critical about our research, and thereby started our process of writing earlier. It shall not be understood as, we have used data that is not important regarding our project, but we have defiantly used lot of time reading data which has been useless to our project, due to the many times we changed our research question. The content document analysis has helped us to find the data, and has therefore been very useful, but we have not managed to be critical enough before very late in the writing process.

The above mentioned has created a massive time pressure upon us, due to the fact that we became aware of our research question and thereby hypothesis very late in the process.

A history of Turkey and the Kurdish people, set within the scope of our project

Turkey

In this part we will give a short account of the background history of the modern Republic of Turkey, looking at how the former, relatively tolerant, multicultural and -ethnic Ottoman Empire, through the founding of the highly centralized and nationalistic Turkish republic, came to be the one it is this present day.

The predecessor of Turkey, the Ottoman Empire, was formed over the remnants of the old Byzantine Empire, by Turkish tribes who migrated into Anatolia from the Asian steppes. By the 17th century the Ottoman empire spanned from the Balkans and Crimea in the north, to Caucasus and Persia in the east, Egypt in the south and the Berber states in the west, forming a relatively vast multi-ethnic multilingual empire with a predominantly sunni-muslim population, ruled from Constantinople (Istanbul) by a Sultan (monarch) and a self-proclaimed Caliph (Kia, 2008). Starting in the 18th century, the Ottoman empire began to crumble, weighed down by internal instability and the emerging of European great powers, who started to chip away at the empire, until it finally collapsed after being defeated, along with the other members of the Entente alliance, in the First World War and had to give up all territory beyond the borders of the modern day Turkey (Kia, 2008).

A further description of the impact Kemalism had on minorities will follow later in the project, but this part will touch more upon the historical aspects of the implementation of the Kemalist ideology on the Turkish society.

The period in and around the First World War gave rise to a cadre of nationalistic officers called the 'Young Turks', with Mustafa Kemal Pasha "Atatürk", recognised as the founding father of the modern Turkish nation, as its central figure. The "young Turks" went on to "modernise" Turkey into a highly secularised, centralized and republican nation state with a parliament, and

its seat of government was established to be placed in Ankara. In its first constitution, dating from 1924, voting rights were granted (with women gaining them in 1934), but the Young Turks dominated Turkish politics for many years to come (Howard, 2001). Many traditional Islamic values and practices were abandoned during the early years of the Turkish republic, among other things, wearing veils in public buildings and polygamy was outlawed. The Arabic script and calendar was also dropped in favour of a Latinised alphabet and a Gregorian calendar. The economy was centrally planned with the state having a monopoly on many aspects of the economy. A public school system was formed and Turkish was made the official language, while publishing in other languages was prohibited (Howard, 2001). All these steps taken by the Young Turks were made in an effort to create a strong centralised state, based on a distinctly Turkish national cultural identity. Minorities were looked upon with scepticism and many of their customs and values were outlawed in an effort to assimilate them into the general Turkish population (Barkey & Fuller, 1998).

After the second world war Turkey was accepted into both the United Nations, NATO, OECD and the council of Europe, and during the Cold war, Turkey was aligned with the Western World. Also during this time, the republic evolved into a multi-party democracy, with the economy shifting towards a capitalist market-economy (Howard, 2001).

Starting from the 1960's Turkey experienced a number of military coups led by officers that felt that the arguing and bickering of the parties in the parliament; on which direction the republic should go, was damaging to the integrity of the state and that the military could not accept Turkey going away from the ideas and visions of its founding fathers, the Young Turks. The military took on a role as a state within the state, the so-called *deep state*. (Öktem, 2011)

Also, during this era a new constitution was implemented where, among other things, a limited right of freedom of speech, rudimentary welfare rights and rights to strike and form unions were granted. The last military government ran from 1980 to 1993, at the same time the PKK (Kurdistan's Worker's Party), started to escalate its violent struggle for Kurdish independence. Since then the military's influence over the Turkish republic has waned, and today it does not have any direct power of the Turkish government. This is no less thanks to the so called *Ergenekon trials*, where hundreds of military officers and military supporters were charged for trying to subvert the elected government and seeking to raise popular opinion in favour for possible future military coups (Öktem, 2011).

Today, compared to previous conditions, Turkey has embarked on a road towards reforms and parliamentarism (Öktem, 2011).

The Kurds

In this part we will try to give the reader an outlook on the Kurdish population's history in Turkey, within in the context of the Turkish history, which is accounted for above.

The Kurdish people is the worlds biggest ethnic group without a nation, they are the majority people in certain regions in the countries of Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Turkey as well as numerous large minority communities in other countries around the world (Yildiz, 2005). As our project will focus on the Kurdish minority of Turkey, their history will mainly be summarized in the context of that country.

Somewhat similar to the Turks, the Kurdish people originated as a nomadic tribal people, who eventually settled in the mountainous northern region of of the Middle East, what some today would call 'Kurdistan'. In the 16th century this region fell under the rule of the rapidly expanding sunni muslim Ottoman empire. By this time a majority of the Kurdish people had converted to the muslim faith. The Ottoman empire did, at that point, not regard the Kurds as a distinct ethnic group because it was categorizing its population into muslims and non-muslims (Kia, 2008). Because of the vastness of the empire many regions of the empire were granted local autonomy, particularly the Kurdish parts were granted extensive autonomy. These areas were ruled by a local kurdish *military governor* (*sancak bey*), a title that was hereditary and whose main obligation to the Sultans was to collect taxes and provide manpower to the Sultan's armies (Kia, 2008). Because the Kurds shared the same sunni Muslim faith as the ruling Turkish elite, they were able to advance into the *upper social strata* (the *askeri*) (Kia, 2008). Only in the later period of the empire did an increased effort of centralization start to cause resentment and unrest in the Kurdish area (Zürcher, 2004). This rearrangement changed after the First World War when the Young Turks came to power in the newly formed stated of Turkey.

As mentioned before, The Young Turks founded the modern Turkish Republic, with the intent of forming a highly centralized and "westernized" state. Initially, Ataturk sought the support of the Kurdish people in the fight against the Greek and the Western powers' military incursion into to

Turkey. But when the situation stabilized in favour of the Turkish, the attitude, towards the Kurdish segment of the population, turned sour and the Turks started to suppress the Kurds in an effort to try and assimilate them, along the lines of the new national Turkish identity they were creating (Barkey & Fuller, 1998).

Publishing and educating in Kurdish was banned by the central government in Ankara, along with celebrating Kurdish holidays, traditions and customs. But after decades of Turkish government oppression, the Kurdish initiated revolts (Barkey & Fuller, 1998).

Around 1980, PKK (Kurdistan's Worker's Party) a left-wing freedom fighter/terrorist movement, started its campaign to gain independence, fighting with guerrilla warfare tactics in the predominantly mountainous terrain of southeastern Turkey, while also conducting terrorist attacks in Turkish cities (Barkey & Fuller, 1998).

The PKK was not the first group of Kurds who was rebelling against the Turkish regime in Ankara, and initially the PKK was at odds with other Kurdish insurgents groups, but it soon proved to be the most potent and powerful rebel group, that the Turkish government had had to face. The political goal for the PKK, during its early stages, was the creation of an independent "pan-Kurdish" state, seeking both a political and a social revolution, as envisioned by the Marxist-Leninist ideology that the PKK based their political program on, with the Turkish state playing the role of the capitalist oppressor state and the Kurds playing the role of the disenfranchised proletariat. Today the PKK claims it has abandoned its Marxist-Leninist ideology behind, as a relic from the Cold War, but Barkey & Fuller argues that it still retains some of its elements, notably the Leninist idea of 'democratic centralization' (Barkey & Fuller, 1998).

The early PKK military campaign was met with brutal counter-attacks by the Turkish armed forces and security units; a general curfew was introduced in the Kurdish parts of Turkey, which was only lifted in the late 2000's (Öktem, 2011). In 1999 the leader of the PKK, Abdullah Öcalan, was arrested in Kenya and was transferred into Turkish custody. He is now imprisoned for life by the Turkish authorities, but he still continues to play an important role in mediating a peace-settlement between the Kurdish population and the central government, with the PKK talking about "...a political settlement within the existing borders of Turkey" (Barkey & Fuller, 1998:25). A peace agreement that seems to move closer towards realisation after the thawing up in the relationship between the two parts in the late 2000's, which also saw the lifting of the

curfew and lifting of the ban of publishing educating in the Kurdish language (Öktem, 2011) (Barkey & Fuller, 1998).

Note: We are aware of the on-going conflict in Syria and Iraq, that started after the "Arab Spring", and seems to cause complications in the peace process between the Kurds and Turkey. But at this stage we have chosen not to include it in our assessment of the situation, because of its immediate and ongoing nature, we have concluded that bringing it into our project will be too speculative.

