Hybrid Sovereignty: from the Ottoman Empire to Modern-Day Turkey and its Failure to Integrate the European Union

Thibaut Paul Philippe Améhamé-Troit

6489087

t.p.p.amehame@students.uu.nl

Politics, Philosophy, Economics

18th of June 2021

Number of Words: 10409

Number of pages: 33

Hybrid Sovereignty: from the Ottoman Empire to Modern-Day Turkey and its Failure to Integrate the European Union

Abstract

This paper examines the principal cause of Turkey's failure to integrate the European Union. Indeed, a deep-rooted cause transcends any other reasons assumed, namely Hybrid Sovereignty described by Bacik (2007). The European Union (EU) has been very vocal concerning the domestic issues present in Turkey, such as problems with minority rights or a stable democracy, which hinder any possibility of integration. Those issues stem from the hybridization of state sovereignty through the implementation of western ideals in a traditional state (Bacik, 2007). Moreover, this historical process of westernization started during the late Ottoman Era and continued with the creation of the Republic of Turkey. This paper investigates this process of state hybridization and its domestic consequences defined by sovereignty crises. Those consequences resulted in the failure of Turkey to uphold the EU framework requirements and explains why Turkey's accession to the EU is on hold. In order to explore the theoretical framework of Hybrid Sovereignty, we used qualitative methods of content analysis through a long and thorough literature review. The conclusion drawn from this analysis is that the Ottoman Empire and Turkey's westernization process proceeded in creating a hybridized state sovereignty. In regard to domestic issues, the latter stem from the failure of the state to uphold and solve sovereignty crises. Because of that the EU became reluctant to Turkey's integration to the EU as a full member. This failure resulted in the inspection of alternatives such as a privileged partnership with the EU. Nonetheless, the EU still has a will to monitor Turkey's domestic improvement if any further partnership is to be implemented. However, this interference in Turkey's domestic politics is also not well accepted. In that regard, the development of Turkey's European integration seems blurry but promising

Table of contents

Introduction

"The European Union needs Turkey more than Turkey needs the European Union" (Barrigazzi, 2016) is the tone used by Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the Turkish President in 2016 after facing criticism on the rule of law in Turkey (Barrigazzi, 2016). Even though it seems like there are strong tensions between the European Union and Turkey, it has not always been like that. Indeed, Turkey's will to join the concert of Europe is over 70 years old, when it joined the Council of Europe in 1949 (Tekin, 2007). Moreover, they applied to officially join the European Economic Cooperation (EEC) in 1987 and became candidate member for EU accession in 1999 (European Commission, 2021). However, Turkey is still far from achieving its goal of joining the EU as a full member. Indeed, in order to be eligible of EU accession, certain EU standards must be upheld. In the case of Turkey, it always fell short regarding fundamental rights, minority rights, rule of law and democracy requirements. The EU is a political and economic union between 27 countries, in which supra-governmental institutions set rules and norms to regulate certain fields (European Commission, 2021). The EU is a supranational entity which, according to the Cambridge dictionary, entails that organisations "involving more than one country, or having power or authority that is greater than that of single countries" (Cambridge University Press, 2021). In that regard, EU members give up a part of their sovereignty to the EU, which, according to the European Commission, means that " Member States delegate some of their decision-making powers to the shared institutions they have created, so that decisions on specific matters of common interest can be made democratically at EU level" (European Commission, 2021). Joining the EU entails a certain loss of sovereignty and the interference of EU institutions in national affairs. Nevertheless, Turkey a strong tradition of a deep-rooted state sovereignty (Tekin, 2007). The failure to comply to these standards of the domestic realm stems from a long historical process of hybrid sovereignty. The inapplicability of EU requirements in the domestic realm of Turkey come from a rooted issue of state hybridity that hinders any possible and concrete development towards EU accession. Indeed, in this paper, we will argue that the hardships that Turkey faces stem not only from recent failures to uphold a democratic state or minority rights, but that the problem is linked back to a hybridization of the state dating from the Ottoman Empire. This theoretical framework of Hybrid Sovereignty is defined and discussed by the Turkish author Bacik (2007). This hybridity comes from the clash between the implementation of western ideals of sovereignty in a traditional state format. This clash between two different state sovereignty cultures created a new state sovereignty that is neither western nor traditional, namely hybrid sovereignty.