Understanding Kemalist nationalism

In understanding the conflict between the Turkish and the Kurdish population of Turkey, it is important to understand the origins of the political environment of the modern day Republic of Turkey, and through this part, an account of how the implications of the creation of The Republic of Turkey will provide a further understanding of the conditions of the Kurdish (as well as other minorities)   population   in   Turkey   at   that   time.

Since the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, Kemalism has been, and remains, a determinant factor of political initiatives (Smith, 2005). To grasp the extent of Kemalism in Turkey, we will dig into the history of how Kemalism influenced all areas of Turkish society during the early stages of the Republic. Although Kemalism is not explicitly stated as a political foundation in the Turkish constitution of today, the preamble clearly states that; "*Affirming the eternal existence of the Turkish Motherland and Nation and the indivisible unity of the Sublime Turkish State, this Constitution, in line with the concept of nationalism introduced by the founder of the Republic of Turkey, Atatürk, the immortal leader and the unrivalled hero, and his reforms and principles(…)*" (Constitution of The Republic of Turkey, as amended 1995, preamble:1). This tells us that both the juridical and the political foundation of the country is still based on the notions first introduced by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, and will lend relevance to our further investigation of how this situation came to be, and how the historical impact of it is still influencing Turkish society today.

As our project's main focus is the Kurds in Turkey, our investigation into the history of Kemalist nationalism extends primarily to how it affected the minorities within Turkey.

As we have already established, a nation consist of a multitude of characteristics, and there are many contributory and contrasting aspects that are valued differently by various political thinkers. Even so, when looking at the grounding for the early Republic of Turkey, one definition of a nation is given to us by the Republican People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi,* CHP), the party founded by Atatürk and the other Young Turks, who governed from 1923-1945, is one of 'political and social community formed by citizens bound by a unity of language, culture and ideal' (Rance, 2012). This perception of a nation was expressed by Atatürk in the textbook Civic Information for the Citizen, created by the CHP to educate the population on what it meant to be a citizen of Turkey, and what this would entail (Rance, 2012).

Within this nation, the CHP aspired to fulfil their six principles, Atatürk's Six Arrows, consisting of; republicanism, nationalism, populism, statism, secularism, and revolutionism (Rance, 2012). These were part of the party's programme, and were later implemented into the Constitution.

Based on these values and ideas, the CHP and Atatürk aimed at creating a Turkish nation filled with Turkish citizens, embracing and fulfilling all of these pillars. This also meant that strict demands were made on those who wanted to call themselves Turkish citizens. This brings us to the CHP's definition of a Turkish citizen.

As stated in their definition of a nation, the Turkish state was seeking to build a society of a homogenous people, and this shone through in their policy-making around citizenship during the early stages of the Turkish Republic, as the people of Turkey were divided between being born ethnically Turkish and being Turkish citizens. Even if citizens, not born Turkish of nationality, lawfully seemed more or less equal to their ethnically Turkish fellow citizens, this distinction paved the way for palpable discrimination in their everyday lives (Rance, 2012). The notion of the real 'Turk' was so monumental for the CHP that in the 1924 Constitution, the term was utilized in the expression of rights, responsibilities and freedoms instead of a term that would allow for citizens not born Turkish to be included (Rance, 2012). Even political participation through elections was impossible, due to non-Muslims not being allowed to vote. In fact, minority citizens were not even considered in the Constitution until 1930, and not before 1935 were they allowed to be elected for Parliament (Rance, 2012). As Yeşim Arat is quoted by

Barak Rance, "*Citizenship in Turkey appeared not as a revolutionary social struggle from the bottom up by the masses, who asked for their rights from those who did not grant it to them, but as a number of choices made by the ruling elite intelligentsia who tried to grant rights to the masses in order to increase social integration and to empower the state*"(Arat as quoted in Rance, 2012:48). Turkish ethnicity was the focus of the CHP's governing of the country, and people not belonging to the majority, who were legally citizens of The Republic of Turkey, came to be considered second-rate citizens, especially if they were not Muslim, even if the state was supposedly secular (Rance, 2012). This became even more evident as the CHP expanded on their attempts at full assimilation of minorities, for instance with campaigns such as 'Citizen, Speak Turkish!' that, combined with threats of lawsuits against non-Turkish-speakers under the pretense of the law against insulting Turkishness, attempted to force assimilation through. Furthermore, CHP passed a law in 1934 on surnames, meaning that surnames were restricted heavily on the basis of not sounding Turkish, reflecting distinguishing societal features, and even surnames that were found to be funny or rude were banned as well (Rance, 2012).

All over society, CHP made attempts at integrating assimilating laws into Turkish society, and even through the creation of schools and people's houses intended at educating the population in the history of Turkey and the ideologies of the CHP. This educations, for instance, consisted of the 'Turkish History Thesis' and the 'Sun Language Theory' claiming, amongst other things, that both modern civilization and all languages stemmed from Turkey (Rance, 2012).

The quest for assimilation stretched as far as for the CHP to pass laws making it possible to reserve certain jobs for the Turks, forcefully removing people from their homes to ensure that the concentration of non-Turks in a certain area was never beyond 10 percent of the local population, and differentiating tax-laws so that ethnic Turks paid far less in taxes than their non-ethnically Turkish fellow citizens (Rance, 2012).

Indeed, in spite of the fact that we have only tapped into a small margin of what was the creation of The Republic of Turkey in this paragraph, it is easily argued that there were clear discrepancies between the conditions of the ethnic Turks and the non-ethnic Turks. Those have proven to be, at least to some extent, persistent up until now, as it has been evident that Kurds have long been particularly exposed to restrictions of their freedoms and violations of their rights as human rights organizations have long called attention to (Human Rights Watch, 2014).

Theory

Kant's Perpetual Peace Theory

Kant argues in his essay, "Toward Perpetual Peace", that one of the key requirements to have a pacific state is through the creation of a Republican state (Kant, 1784).

What Kant means by Republican state is a governance system where legislative and executive powers are separated and where every citizen lives under the same republican civil constitution (Ion, 2012).

In the civil constitution of the republican state imagined by Kant every man must have "the greatest possible freedoms" (Kant, 1784). The republican state must have freedom as one of its main foundations.

It is important to note that he writes "possible freedoms", and in fact, Kant does not believe that every man should have infinite freedom, but a specifically limited amount of freedom that would allow citizens to coexist in a society free of chaos.

Kant considers men who are not subjected to a clear limit of their freedoms to represent a threat to the rest of men (Kant, 1784). In fact, another of the main foundations of the republican state to be the idea of dependency. Kant argues that every man should be dependent on a common law, which will limit and protect the freedom of its citizens (Ion, 2012). In his essay "Toward Perpetual Peace" he states: *"A man in the state of nature deprives me of this security; and if he is in my vicinity he harms me -even if he doesn't do anything to me- by the mere fact that he isn't subject to any law and is therefore a constant threat to me."* (Kant, 1784: 5).

Kant believes that freedom must have its limits, otherwise people's freedom would be a threat to itself.

With this notion in mind, it is important to ask how we can ensure that people will respect the civil constitution if, after all, it limits people's freedom? Kant considers that laws do not just constrain, but also protect people from each other. For this reason citizens should be able to accept a civil constitution, and thereby, laws that limit people's freedom must be consented by all the citizens affected by it in consensus (Ion, 2012).

Another of the main foundations of the civil constitution is that every man should be bound by "juridical equality". Juridical equality is the fundament of consensus, and without this principle,

it is impossible to have a civil constitution accepted by all the citizens of a state, since all citizens of a state must be protected and limited by law in the same way (Kant, 1784).

By this, we can argue that every civil constitution must be based on these basic principles: freedom, dependency and equality (Ion, 2012).

The body that builds the civil constitution is the Government. That is why the Government must represent all its citizens and the ruler must be member of the state. Kant argues that a ruler who is not member of the state, meaning that is not equal to its citizens and do not leave the possibility to them to take over his position, becomes the owner of the state. If the ruler is the owner of the state, peace cannot be obtained (Kant, 1784).

In case the ruler has a position of superiority to his citizens, he will be breaking one of the main foundations of the civil constitution, one of the keys of peacekeeping in a state, making the possibilities of suffering a revolt very high. This could happen because a state is *"a society of men that can't rightly be commanded or disposed by anyone, except by itself"* (Kant, 1784:2)*.

Only the peoples' satisfaction with their *status quo* can guarantee their commitment to peaceful resolution norms. If citizens see that the civil constitution is not being respected, the consensus will be broken, as well as the peace the republican state entails (Ion, 2012).

Kant furthermore believes that all the Republican states must be cosmopolitan. In fact he argues that multiculturalism is a natural condition of states, since borders are not defined by ethnic disparities. Republican states must be ethnically plural, and that ethnical plurality represented by the government that makes, executes and follows the civil constitution (Ion, 2012).

These are the main notions that Kant considers essential of a republican state, and which would thereby make "perpetual peace" a possibility.

The reason why Kant reckons that these principles will bring peace, is because he believes that they would limit the conditions of political disagreement and offer means to solve those disagreements in a peaceful way (Ion, 2012), and concluding that no single, or group of citizens, would initiate a war under the principles of freedom, consensus and equality. The only reasons why a citizen would start a war, with all the costs it entails, is because those three principles were not respected, if it was commanded by a government that owns the state, or if a rebellion against the government would ascent against the backdrop of an illegitimate regime (Kant, 1784).

Nationalism

In order to understand the conflict that occurs between the Turks and the Kurds, one could argue that it is essential to include an understanding of nationalism (Smith, 1998). Nationalism has, arguably, been the most powerful force in world politics (Smith, 1998). It has contributed to the outbreak of wars and revolutions; it has been closely linked to the birth of new states, the disintegration of empires and the redrawing of borders (Heywood, 2014). We find it important to include nationalism in our project, in order to understand and analyse if and how the ideologies of nationalism has had any impact on the issues between the Turks and Kurds in Turkey.

Nationalism is something that most of us can relate to, it is in our identity and it can be argued that nationalism is somehow shaping us as human beings (Heywood, 2014). However, it can be argued that the greatest achievement of nationalism, seen from a political perspective, has been the establishment of nations. This means that the so-called nation-state has come to be accepted as the most basic – and, nationalists argue, the only legitimate – form of political organization (Heywood, 2014). The question of how nationalism has formed world politics can be divided into two questions; has nationalism advanced the course of political freedom? Or has it simply legitimized aggression and expansion? (Heywood, 2014).

Before the explanation and outline of the theories, we have chosen to use within nationalism, it is important to understand that we are not going to discuss the development and historical aspects of nationalism, but we will include the evolution of nationalism concerning primordialism and modernism. We will use these theories as a device to determine if, how, and why, nationalism has influenced the conflict in Turkey between the Kurds and the Turks and in order to do that, we find it necessary to outline these theories.

Before we outline the theories, we find it essential to define what a nation is, since nations are based upon nationalism, and therefore it will be a necessity to understand the term "nation".

Definition of a nation

Today, there are numerous notions that can be used to describe a nation such as; a state, a country and even one based on race (Smith, 1998). These are just some of the different terms that are used in the everyday language, when trying to capture the notion of a nation. However, some might argue that a nation is a political organization held together by people, who share the same history, traditions or language, or who are living in a particular area under the same government (Heywood, 2014). Therefore, it can be extremely difficult, and even incorrect, to determine that these exact characteristics are essential in terms of describing a nation. If the above description should be the definition of a nation, problems would occur (Anderson, 1983). It could be argued that if the definition of a nation was based on language, religion, and culture, the world would be parted into considerably fewer nations than what reality is today.

Another point could be that the world would not have been divided into several nations, but only been divided into 'few' nations, due to the fact that many nations today share the same language, religion or culture (Heywood, 2014).

In order to define a nation, it is important to acknowledge the value of different aspects, as Heywood notes; "*A nation can be defined by objective factors, people who satisfy a requisite set of cultural criteria can be said to belong to a nation; those who do not can be classified as non-nationals or members of foreign nations*" (Heywood, 2014:158).

Accordingly, it is impossible to define a nation based on objective factors, emphasized by the examples of non-nations, who have accomplished to be part of a nation without sharing the common language or religion (Smith, 1998). For instance, it could be argued that the people of Switzerland are one nation, even though they have three major languages; French, German, and Italian.

Given the rejection of objective factors as defining features of a nation, it is then necessary, in order to define a nation, to acknowledge that a nation must be defined by subjective factors (Heywood, 2014).

This will signify that a nation is defined by its members; the people who share values, cultures and/or languages, and hence people who feel they are connected by their human origins.

The last factor to be considered is the definition of a nation in accordance with political aspects. According to this, a nation is a psycho-political entity; consisting of people who distinguish themselves as a natural political community, and are through that sharing the same loyalty to, and affection for, the nation in form of patriotism (Smith, 1998). A nation seeks to gain political power, political independence and by that the creation of a sovereign state, and consequently political autonomy (Heywood, 2014). It is important not to confuse a nation with an ethnic group, due to the fact that even though ethnic groups share values, language or culture, they do not tend to have equivalent desires of collective political aspirations, and so ethnic groups do not share the same political dimension of nationhood (Smith, 1998).

Nonetheless, there are aspects yet different and further arguments within the understanding of a nation to be considered. For instance Anderson, argues that nationalism is based on safety (Anderson, 1983), meaning that we are, and have always been, afraid of the things we do not understand, and so, it lies in our nature to build boundaries and to dissociate ourselves from unknown cultures, religions or values (Anderson, 1983). Anderson also argues that nationalism is a form of imagination; we think that we automatically share the same values and even same thoughts as the rest of our society (Anderson, 1983). This is an interesting aspect within nationalism, since we have a tendency to share the idea of a united nation when, in fact, we do not know the people living in our society and their customs. This entails that we build boundaries in order to keep our self away from others who do not share the same identity as we do. According to Anderson, this is imaginary, due to the fact, that we do not know what everyone else in the society is building their identity upon (Anderson, 1983).

In relation to the above-mentioned, the definition of a nation should be based on subjective factors, meaning that a nation should, to some extent, be a country or at least a territory, where people share a common political goal. It is to some extent a necessity that the people of a nation are bound together by cultural, political, and psychological factors. A nation can consequently be defined as a group of people who favour themselves as a natural political community, usually gathered through the desire to establish or maintain sovereignty.

But, according to Anderson, it can also be argued that nations are constructed in order to gain safety, which is gained by the cohesion the society of a nation shares (Anderson, 1983).

Primordialism vs. Modernism

There are different point of views, and thereby several theories within nationalism (Smith, 1998). We have chosen, though, to let our focus fall upon "primordialism" versus "modernism," due to the fact that these are the theories, which we deem to be the most effective regarding our research question.

Primordialism and modernism will be described and analysed based on the theoretical work by Anthony D. Smith, Andrew Heywood and Benedict Anderson. We are well aware that there are different theories within nationalism, and we will in this chapter try to outline the theories, which we have deemed to be of utmost importance and efficiency in order to answer our research question.

Primordialism is an approach to nationalism that might be broadly defined as the notion that nations are ancient constructs, even if the notion of nationalism is modern (Smith, 1998). This means that primordialists argue that nationalism is based on older traditions, such as a shared language, and territorial belonging and thereby history, but most importantly a politicised ethno-cultural community (Smith, 1998).

Modernism is a newer theory within nationalism, which does not believe that a nation is based upon history and ethnicity (Smith, 1998). It holds that nations, and thereby nationalism, is created and not preexisting (Anderson, 1983). It can be argued that primordialists tend to see the rise of a nation as a goal, achieved by the members of the nation, in order to create a community 'for the people', whereas modernists believe that the nation is built by the elite in order to accomplish their own goals, and that they are thereby using the people of the nation to accomplish their own individual means (Smith, 1998).

Yet, modernists argue that nations and nationalism are "new" terms, created by modern and

recent conditions (Smith, 1998). Anderson argues that nationalism is imaginary, and one can argue that he finds it rather meaningless (Anderson, 1983). Even so, Anderson reasons that nations are a manifestation of inherently group–oriented people, denoting that we have a tendency to 'stick' with people who look like us, act like us, or just speak the same language as us. According to this argument we like to be in a group, it make us feel safe and supported (Anderson, 1983). Primordialists and modernist both acknowledge that the need of being in a group is inherent and is thereby uncontrollable (Smith, 1998).

It can be argued that nationalism is inherent and so, has always been a part of our human nature (Smith, 1998). All the same, it can be discussed whether or not nation is a newer term or an older term, and even though both theories argue that nationalism is inherent, one can question whether or not it is possible to have nationalism without nations?

We will argue that in order to define a nation it is required to define nationalism, and it is therefore necessary to have nationalism in order to create a nation. It could be reasonably contended that nationalism has evolved over time, and even though some argues that nationalism is created upon our imagination, it is still an ideology that controls our society to some extend.

Instrumentalist (or constructivist) theory on ethnicity.

The theory of instrumentalism argues that ethnicity is a social construct that is shaped by the content of its history and social mechanisms, both of which are subjects to various changes and interpretations.
This is the general outline of the instrumentalist approach. Within this narrativeva multiverse of different sub-theories and approaches exists, with only some of them being relevant to our project. These will be introduced below and also further elaborated upon in our analysis.

The instrumentalist theory encompasses an idea that people of the upper social strata are able to use the notion of a common national ethnic identity, to garner support from the lower social strata, in their quest for obtaining political results. (Hutchinson & Smith, 1996)

Another implementation of the instrumentalist theory is an approach that adheres to the idea that people, or groups of people, can practice the so called 'cut and mix' technique, where they 'create their own' understanding of an ethnicity that suits them and the situation they find themselves in.

Contradicting instrumentalism's notion of fluidity of ethnicity, is the theory of primordialism, adhering to the idea that ethnicity is a cultural phenomenon that has a more static nature, not open to changes and interpretations (Bunar & Valenta, 2012).