Furthermore, the implementation of this western style sovereignty rose with a wide westernization campaign that started with the Ottoman Empire, with for example the Tanzimat reforms, to the creation of the Republic of Turkey and the westernization process put in place by Kemal Atatürk that ultimately translated itself in Turkey applying for a full membership in the EU. As we can see, there is a lengthy historical process of westernization that created this hybrid sovereignty. Moreover, this hybridization comes with certain consequences which are defined by sovereignty crisis and illustrate themselves through failure of central authority or problems with minority rights (Bacik, 2007). Those domestic issues are the one hindering the process of Turkey's EU accession. In that regard, we will analyse that Hybrid Sovereignty is the reason behind those domestic issues. Moreover, we will explain that the rise of Hybrid Sovereignty started during the Ottoman Empire and continued after the creation of modern-day Turkey in a post-World War I context, in which the state followed intensive westernization periods. Those periods translated themselves in the appearance of sovereignty crisis that illustrate Turkey's domestic issues and hardships to comply with EU regulations and standards (Bacik, 2007). Nonetheless, in order to prove this hybrid sovereignty, we need to find symptoms of it, in the Ottoman Empire and in Turkey. Those symptoms illustrate themselves with the survival of traditional patterns at the state level and at society's level, even though Turkey underwent westernization reforms to adapt to the EU institutional framework. In that regard, we will pay attention to the on-going military influence in Turkey and the surviving patterns of primordialism within Turkish society. In light of those domestic issues hindering and putting at a stop Turkey's EU accession process, we will see that an alternative to the full membership might be a privileged partnership. In order to examine the cause of Turkey's failing accession to the EU, we will answer the following question: In what ways is the hybrid sovereignty structure of Turkey the root cause of its failure to integrate the European Union as a full member? In order to answer this question, we will start with a short background of Turkish-EU relations. Second, we will explore the concepts of sovereignty, hybrid sovereignty and sovereignty crisis. Third, we will look at how Turkey installs itself in this theoretical framework (with a historical analysis dating back to the Ottoman Empire). Last, with the failing prospect of Turkey joining the EU, we will illustrate a potential alternative to becoming a full member of the EU through the analysis of a privileged partnership.

Methods

The methodology used to write this thesis is a literature review. Indeed, in order to find the historical background and a theoretical framework that inserts itself in the latter, we conducted research mostly using Google Scholar, journal articles, Utrecht University WorldCat, literature from previous courses, namely Imperialism and the Middle East, and the official website of the European Union. The literature review inspected the different westernization processes that happened in the Ottoman Empire and in Turkey. Additionally, we looked into different types of sovereignty crisis as well. In order to look at those, we applied the theoretical framework of Hybrid Sovereignty described by Bacik. The time frame of this study starts with the end of the Ottoman Era and the disintegration of its Empire, to the creation of the Republic of Turkey and to more recently with for example the 2016 failed coup in Turkey. This analysis is solely qualitative and dived into a long process of content analysis. The latter included westernization processes such as democratic reforms, and also sovereignty crises such as failures of central authority and citizenship, and problems with minorities and fundamental rights. Nonetheless, the exploration of Hybrid Sovereignty in Turkey seemed to not have been studied before. In that regard, the application of Hybrid Sovereignty had to be thoroughly justified.

I/The History between Turkey and the EU and its requirements to join it

Turkey's will to join the EU dates to the Ottoman Empire during which it tried to assess themselves as a European power in order to join the European concert. Nevertheless, they officially announced their commitment to the West in 1949 by becoming a member of the Council of Europe and by joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in 1952 (Tekin, 2007). Moreover, they continued their wave of European Integration with the Ankara Association Agreement of 1963, a cooperation framework between Turkey and the EU, which led to the creation and joining of the Customs Union of 1995 (Tekin, 2007). Furthermore, they officiated their relationship with the EU when they applied for the EEC in 1987, which then became part of the EU framework. A decade later, the Luxembourg Council summit reports that Turkey is eligible to become a EU member and they are officially declared as a candidate member during the Helsinki summit in 1999 (European Commission, 2021). In 2005, the European Council started to open the accession negotiations for Turkey to join the EU and assess what still needs to be done for Turkey to fulfil all of EU standards (European Commission, 2021). Nonetheless, in 2006, following the Cyprus crisis and the non-compliance of Turkey, several chapter negotiations were closed (European Commission, 2021). The following years, Turkey and the EU opened their negotiations over several chapters such as Policy and Coordination of Structural Instruments and Economic and Monetary policy (European Commission, 2021). However, with the failed coup attempt of 2016 (Altay, 2018) and other domestic issues such as fundamental rights, minority rights, democracy and rule of law, the Turkish accession to the EU seems to be at a stop. As we can see, Turkey has had a long past regarding its European integration, but the Turkish government failed to meet all the requirements that are necessary in order to join the EU.