Although we use both an instrumentalist approach, for the analysis of Turkish ethnicity, and a primordialists approach, for the analysis of nationalism, which are two theories that appears to be mutually excluding, this not the case as there are many examples of the two theories to co-exists and support each other (Bunar & Valenta, 2012).

<u>Multiculturalism theory</u>

This part will seek to understand different aspects of theories on multiculturalism. We find it important to understand the roots of this theory as to be able to incorporate it into our analysis of the situation in Turkey, and attempt to examine possible solutions of the conflict through the implementation of multiculturalism.

Fleras regards multiculturalism as "*a set of principles, policies, and practices for accommodating diversity as a legitimate and integral component of society*" (Fleras, cited in Watson 2000).

That said, it is easy to claim that following Fleras arguments, a multicultural state is one that has in its foundations, the recognition of the cultural differences of the people that inhabit it.

Through recognizing the cultural differences within itself, the multicultural state negates the existence of a common identity that must be expanded and protected by the Government and citizenship.

The identification process of the multicultural state is in fact based on continuous identity exchanges between its citizens (Spencer, 2014). The identification processes change radically between the multicultural and the nation-state. The nation-state has a static homogenous and legitimate identity, which is transmitted generationally by it own citizens or by the state itself. The multicultural state instead identifies itself through continuous identity exchanges between its

inhabitants, who share and build new identities through comparison and critical dialogue. In this way the multicultural state is not based on a static core of values and identities as the nation-state, but these are being constantly reconstructed (Spencer, 2014).

This is a very important point when it comes to describing what lies in the theoretical roots of the multicultural state. After the French revolution a common belief that states must be built on the base of a nationalistic ideal started, that gives a reason and a meaning to the nation.

Multicultural states break with this ideal and claim that states should not necessarily be built on a common national identity, nor on a national culture, but that every inhabitant of it should openly expose their own cultural identity in the public sphere and the state should act as a product of it.

The state does not produce a 'best identity' which must be incorporated by its citizens, but reflects the identities of those who live in it (Watson, 2000).

Multicultural states could give a solution to countries that have internal ethnic or cultural conflicts, countries with high levels of immigration or countries where programs of assimilation are not working.

However, Watson claims that the construction of multicultural states from existing nation states is a very hard task. He argues that a great part of the modern world still lives under the conviction that there should be a sense of common identification, which must characterize the state.

Watson considers multiculturalism to be generally tolerated. This is true until it arrives to what is perceived to be the borders of the national culture (Watson, 2000).

In other words, it becomes very hard for people who have already adopted the national identity of a state, to accept a state system with several identities that could, possibly in a near future, substitute the one already held by that people.

Watson elaborates those claims arguing that national identities propose a plan of homogenization that produces a sense of psychological security to the people within it (Watson, 2000). It builds a kind of 'comfort zone' around individuals.

He believes that national identities act as "*familiar institutions*", particular ways of doing things that are so familiar that they become a sort of "*second nature*". A sense of threat to those familiar

institutions can provoke a loss of the psychological security and therefore provoke negative reactions in response to it (Watson, 2000).

The creation of multicultural states constitutes an attempt against these familiar institutions, since they lose the position of leadership that they have in nation-states (Watson, 2000).

On the other side, Watson considers the passage from the nation-state to a multicultural state as a possible step, whose result depends on the individuals that conform the nation (Watson, 2000).

He believes that the sense of statical identities promoted by nationalism is, in the end, a mere psychological construction. Identities are always in continuous transformation and not static and, as nationalism claims, national identities are not strongly rooted but very superficial (Watson, 2000). The values that were considered national only one generation ago are probably different than the ones considered by this new generation (Bloom, 1993).

Watson claims that the nature of staticity of national identities is an illusion created by the state itself through channels of power as education, media or the Government (Watson, 2000). States, not meaning a Government, but the people that compose the state, build senses of homogeneity to produce psychological security.

Often those identity constructions that build the nation are not self-questioned, since they are historically backed up: 'that is how things have always been done in here'.

Watson argues that a process of the state being critical about the rationality of having a homogenous leader identity, can break the sense of psychological security and open the course for a multicultural state (Watson, 2000).

The reason why states should question the rationality of their processes of national identification, is because those processes might generate problems. Problems start when the creation of an imaginary leading identity can build states where people who did not assimilate that identity become automatically excluded, and in some cases oppressed.

Watson reckons that multicultural states can finally give a voice for minorities, through allowing them to participate and have a voice in the discussion of what constitutes the state and how its citizens should work to pursue that objective (Watson, 2000).

However, Spencer constitutes that building a multicultural state is not enough to create a fair equal state where a voice to minorities is given. The construction of the multicultural state must be followed by a plan by the Government to build, what he calls cooperative communal structures, meaning structures that propose a project of social equality between all the different ethnicities living within the state (Spencer, 2014).

He argues that even if this represents an important first step, ethnic exclusion and racism can still appear in multicultural states (Spencer, 2014).

In this regard, Spencer takes the arguments of Hall to explain that multicultural states make cultural distinctions more apparent and draw hard-edged boundaries to demarcate ethnicities. When there is no need of having a common identity as it happens in nation-states, and people openly share their own identity, a heterogeneous state where it is possible to find more than one identity is being built. That heterogeneous state is one that has differences in its roots (Spencer, 2014).

This argument does not mean that a heterogeneous state is a divided state. A multicultural state can build a sense of homogeneity within heterogeneity (Spencer, 2014). People feel part of their own ethnicity/culture (heterogeneity), and at the same time part of the state where they live with other people from different ethnicities/cultures (homogeneity).

Spencer establishes that the multicultural state should be built as a project of not just equal recognition of all the ethnicities, but also of building a common social equality (Spencer, 2014). Social exclusion or social division occurs both spatially and mentally. Spatially when specific groups are physically separated to the rest of the population, and mentally when divisions in the structures proposed by the state exists (Spencer, 2014).

Considering Great Britain as an example might help in understanding this dilemma. Great Britain can be considered a multicultural state which has adopted this specific state structure without having a social project to support it (Spencer, 2014). Nowadays it results in a society where every ethnicity is recognized and there is no official national identity, but that still has a lot of ethnic divisions within it (Spencer, 2014). There are still ghetto's where specific ethnicities live

and specific professions taken by specific minorities. Britain has still a persistent problem with racism and very aggressive nationalist movements.

Spencer would argue that Britain failed to cooperate communal structures that would have allowed the country to build a more equal society, where social ethnic differences would be inexistent.

Goodin, taking a starting point in Macpherson's models of democracy, proposes two different types of multiculturalism: protective and polyglot multiculturalism.
The main differences between the two systems lay on the motives of the application of them and in the types of policies needed to apply them.

Protective multiculturalism is based on the idea that multiculturalism is needed in order to protect minorities from the majority community or the government itself (Goodin, 2006).
This ideology suggests that minorities do not have the potential of being able to defend themselves and must be protected by a higher organ, like law (Goodin, 2006).
The ideology comes from the liberalist idea that everybody must have an individual autonomy and minoritarian cultures must be protected in order to not be repressed and deprived of this individual freedom.
Another main characteristic of protective multiculturalism is that it claims that cultures must be secured from not losing its genuinity through internalizing characteristics from other cultures. This means that cultural minorities should not only be protected from repression, but also from losing its purity (Goodin, 2006).

An interesting point to remark of protective multiculturalism, is that it promotes multiculturalism as a defensive maneuvre. It exists as a solution to societies which have different cultural communities within them and need to protect its citizens' personal freedom. But it does not promote multiculturalism as a method of social development (Goodin, 2006).
In fact protective multicultural societies are not necessarily open to receiving new cultures, just to protect their already existing minorities (Goodin, 2006).

On the other hand polyglot multiculturalism argues that multicultural societies must be created since it claims that cultural difference are strong developmental factors in societies (Goodin, 2006).

In opposition to protective multiculturalism, polyglot multiculturalism considers that societies should be built under the foundations of a cultural heterogeneity which must promote continuous contact and exchange. In this way the polyglot multicultural state is not a state that comprehends several well-bounded cultures, but a state where individuals are in uninterrupted cultural development through continuously implementing cultural characteristics from new cultures (Goodin, 2006).

Goodin points out that both models of multicultural societies can face strong problems when they comprehend cultures that can be in conflict with others in the public sphere, or that do not accept the principles of multiculturalism (Goodin, 2006). Unfortunately, he is not able to give a clear answer on how to solve that specific problem.

Analysis

How can Kant's "perpetual peace process" help us understand the roots of the of the conflict?

It is interesting to derive an analysis of the conflict occurring between Turks and Kurds by applying the theories of peace and conflict by Kant - even if they were conceived in a period when there was a very different social reality than the one existing nowadays, his theories can give us the fundamental theoretical roots of the conflict, hence helping us to understand the conflict better.

As we described before a general consensus on the the common constitution that limits and protects citizens freedoms is required to ensure a peaceful state, and the way of achieving this consensus is through juridical equality. Every citizen's freedom, within the constitutional

framework of a given nation, should be limited by law in the same way, disregarding ethnicity, religious and political backgrounds.

If we take into consideration how laws are applied in Turkey, we can clearly see that there is no juridical equality. Turkish laws offer more freedom and possibilities to the ethnically Turkish population than to the minorities living within the boundaries of Turkish jurisdiction, especially the Kurds.

Cultural rights and political freedoms are very limited and trial rights are very harsh and considered unfair in their handling of the Kurdish population (Human Rights Watch, 2014).

Human Rights Watch denounces the fact that Kurds are not free to teach in their own languages in state schools in zones where the great majority is ethnically Kurdish, and that in the same way they cannot broadcast in any media channel or run an election campaign in those languages either (Human Rights Watch, 2014).

Restrictions on the Kurdish population become harder when it comes to political rights and freedom of speech.

After the military defeat of the PKK, the Turkish government has maintained an entire legal apparatus to keep Turkey "safe" from any other form of Kurdish uprising. In fact, the civil war gave an argument for the government to legitimize repressive policies targeting the political freedom of the Kurds, with its main objective to protect the nation of "crimes against the state" (Human Rights Watch, 2014).

Basic human rights, as freedom of association, are easily repressed. Kurdish political organizations can be easily banned and closed, in the same way that protests and journalistic activities are often persecuted throughout Turkey (European Commission, 2014).

Yet, still more gravely, in the early 1990s several members of nationalist Kurdish parties were murdered, presumably by government supported counter-guerrillas (Spencer, 2014).

Further, Kurdish political activists, students, journalists and lawyers are easily targeted and investigated on "terrorism charges" in abusive terrorism trials that form a pattern of violation of fair trial standards (Human Rights Watch 2014).

Suspects under that sort of investigation are almost automatically placed in pretrial detention, which can be up to 5 years. The time of pretrial incarceration has been shortened in March 2014 to 5 years, but before that date it was up to 10 years according to the Anti Terror Act. (European Commission 2014).

The Human Rights Watch criticizes the hard limitations to the rights of the defendants in those trials for "crimes against the state" as prolonged incarcerations once their trials are underway and pending verdict without giving compelling reasons (Human Rights Watch 2014).

The examples mentioned above gives a clear picture of violations of rights, or lack of rights, which suggests that within Turkey there is a clear juridical inequality, where the Kurdish minoritarian ethnic group has a more limited set of rights than the Turkish majoritarian group, or at least the laws tend to easily act stronger on them.

If we take in consideration the Kant's Perpetual Peace Theory we can conclude that there is a common constitution that limits citizen's freedom, yet this constitution is not based under principles of juridical equality, and cannot have been agreed by consensus by the population.

The Kurdish population is currently being imposed a Turkish legal constitution that has not been agreed by them, thus making a state of continuous conflict a natural response to the problem.

Also, since the political rights of the Kurdish population are very limited, their political representation and possibilities are also diminished compared to the general ethnic Turkish population. Again taking Kant's arguments in consideration, the government must equally represent all its citizens through a principle of equality of possibilities with them. In the case that the government, which is the organ that builds the common civil constitution, does not represent a part of the state it works for, that part of the state becomes owned by it and the government loses its status as a representation of that segment of the population .

We therefore argue that under Kant's arguments the Kurdish population is not just oppressed by the Turkish state, but also it is owned by it. Since their political rights are limited, it becomes

very difficult for the Kurds to have a voice in the decision-making process in Turkey, having in this way to respond and abide to the decisions taken by others.

In this case we can also conclude that under Kant's arguments peace cannot be granted if there is not an equal possibility of government representation.

Kant allows us to understand that the lack of juridical equality, and the limited possibilities of governmental representation of the Kurdish population in the government, are the main causes of the conflict.

It is a very important point, since it permit us to conclude that even the conflict between Kurds and Turks is an ethnic conflict, it does not only take place for ethnic reasons, but also political ones.

Until equality for the entire population in Turkey is granted and discussed there will not be any possibility for a state of peace.

To what extent has Kemalist nationalism had an impact in the conflict?

In the second part of the analysis, we will be focussing on how our theoretical framework is helping us to outline the main perspectives, in the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds in Turkey. By means of this, we will analyse how the theory of nationalism and Kemalism has an impact on the conflict, and thus, if any of the theory can be used to determine how and why the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds has started.

As stated before, the Kurds are not represented in the Turkish constitution, (Constitution of The Republic of Turkey, 1961)

It can be argued that there has not been accounted for any minorities in the constitution, meaning that there is no minorities who have been recognized in the Turkish constitution (Constitution of the republic of Turkey, 1961). The Kurds are a large minority in Turkey, and it can thereby be argued that they should have certain legal and political rights, in order to maintain equality. We are aware that the constitution has been modernized several times, however it is still based on the secularist nationalistic notions of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and so, on the theory of Kemalism (Rance, 2012). The first lines in the Turkish constitution go as follows "*Affirming the eternal*

existence of the Turkish Motherland and Nation and the indivisible unity of the Sublime Turkish State, this Constitution, in line with the concept of nationalism introduced by the founder of the Republic of Turkey, Atatürk, the immortal leader and the unrivalled hero, and his reforms and principles" (Constitution of the republic of Turkey, 1961:1).   Reading the constitution, and especially the first few lines, it becomes very clear that the constitution is build upon the values of Kemalism. It can be defined that since the constitution is build upon Kemalism, and Kemalism has for a long time resulted in people, who are not born as ethnic Turks, being treated as second class citizens. Through what is almost a decade of The Republic of Turkey, this has even made its way to legislation and resulted in exstensive and persistent discrimination (Rance, 2012). A case could be made for the argument that since many of the problems between the Turks and the Kurds are based upon Kemalism, it is problematic for the Kurds to be a part of Turkey, when they are not perceived as equals (Rance, 2012). As long as the Kurds are not considered equals to the Turks it is, according to Kant, impossible to attain peace between the two populations (Kant,1792). The foregoing description is essential in order to understand why, and how, Kemalism has an impact on the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds, and thereby to understand the importance of equality in the process of solving the conflict according to Kant.

One of the problems that occurs in the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds is the complication within nationalism. The Kurds do not share the same form of nationalism as the Turks do (Rance, 2013). And it can thereby be arguable that it is more or less impossible to create and united nation, when such a large minority as the Kurds is not acknowledge as first class citizens (Ramce, 2012).

 In order to gain peace between the Turks and the Kurds, it is, as mentioned before essential that equality occurs, as Kant predicted (Kant, 1792). It is well known that equality do not transpire between the Turks and the Kurds, however as Smith argues, nationalism is not only build upon political factors but also psychological factors, and as long the Kurds do not feel "psychologically" attached to Turkey, it is difficult to obtain a united nation (Smith, 1998). The above mentioned is pivotal in order to gain a united nation according to Kant`s peace process, also is it essential, that all of the citizens in a certain state, feel understood and by that represented by the government (Kant, 1792). It can thereby be argued that according to the

theory of Kant, Kemalism is a vital problem, due to the fact that kemalism creates distance between the Kurds and Turks, and is through that a factor that spawn difficulties in gaining peace (Rance, 2012).

It is a fact that the Turks wrote their constitution without taking the large Kurdish minority into account (Constitution of the republic of Turkey, 1961). However the constitution requires equality between the citizens of Turkey, and it states *"That all Turkish citizens are united in national honour and pride, in national joy and grief, in their rights and duties regarding national existence, in blessings and in burdens, and in every manifestation of national life, and that they have the right to demand a peaceful life based on absolute respect for one another's rights and freedoms, mutual love and fellowship, and the desire for and belief in "Peace at home; peace in the world"* (Constitution of the republic of Turkey:5). According to Kant it is important to regard the peace process as an acknowledgement of the freedom of the individual (Kant,1792). And even so it is stated in the constitution, it is also stated that the constitution is build upon nationalism, meaning that the Kurds are second- class citizens (Rance, 2012). We find it necessary to outline this, in order to give an idea of how much impact nationalism has on the constitution, and thereby how much impact nationalism has had on the conflict between the Kurdish and the Turkish population (Rance, 2012).

 A united nation is a term often used in the theories of nationalism. If the Kurds do not see themselves as a part of Turkey, it can be difficult to create a nationalist cohesive community, and thus a form of common nationalism (Smith, 1998). Smith argues that a nation is not only based upon religion, language and culture, but also upon the desire to create a political power state (Smith, 1998). Based on Smith's definition of a nation, one can argue that one of the problems that arise between the Kurds and the Turks, is the lack of Kurdish representation in the constitution. It must be imagined that the Kurds do not share the same motivation to build a common nation, as the Turks, due to the lack of equality.