Indeed, the EU possesses several conditions for membership, for which they have 3 main guidelines:

1) "complying with all the EU's standards and rules" (European Commission, 2020)

2) "having the consent of the EU institutions and EU member states" (European Commission, 2020)

3) "having the consent of their citizens – as expressed through approval in their national parliaments or by referendum" (European Commission, 2020)

The EU standards and rules were set by the European Council in Copenhagen in 1993 and are known as the Copenhagen Criteria (Eur-Lex, 2021). Those criteria also possess 3 main guidelines as follow:

1) "stable institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities" (Eur-Lex, 2021)

2) "a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competition and market forces in the EU" (Eur-Lex, 2021)

3) "the ability to take on and implement effectively the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union" (Eur-Lex, 2021)

The EU has important demands regarding domestic and political issues such as a stable democracy, human rights upheld and protection of minorities. Nonetheless, Turkey is not fond of being told what to do in their domestic realm. Indeed, according to Tekin:

"whenever the conditionality for European integration touches on the internally sensitive issues such as minority rights and religious freedom and thus suggests alterations in the basis of the Treaty of Lausanne, Turkey immediately remembers the other side of the old equilibrium: the West as a source of threat. Then, the demands of Europe in that context are interpreted as threats to national security and sovereignty" (2007. P5)

The reason for this mistrust dates back to the Ottoman Empire as we will explore in the following sections. Furthermore, the hybridization of the state explains the failure to uphold these domestic rights, which take the form of sovereignty crisis and hinder Turkey's process of integrating the EU. In the following section, we will explore why Turkey integrates itself in the concept of Hybrid Sovereignty by taking a look at the continuity and link with its past, namely the Ottoman Empire, and the Westernization process that was experienced from the Ottoman era to modern day Turkey.

Theoretical Framework: Sovereignty, Hybrid Sovereignty and Sovereignty Crisis

1) **A Brief Introduction to Sovereignty**

Sovereignty is defined by Bacik "as the power that effects on all levels the legitimate organization of a society and its international relations" (2007. P20). The concept of sovereignty rose in importance during the 17th century. Indeed, the Westphalian Peace Treaty of 1648 is the anchor of modern state sovereignty, in which European powers came together and agreed that Europe would be divided into sovereign states with established boundaries that would each give absolute control over its subjects (Ku & Yoo,2012). The treaty further included a clause of non-intervention in other states affairs and in which every sovereign state is equal before the law (Tekin, 2007).

In a Post-World War and Post-Cold War context, the world experienced the biggest leap towards the establishment of an international legal framework with the turbulence of both World Wars and the emergence of international organisations such as the United Nations (UN) and the International Court of Justice (ICJ) but also of supranational organisations such as the European Union. Indeed, the emergence of an international political order coupled with the on-going globalization changed the face of sovereignty and broke its ties with the Westphalian-type sovereignty (Ku & Yoo,2012). The absolute sovereignty of states and the rule of non-intervention completely disappeared with the UN Charter. Additionally, interventionist measures were implemented in case of mistreatment of national populations or the failure to protect its own citizens through policies like the Responsibility 2 Protect (R2P). Moreover, the interconnectedness of states through international organisations such as the EU in our case has diminished the importance of absolute sovereignty since states need to abide to rules that are above the mere authority of the state. According to Ku and Yoo, globalization had a negative effect on sovereignty for 3 main reasons: First, the economic integration has "led to the decline of the nation-state as a unit of social organization" (2012. P213). The increasing influence and independence of international organisations gave them power to exercise their authority on states. Globalization transformed international law, as the "new international law" purports to create universal, binding obligations regulating a nation-state's treatment of its own citizens" (Ku & Yoo, 2012. P213). This 'issue', in the case of sovereignty, gained importance with the establishment of international human rights. (Ku & Yoo, 2012).