To sum up the above mentioned, one can argue that the Kurds is an etchnic group, and they do thereby not share the same political values as the Turkish nationalists (Smith, 1998). According to Smith, nationalism within ethnic groups, is more based upon factors such as language, religion

and culture, and they do according to Smith, not share the same objectives as Turkish nationalims (Smith,1998). One can argue that as long as the Turks do not recognize the Kurds as first classe citizens, they will to some extend be regarded as an ethnic group. As long as the Kurds is regonized as an ethnic group they will according to Smith not be a part of the political sovereignty, and thereby not a part of the Turkish nation (Smith,1998). And as stated before, it is difficult to gain peace without a united nation.

In accordance with the above mentioned, it can be reasonably contended that the Turks and Kurds do not share the exact same identity, seen from a nationalist perspective. They have different cultures and thereby different values (Yildiz, 2005). Seen from a nationalist perspective Anderson argues that in order to gain a united nation, the people of the nation needs a common identity, due to the reason, that we have a tendency to interact with the ones who share the same perceived identity as our self, and divide us from those who do not (Anderson, 1983). We will use this to interpret the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds. We are aware that they, to some extend, share the same values, and to some extend the same language. However, the Turkish language is not the mother tongue of the Kurds, but they have eventually admitted Turkish as if not, their native language, their primary public language (Yildiz, 2005).   In reference to Anderson, it can be argued that the conflict arose from the distinction of individuality between the Turkish, and the Kurdish part of the population. The Kurds are somehow forced to take the Turkish traditions into account, due to the fact that they do not have the same rights as the Turks (Yildiz, 2005). An example could be that the Kurdish population is not allowed to teach in their local languages in state schools in areas of Kurdish majority, it is arguable that these sort of laws have "helped" to create different conflicts (Human Rights Watch, 2014). Again the lack of equality and the distinction between the Turks and the Kurds regarding individuality, might have caused the development of the conflict in a negative way (Anderson, 1983).

Anderson emphasises that nationalism affects people of the society in a negative way, meaning that nations build themselves by building boundaries, since no nation wishes to share their nation with others than themselves (Anderson, 1983). It can thereby be derived from the theory of Anderson, that the Turks want to gain political sovereignty, and that they will gain that through

an united nation, and they are again accomplishing a united nation through nationalism. As Anderson argues, the Turks are using nationalism in a "negative" way, meaning that they try to "push" the Kurdish population out of Turkey, or include them in the Turkish values through nationalism (Yildiz, 2005). An example could again be the rules there have been regarding the illegalization of teaching in Kurdish, or the social necessity of having to speak Turkish in order to have a job in Turkey (Human Rights Watch, 2014). According to this, Andersons reckons that nationalism sustains, the Turks are aware that the Kurds do not share the exact same values, and to solve that, they are "forcing" the Kurds to identify themselves with their own values, culture and language. According to the arguments of Heywood and Anderson, it can be argued that the Kurds experience some form of exclusion from their own community, and that this causes for them to see themselves as an ethnic group, and therefore not as though they are considered a "real" part of Turkey, which again is the reason why they do not share the same kind of nationhood as Turks (Yildiz, 2005).

In the second part of this analysis we will include the theories, which have shaped our theoretical framework within nationalism, primordialism and modernism.

As the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds has a long and persistent history, we find it first of all necessary to imply the theory of primordialism, based on the very applivable perspectives it implements within the history of nationalism, which can gives us the right utility to understand the arise of the conflict.

As Anderson has reiterated that individuality is an important factor within nationhood, and this is consistent with the claims of primordialism, where Smith argues that the foundation of nationalism and thereby primordialism is individuality (Smith, 1998). As referenced before, culture, language, religion and traditions are indispensable factors within primordialism (Smith, 1998). The Kurds and the Turks share the same country, but they are applied with different norms and values, seen from a primordial perspective. They do not share the same language nor same culture, and it is evident that primordialism has taken part in shaping the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds from the beginning (Yildiz,2005). Stating that the conflict was inaudible seen from the perspectives of primordialism, it is in our human experiences, we connect with the ones who shares the same values as us, and divide us self from those who do not (Smith,1998).

However it is conceivable that taking the conflict into account, it is clear that there has been a division between the Turks and the Kurds. It is however not possible to "blame" only one of the part in this matter. Regarding the theory of primodialism, it must be taken into account, that not only did the Turks distance themselves from the Kurds, they also tried to implements their norms and values on the Kurds, however the Kurds did to some extend refuse to implement the Turkish culture, none of them were able to implement a new culture, due to their refusal of giving up their identity (Yildiz, 2005). This could be some of the reasons why the conflict aroused in the first place. The norms and values of the two different cultures lie in both the Turks and the Kurds, regarding their human experiences, and it can thereby be difficult for any of them to implement the other parts culture (Smith, 1998).

As analysed before, primordialism is incorporated in the human nature, modernism proposes a newer form of understanding nationalism, but it has however based its foundations upon primordialism (Smith, 1998). This entails that according to theorists within nationalism, it is almost impossible to look away from the norms and values of identity, however it is possible to develop nationalism, as the world and the nations evolve (Anderson, 1983). The modernists believe that the political aspects has taken over nationalism, and shaped nationalism through the elite (Smith, 1998). The assumption takes part in the believe, that the elite is controlling the nations, and thereby uses the nationalism to gain advantages (Smith, 1998).

In reference to the above mentioned, the Turks can be seen as the elite of Turkey, who tries to use the terms of nationalism in order to gain sovereignty and thereby political power (Yildiz, 2005). The Turks created their own form of nationalism through Kemalism and has thereby managed to obtain their own individuality, thus obtaining control over the Kurds (Yildiz, 2005). It shall be mentioned that this part of the analysis is based on the recent developments that have occurred in the conflict between the Turks and the Kurds.

We can conclude that it can be argued that the Turks and Kurds have never shared the exact same understanding of how the conflict should be solved between them. However we do argue that nationalism has a leading role in the conflict. On groundings found through this analysis, it

can be contended that the Kurds do not share the same form of nationhood as the Turks. This problem could be thought to have occurred because the Kurds have been viewed as an ethnic minority and due to that fact have been lacking recognition. At the same time the Turkish government has managed to control the Kurdish nationalism, which occurred earlier, meaning that it can be argued that the Turkish government has managed to sway the individualism of the Kurds away through Kemalism. The elite have thereby managed to control the nationalism, and to a certain extent, assimilate the Kurds into the Turkish construction of a nation.

In the theory part Heywood raised a question of the following terms; "has nationalism advanced the course of political freedom? Or has it simply legitimized aggression and expansion" (Heywood, 2014)? Taking the analysis and the preliminary conclusion into account, it must be maintained that in this case nationalism has led to aggression and expansion, seen from the Kurdish perspective. Due to the lack of equality and the far reach of Kemalism, it would be difficult to accept the notion that nationalism has lead to political freedom, again seen from the Kurdish perspective.

Instrumentalism

This part of the analysis will have the purpose of defending the notion that the Young Turks created a new national Turkish ethnic identity, which was exclusively for what they defined as ethnic Turks (Howard, 2001). Although modern Turkey is moving away from the principles of Kemalism (Öktem, 2011), the decades of Turkish commitment to the Kemalist ideology, has had a profound impact on the relationship between Kurds and Turks, and in the latter's treatment of the former (Rance, 2012). The analysis will try to accord an explanation to this problem using the instrumentalist theory on ethnicity.

While looking into the theory about instrumentalism we came across this line. "*For Hutchinson and Smith (1996), one version of this approach focuses on elite competition for resources and suggest that the manipulation of symbols is vital for gaining the support of the masses and*

achieving political goals. For them, one of the central ideas of instrumentalism is the socially constructed nature of ethnicity, and the ability of individuals to 'cut and mix' from a variety of ethnic heritages and cultures to forge their own individual or group identities" (Bunar and Valentia, 2012. "Introduction to sociology Scandinavian Sensibility":305). We have found this to be crucial in understanding and illustrating how the Young Turks created the new Turkish national ethnic identity.

As mentioned in the historical part, as well as in the description of Kemalism in the project, after the first world war the Young Turks sought to establish a new Turkish state on the remnants of the Ottoman Empire, and in order to do this they wanted to create a new national, and exclusively Turkish identity. So it could be plausible that the Young Turks, who at that point had near dictatorial powers of Turkey (Zörcher, 2004), constructed a new Turkish ethnic identity, to sway the Turkish people towards the direction of their vision of a new Turkish state, with a uniform ethnic population, and to rally behind them in the volatile situation Turkey was engulfed in after the end of the first world war. They 'built' this new national and ethnic identity by using and putting together many different "ethnic components", taking in a lot of new western customs and practices, such as the latin alphabet, a public school system and so called "People's Houses", where pupils and citizens were taught about the Turkish culture in accordance with the principles of Kemalism (Smith, 2005) (Howard, 2001), and a parliament. While also abandoning and outlawing many traditional muslim practices and customs (Howard, 2004). This goes hand in hand with the description given of the instrumentalist theory, where the elite uses the ethnical and national identity to entice the people into supporting them, while at the same time practising the 'cut and mix' mechanism in tailoring their own brand of national ethnicity (Bunar & Valenta, 2012).

Siân Jones argues in his chapter about instrumentalism that, "*He (Cohen) argued that in the course of social life a variety of groups emerge whose members share common interests. In order to these interests collectively such a group has to develop 'basic organizational functions distinctiveness (some writers call it boundary); communication; authority structure; decision making procedure; ideology; and socialization' (ibid.: xvi– xvii). It is possible for these organizational functions to be developed on a formal basis; however, Cohen (ibid.: xvii) argues*

that in many instances formal organization is not possible and under these circumstances the group will articulate its organization by drawing on existing cultural practices and beliefs, such as kinship, ritual, ceremony and cultural values. According to Cohen (ibid.: xxi) this use of culture to systematize social behaviour in pursuit of economic and political interests constitutes the basis of ethnicity." (Jones, 1997:74).

Again, adopting the logic put forward by Jones, we can apply this to explain the mechanisms at work when the Young Turks began their work of breathing life into their idea of the Turkish national ethnic identity. They imported new social practices from Western Europe, because they deemed many of the old social, political and cultural practices from the old Ottoman Empire to be archaic and inadequate to build their new vision of Turkey upon (Howard, 2001), while at the same time building upon cultural values 'already in place', bending them to suit their purpose (Smith, 2005).

Regarding the Kurdish population; who were seen as loyal subjects back in the days of the Ottoman Empire due to their sunni muslim faith (Kia, 2008), they now had to submit the new nationalistic Turkish ideology of Kemalism, which sought to erase their ethnic identity by assimilating them into the uniform Turkish ethnicity they intended to create. The assimilation process did not have its intended effect, but caused resentment in segments of the Kurdish population, which eventually spilled over into various rebellions, with the one begun by the PKK as the most notorious (Fuller & Barkey, 1998).

What solutions can multiculturalism bring to the conflict?

In this part we will argue why the multi culturalist theory can be applied to reach a peaceful settlement between the Kurds and the Turks, be recognizing the Kurds as a separate cultural entity within the Turkish state and thereby gaining its support for the Turkish state as a whole.

In the last part of the analysis we will go through the argument that the nationalist project of Kemalism has been the father of the conflict between Turks and Kurds, since it proposes the creation of a homogenous Turkish identity excluding the plurality of identities in the country.

The Kurdish population is not included in the national project of Turkey but still have to respond to the same civil constitution, creating a limit in their representation that can be interpreted as repressive.

Multiculturalism proposes an alternative system to nationalism that could have a say in the final solution of the conflict.

As argued before, multicultural states are based on the open recognition of the cultural differences that exist within a state. Following the line of our arguments, a multicultural state would propose a break with the Kemalist model of nation of Turkey, opening an opportunity of re-discussion between the Turkish government and the Kurdish population.

As Watson argues multicultural states can give a solution to the problem of underrepresentation of minorities through giving them a stronger possibility of having a voice in the matters that constitute the state (Watson, 2000).

As the situation in Turkey is right now, the Kurdish population have voting rights, political representation and other sorts of participation in the public sphere. But they still do not have the possibility of participation as Kurdish citizens, meaning that the only possible way of participation is through an assimilation of the Turkish national identity.

This means that even if they can officially participate in the matters that constitute the state, they can not do it under their own conditions or commonly agreed ones, but through the acceptance of rules that have been imposed to them by the Turkish nationalist project. An example of it is the restriction of running on election platforms in the Kurdish language. If a group of Kurdish people wants to run an election, thus to participate in the process of political representation of the state, they first have to accept that there is a majority language that has a predominance over the Kurdish one.

Also, political parties must respect the second article of the constitution that states that Turkey is built on the nationalist project of Atatürk.

If Kurds want to participate in the public sphere through seeking an political representation they must do it through the acceptance that there is a Turkish nation that works for building a common identity which has a predominance over the rest of identities, including the Kurdish one.

Also, it would be irresponsible to recognize just political participation as being the only way of having an open participation in the matters that constitute the state. The state constantly shapes and reproduces itself under many other forms which take place in the daily public sphere, education or commerce are just simple examples of them.

The Kurdish population is still under recognized and consequently underrepresented also in great part of the non-political aspects that build the state. Kurdish language is practically useless in the commerce sphere, in the same way that education must be entirely in Turkish and Kurdish culture is not taught in Southeastern state schools (Kocher, 2007).

The Turkish government has been able to build large assimilation programs that have as main objective to break the means of reproduction of Kurdish identity.

In the same way that in the political sphere, in great part of the public sphere the Kurdish population must accept the Turkish nationalist project in order to be able to participate.

The objective of these examples is to paint a picture of the way that the processes of representation and public participation in Turkey, even if they superficially present themselves as equal for everybody, they are not and strongly limit the voice of the Kurdish population.

As we precedently argued through the use of the theories of Kant, this stage builds a state of inequality which is condemned to fall into continuous conflict.

Through a process of open recognition of the Kurdish population and acceptance of their cultural identity, a state of equal representation and participation could be built, putting in this way the foundations for a peaceful Turkey.

Spencer considers that multicultural states can create homogeneity within heterogeneity, through considering that citizens will have a sense of belonging in a state that equally recognises them. Following Spencer arguments, if Turkey starts a process of openness and recognition of the Kurdish ethnic minority, the Kurdish population will recognize themselves as part of the Turkish state.

As we saw with Kant, one of the bases of conflict is the lack of possibility representation of a group of people by the state, making the state the owner of that group (Kant, 1795). If a group of people do not feel that their state is representing them, they feel owned by it.

If the multicultural state, as Spencer claims, can build a sense of belonging to the Turkish state by the Kurdish population, it can as well break the sense of ownership that Turkish Kurds feel, removing the main root of the conflict.

The creation of a Turkish multicultural state can break the barriers constructed by Kemalism and build a state which can equally represent its citizens, bringing finally peace to Turkey.

Without a doubt the first step the Turkish government will have to take is to open up their legal system to include the Kurdish population as a recognized actor in their society, as well as dropping the articles in their constitution that make references to the Atatürk's nationalist project and proved to actively exclude the Kurds.

Turkey will have to leave the harsh laws of protection the state security from anti-nationalist attacks behind and facilitate Kurdish population freedom of assembly and political participation. Through a process of political opening to Kurdish free political organization, the Turkish state will be able to ensure a much stronger representation of Kurds in the state decision-making process. Following again Kant's Perpetual Peace theory, a stronger Kurdish representation in the state processes, will allow the Kurdish population to effectively become a part of the state and avoid the sense of being owned by it, preventing future conflicts.

Also, cultural rights will have to be opened and rediscussed in order to build a society that does not lay on principles of national cultural assimilation, but on common agreements between the ethnic communities that inhabit Turkey.

A process of political openness to Kurdish participation will definitely ensure a process of negotiation between the Turkish and Kurdish populations.

Whether Turkey should have a state model that follows the principles of protective or polyglot multiculturalism, is a decision that will definitely have to be discussed and negotiated by the entire population of Turkey.

The protectivist reasons of the construction of a Turkish multicultural state are more than ·
obvious, nowadays the Kurdish population represents an ethnic minority that must be protected from repressive government policies that limit their freedom as citizens. The long term objectives of a hypothetical multicultural state could be different and therefore is very difficult to draw a conclusion of which model would be best and more possible.

However, as the situation is presented nowadays in Turkey, the most viable model appears to be a protective multiculturalism, at least as a starting point that will allow the country to move forward to process of equal discussion of the long term objectives of the state.

A sure point is that Turkey will have to work to build what Spencer names cooperative communal structures in order to avoid strong social divisions and inequality of possibilities based on ethnic differences, as we explained with the example of Britain in the theory chapter.

Fighting against this sort of problem must be a clear objective of the state, since social division might lead to under representation and lack of possibilities of participation, planting in this way the seeds an ethnic conflict within the multicultural state.

Discussion

The discussion will give the reader a look into an alternative analysis of the Turkish and Kurds conflict. This will be done by using Kocher reflexions on how the Turkish state is actually "winning" its cultural "war" against the Kurds.

Kocher arguments on Kemalism

The Turkish nation-building project has often been considered, by many analysts, as a failed project (Kocher, 2007). It created a system based on exclusion which provoked several ethnic conflicts, throughout the history of the Turkish Republic, especially with the Kurdish population. In this project, we argue that the Kemalist project of Turkey, has been in the roots of the conflict between Turks and Kurds and that the most reasonable solution to the conflict is to start a counter-project of building a multicultural state. As we argued a multicultural state will open the doors for recognition and hence Kantian juridical equality, bringing Turkey to a period free of internal conflicts.

Kocher argues instead that the Kemalist project of Turkey has been very successful and in the long term it will apparently ensure peace (Kocher, 2007).