Nonetheless, in the current years, the notion of state sovereignty became to broad and was divided into two branches, namely external and internal sovereignty, international and

domestic sovereignty. The external sovereignty refers to foreign politics and the relations of the state with international organisations and other states. However, internal sovereignty deals with the relationship between the state and its society which includes every national citizen. Therefore, all social actors are expected to recognize state practices and standards. As Bacik (2007. Pp19-20) defines it:

"The boundaries between state and society at the domestic level are essential for creating the basic institutions of modern statehood, among them the essential institution of citizenship. These institutions, neutral and rational in a modern/Weberian-state sense, then create a political structure that is set to maintain an equality-based relationship between people and state"

Consequently, internal sovereignty and external sovereignty are complementary in order to achieve a functional and organized state. The role of the state is to protect the boundaries imposed by the international and domestic realms. Moreover, the state is required to take action when either of those realms are violated by threats from within the territory as well as external to the territory (Bacik, 2007). The protection of the latter "is the proof of their capacity for statehood. In sharp departure from the traditional view that sees sovereignty as a typical foreign-policy matter, it is proposed in this book that the domestic realm is an equally important sovereignty context" as described by Bacik (2007. P20).

2) Hybrid Sovereignty

The theory of 'Hybrid Sovereignty' is put forward by Bacik. He describes Hybrid Sovereignty as the injection of Western-style sovereignty in the Arab region through "methods such as unequal treaties, capitulations, protectorate systems, conventions, contracts, coercion, and imposition" (Bacik, 2007. P15). Such patterns of power imbalances can be explained by colonial intent (Bacik, 2007). However, countries from the Arab region already had their own sovereignty. One can therefore observe a clash of sovereignty cultures between more traditional forms of sovereignty with the Western one. The diversity among various social and political cultures evolved through time, in Europe from the 17th century to nowadays. The imposition or voluntary cultural change regarding sovereignty has been an on-going process shifting between a traditional form of sovereignty to a western one will prove itself difficult and remnants of the old system will survive (Bacik, 2007). Hence, we have a mix of a traditional and western sovereignty which created a new type of sovereignty namely Hybrid Sovereignty. Nonetheless,

this new Hybrid Sovereignty comes with negative consequences. Bacik differentiates three potential outcomes of hybridity:

1) "The total dominance of one side by the other, and thus the reconstruction of the other by the conquering model" (2007. P30)
2) "The two models completely reject each other" (2007. P30)
3) "The two models give way to a hybrid model that is significantly different from both of them" (2007. P30)

In the case of Turkey, it seems like the third model is the one that developed itself through the years. This model created problems through out Turkey such as legitimacy issues, economic instability, or democratization issues. Those issues arise through a lengthy historical and cultural process (with for example, the injection of Christian values and models in states where Islam in completely dominant) of clashing cultures between the West and the Arab world. This hybridity affects the institutions and norms already established and tries to change them. Those new norms establish themselves in a foreign model and the institutions struggle to adapt to them. Nevertheless, it does not mean that the adaptation is a complete failure. However, this process illustrates the defectiveness of this hybrid model. Hybridity is felt at different levels. Indeed, at the social level, Arab states did not possess a working class or bourgeoisie as observed in the West. At a political level, there was a legitimacy crisis. It illustrates itself by the end of a traditional system in which its legitimacy was its sole base. The traditional legitimacy system is undermined, and the new legitimacy fails to impose itself. Moreover, the original starting point of an evolving hybridity in the Arab world finds itself in the disintegration of the Ottoman empire, in which new boundaries were settled regardless of the ethnic, religious and social differences such as the Kurds in Turkey and Iraq. This phenomenon enhanced the legitimacy crisis of different cultures placed together that are not equally represented. In this regard, the social, political, and cultural issues coupled with westernization created sovereignty crises as a consequence of Hybrid Sovereignty.

3) Sovereignty Crisis

The consequences of Hybrid Sovereignty illustrate themselves with the rising sovereignty crisis that come with it. Those crises show the survival of traditional models in the state system after attempting to modernize or forced to modernize. As we know, Sovereignty is divided in two branches the domestic and the foreign one, in which the goal is the guaranty of a legitimate state authority.