It is without a doubt a very polemic argument, since he openly recognizes that the methods used in the last 50 years by the Turkish government were excessively repressive and constituted strong violations of Human Rights against the Kurdish population. Even if he claims that he does not agree with that sort of procedure, he recognizes that those methods have given clear results in creating a common national identity.

Kocher considers that nowadays, the possibilities of having another guerrilla movement, as the PKK constituted in its heydays, are very low, since the new Kurdish generations are much more assimilated into the Turkish identity (Kocher, 2007).

Nowadays the differences between Kurds and Turks are not so clear as 30 years ago. During the civil war, Kurds were often moved by force from their villages in the rural area, where the PKK had its center of power, to the urban area, where they started living in continuous contact with the Turkish population. While the rural areas of the Southeast were mainly inhabited by Kurds and the daily life of those zones was defined by Kurdish culture, the urban areas left no place for it in the public sphere. If Kurds wanted to adapt to that new environment they had to assimilate the predominant Turkish culture of the urban areas (Kocher, 2007).

The reason why Kurdish assimilation into Turkish identity was such a hard process, was because of the strong tribal structures they built in the rural areas of the Southeast, moving to the urban areas meant to abandon this kind of structures (Kocher, 2007).

If we sum this to the fact that compulsory education was in Turkish and based on teaching the principles of Kemalism, all males had to participate in the army where they had to live in an entirely Turkish environment and that the state had the entire control of the media, it is not difficult to understand why new Kurdish generations easily "falls" in with the programs of assimilation driving by the Turkish state (Kocher 2007).

Kurdish indigenous culture and identity is passing through a process of disappearance in Turkey, since its means of reproduction have been blocked.

Kocher considers that this program of "destruction" of the Kurdish means of reproduction of culture could have ensured a process of peace in the future of Turkey. Through a repressive but effective process of assimilation, the Turkish government might have erased the possibility of an attempt of Kurdish revolution or secession since the Kurdish identity in Turkey might be disappearing to give finally place to a common Turkish identity (Kocher 2007).

Kocher final argument is that the Kemalist project, even if repressive, might have built a stage of peace in the present and future of Turkey.

Kocher backs his argument through claiming that in the elections the pro-Kurdish parties have not received enough support from the Kurdish population as expected, that has preferred to support other Turkish parties (Kocher, 2007).

An argument for this shocking fact might be that all pro-Kurdish parties have a strong left-wing position, losing voters within the conservative Kurdish population (Kocher, 2007). On the other side no conservative pro-Kurdish party has been ever created. Also, the lack of diversity within pro-Kurdish parties might be because of the difficulty of political association that Kurds have.

On the other hand, in the last presidential elections a pro-Kurdish party raised a relatively higher support than the other years (still very low taking in consideration the quantity of Kurds living in Turkey). The party was focusing on many other points and not just into pro-Kurdish causes, having the possibility of receiving support from other sectors which are not directly interested with the Kurdish question.

The reasons of the lack of support to pro-Kurdish parties can be several and it is very difficult to give a final answer of the real reasons for this problem, that is why this argument was not included in our analysis.

Conclusion

Kant allows us to conclude that the conflict between the Kurdish and Turkish population has at its main root, a strong lack of what he would call juridical equality, defined as an insufficiency of legal equality between groups of people that inhabit the same state.

As shown in the reports of the Human Rights Watch, and the European Commission the means of reproduction of Kurdish culture are highly blocked, in the same way as their possibilities of participation in the public sphere.

In fact the only way for the Kurdish population to have a full and equal representation and participation as citizens is through accepting the programs of assimilation of the Turkish government, through renouncing to their Kurdish identity.

The Turkish state is in a condition of, using Kant's terms, ownership of the Kurdish population. Since the Kurds can not live according to their cultural status quo, and have to accept a civil constitution that has been imposed on them, they do not have the possibility of being part of the state but being owned by it.

This condition of inequality, imposition and servitude is what built the conflict between Turks and Kurds.

The Kemalist project of nation building has created a Turkey that aims to build a homogenous society in a geographical area, where ethnic diversity rules.

The only way of making that project a reality was to build state structures, that would facilitate that process of identity homogenization and block the reproduction of other internal minorities that could be a threat to the nationalist ideal.

The nationalistic project has been proven partially a success for its accomplishments in the field of assimilation of minorities, that had become part of the Turkish nation, but also a big humanitarian failure since those accomplishments were achieved through a state of repression that left no real freedom of cultural autonomy.

The nationalist project of Turkey has been the reason of ethnic inequality in Turkey and therefore the cause of the conflict.

If Turkey wants to end the conflict between the Kurdish and Turkish population it will have to propose a model of state, that puts ethnic equality in its foundations, breaking with the condition of internal juridical inequality and governmental ownership of the Kurdish people.

Definitively such a model is not possible within the Kemalist project, since it does not leave space for ethnic equality outside the Turkish national identity.

A multicultural model of state could bring a solution to a conflict, that will never end if the foundations of the Turkish system are not changed.

It would allow to start a new process of discussion and agreement on the fundamental rules of a state, that will work for equally include every ethnicity and finally ensure the end of ethnic-related conflicts.

Bibliography

Books:

- Barkey HJ & Fuller GE 1998, *Turkey's Kurdish question,* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bloom, W 1993, *Personal Identity, National Identity and International Relations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bryman, A 2013, *Social research methods 4nd Ed.*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bunar, N, & Valenta, M, 2012, 'Sociology of ethnicity' in *Introduction to sociology Scandinavian Sensibility.* eds Aakvaag, Jacobsen & Johansson, pp. 298-317.
- Delanty, G, & Strydom, P, 2003, *Philosophies of social sciences*, Open University Press, Philadelphia.
- Heywoo, A, 2014, 2nd edition, *Global politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, Uk.
- Howard, DA 2001, *History of Turkey,* Greenwood Press.
- Hutchinson, J & Smith, AD 1996, *Ethnicity,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Ion, D 2012, *Kant and International Relations Theory : Cosmopolitan Community-building,* Routledge, Oxon.
- Jones, S 1997, *Archaeology of Ethnicity : Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*, Routledge, London.
- Kia, M 2008, *The Ottoman Empire*, Greenwood Press.
- Kocher, MA 2007, The Decline of the PKK and Viability of a One-State Solution in Turkey, *Democracy and Human Rights in Multicultural Societies,* UNESCO, Hampshire.
- Rance, B 2012, *Citizenship and Identity, in Turkey: From Atatürk's Republic to the Present Day,* J. B. Tauris.
- Slobin, DI & Zimmer, KE 1986. "Typological Studies in Language, Volume 8 : Studies in Turkish Linguistics". John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Smith, AD 1998, *Nationalism and modernism : a critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism*, London ; New York.
- Watson, CW 2000, *Multiculturalism,* Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Yildiz, K 2005, *Kurds in Turkey : EU Accession and Human Rights.*
Zürcher, EJ 2004. *Turkey : A Modern Histor*y, 3rd Edition, London, GBR.
- Öktem, K 2011, *Turkey since 1989: Angry Nation,* Zed Books.

Journals:
- Anderson, B, 1998, *imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism,* London, Verso.
- Goodin, RE 2006, *Liberal Multiculturalism: Protective vs Polyglot, Political Theory,* vol. 34 no 3, SAGE Publications, Canberra.
- Shannon, SE & Hsieh, HF 2005, Qualitative health research, vol. 15, no. 9, p. 1-12.
- Spencer, S 2014, *Race and ethnicity: culture, identity and representation,* Routledge, New York.

Web:

- Constitution of the Republic of Turkey 1961, available from: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/constitution-of-the-republic-of-turkey.en.mfa [18 December 2014].
- Smith, TW 2005, Civic Nationalism and Ethnocultural Justice in Turkey, Human Rights Quarterly, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 436-470. Available from: http://bd9jx6as9l.search.serialssolutions.com/?genre=article&issn=02750392&title=Human+Rights+Quarterly&volume=27&issue=2&date=20050501&atitle=Civic+Nationalism+and+Ethnocultural+Justice+in+Turkey.&spage=436&pages=436-470&sid=EBSCO%3ASocINDEX+with+Full+Text&au=Smith%2C+Thomas+W [7 December 2014].

Reports:

-
- Bennet, J 1795, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* Translation by Jonathan Bennett, October 2010
- Central Intelligence Agency, *CIA world factbook 2014*, Avialable from: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html [17 December 2014].
- European Commission, 2014, *Turkey Progress Report,* Brussels. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2014/20141008-turkey-progress-report_en.pdf
- Human Rights Watch, 2014 *Turkey's Human Rights Rollback,* USA, Available from: hrw.org [18 December 2005].
- Kurdish Academy of Language, 2014. Available from: http://www.kurdishacademy.org [17 December 2014].

Martinich, AP 2014, *Epistemology*, Britannia.com, Available from:

http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/190219/epistemology/11460/Immanuel-Kant [17 December 2014