Sovereignty crisis in the domestic realm is defined as follow by Bacik:

"Sovereignty crisis in the domestic realm can be defined as the failure of any part of this rationality. In other words, the failure of rational components such as citizenship or central government are typical sovereignty crises that clearly show that Western-type sovereignty has not been realized, as does the perseverance of tribal loyalty in the rational state structure"

In order to solve those sovereignty crises, the state deploys methods known as substitution mechanisms. Those mechanisms are different that the one offered by the rational state. In that regard, those response policies revitalize traditional patterns such as tribalism or sectarianism (Bacik, 2007). The use of tribal support in the political sphere or the use of violence are substitution mechanisms used to solve sovereignty crisis. However, those methods come from hybridisation and create hybrid solutions (Bacik, 2007). This reflects itself on the state and creates an atmosphere of instability caused by the mix of traditional and western norms (Bacik, 2007). Certain events trigger sovereignty crisis. Those sovereignty crises come into different forms.

a) The Problem of Minorities

Sovereignty crisis reflects social issues with minorities. In that regard, the state fails to integrate minorities in a homogeneous territory. Hence, those minority groups stay together and keep their ethnic status such as the Kurds in Turkey. They decide to stay by themselves in order to protect themselves and their future interest. The non-integration or disregard for those population will create sovereignty crisis as they will neglect and harden the state's work in future policy implementation.

b) The Failure of Central Authority

The failure of central authority translates that the state does not possess full authority over its territory. The loss of full authority appears when there are rebels, terrorist activities or ethnic problems (Bacik, 2007). One of the consequences of hybrid sovereignty was the failure to create a central authority in a modern state. In that regard, the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire led to the creation of states that were completely heterogenous. Hence, the difficulties of assembling every ethnic group under one central authority throughout the entire territory.

c) The Failure of Citizenship

Bacik defines citizenship as "All citizens in the defined territory of "a state" have the same rights and responsibilities" (Bacik, 2007. P47). The guarantee of a citizenship equal to all is a pillar of western-style sovereignty. The characteristics of citizenship assume a complete neutrality regardless of "tribal, racial, and gender-based considerations" (Bacik, 2007. Pp47-48). In that regard, the entirety of the population possesses equal rights and duties. Those assumptions are the guarantees of the ruler's legitimacy figure in its right to sovereignty. The failure to comply to those standards and the favouritism of a part of the population translates into a sovereignty crisis. That is to say, Turkey has still mitigated equal rights between Turks and Kurds which are differently treated and discriminated against. Those difference in rights create a sovereignty crisis.

d) The Instrumentalization of Power

The instrumentalization of power looks at the different means used by the state to assert its power and authority over its territory. In that regard, Bacik identifies two different means: power-oriented means and mechanism-oriented means (2007). The modern state is attached to mechanism-oriented means such as social and economic institutions to assert their power. However, in states where those institutions lack, we can see a shift to power-oriented means such as violence to stay in power. This is where the hybrid sovereignty plays a major role. Indeed, the establishment of western-oriented institutions in the Arab state failed to come with its operationalization. The social contract established between the state and the population is failing to persuade through social and economic means, so the state uses means of coercion and violence to keep its authority. This goes back to the use of substitution mechanism to solve sovereignty crisis through the same means of violence. Those methods are safeguards for the rulers to keep their regime in power and one of the consequences of hybrid sovereignty.

As we can see from the previous sections, the evolution of sovereignty played a major role in the domestic issues present in Turkey nowadays. Indeed, the transition to the importance of domestic sovereignty is essential for Turkey to join the EU. The consequences of hybridity reflected itself in the rising sovereignty crisis that Turkey faced domestically, which hindered its EU membership process. Moreover, the state fails to deal with these internal problems and tries to solve them using substitution mechanisms that prove the failure of the established hybrid institutions. Those issues need to be solved in order for Turkey to gain terrain in joining the EU as a full member. Nonetheless, the perpetual cycle starting from hybrid sovereignty to sovereignty crisis to substitution mechanisms seems to hinder and block any possible

developments for Turkey accession to the EU. In order to understand the peculiarities of the case of Turkey in the Hybrid model described by Bacik, we will look at the pre-historical case of the Ottoman Empire and its reflection on modern-day Turkey to assess why Turkey fits in Bacik's model and why its case is unique.

III/The Special Case of Turkey in the Framework of Hybrid Sovereignty

In order for this analysis to be relevant, the justification of the choice of Turkey in the framework of Hybrid Sovereignty is important. Turkey and sovereignty have a long history dating back to the Ottoman Empire from which we see its remnants in modern-day Turkey. According to Tekin:

"Turkey has a long and deep-rooted sovereign state tradition and is expected to protect it jealously against outside world. Yet, it yearns for a membership in the European Union (EU), which requires the country to "share" its sovereignty (2007. P1)"

As we have seen, sovereignty issues in Turkey are not new and they date back to the Ottoman Empire. An important observation that we shall not omit is the link in the applicability of the theory of Hybrid Sovereignty between the Ottoman Empire and modern-day Turkey. Indeed, there are similar trends in the development of sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey.

First, the fact that makes the case of Turkey in Hybrid Sovereignty special is that it was not colonised similarly to its neighbouring countries, such as Iraq and Jordan, after the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in the post-World War I context. In that sense, western ideals were never directly injected in Turkey through colonialism. However, the westernization process was self-injected or self-implanted by the Turkish government. Furthermore, this modernization process to resemble Western powers also took place in the context of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century. In that regard, Turkey self-hybridized itself and created its own Hybrid Sovereignty. This historical process of hybridity reflects itself in modern-day Turkey through its EU membership candidacy in 1987 and its failure to uphold EU standards in order to join the Union. Indeed, joining the EU entails setting aside certain aspects of sovereignty that is given up to the EU authority. This is an issue for Turkey since they experienced loss of sovereignty in the past during the Ottoman Empire and it came with negative consequences, which explains the reluctance of Turkey to share its sovereignty (Eldem, 2005). Nevertheless, we have seen that the concept of sovereignty can be divided in two branches, namely domestic and international/foreign sovereignty. In that regard, Tekin argues that "the Turkish state guards sovereign rights related to internal political affairs more energetically than those related to foreign economic and security issues" (2007. P1). Indeed, it seems like Turkey would not move from their position on giving their sovereignty in the domestic realm. However, as mentioned above, Hybrid sovereignty causes sovereignty crisis internally and those must be solved in order for Turkey to join the EU.

1) The Ottoman Empire, Turkey and Westernization

a) *The Ottoman Empire and Westernization*

As Bacik describes it, Western powers injected their ideals into the Arab World through colonial means. However, the case of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey is similar yet different because they self-injected these ideals in order to identify themselves with the West and try to integrate it. In that regard, the new hybrid model did not directly come from colonial coercion but from indirect influence from the Western power as the model the world should adopt. Following these ideals, the Ottoman Empire and Turkey tried to modernize and westernize themselves to resemble the Western World.

First, we will analyse the attempted westernization of the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, The Tanzimat reforms were the first attempt of westernization for the Ottoman Empire in order to join the concert of Europe and associate with the latter. The Tanzimat reform was initiated from 1839 to 1876 under the rule of the Ottoman sultan Abdülmecid (Eldem, 2005). The goal of those reforms was to align to western standards in order to join the European powers such as Turkey with joining the EU. One of the objectives of the Tanzimat was to raise and empower minorities by upholding human rights standards. This was proven difficult since the Ottoman Empire was a very heterogenous and non-secular empire. In order to deal with those issues, the sultan introduced the Millet system during the Tanzimat period. The Millet system permitted non-Muslim communities to enjoy new rights regarding their religion and social practices (Akgün, 1991). The Ottoman state was trying to replace its Shariah law with a more comprehensive and open western law (Aral, 2005). Some of the rights developed for the non-Muslim communities entailed freedom of travel, freedom of religious, freedom of conscience, right to education and right to privacy (Aral, 2005). Indeed, in the Gülhane Treaty of 1839, that launched the Tanzimat reforms, it stipulates that "The guarantees promising to our subjects perfect security for life, honor, and property" (Hurewitz & Inalcik, 1975). The sultan did not refer only to the Muslim population but to all his subjects. In that regard, the Ottoman empire fits perfectly the model developed by Bacik. In our case, the western ideals were self-injected by the state as we can see with the Tanzimat reforms led by sultan Abdülmecid and led to a clash of sovereignty culture between the western ideals and the traditional ones.

b) *Turkey and Westernization*

After the defeat of the Ottoman empire in World War I and its disintegration by European powers, the Republic of Turkey was founded in 1923 with its new president Kemal Atatürk.

Kemal's goal was to get rid of the conservatism that was running in the Turkish state and orient itself in the direction of westernization. In that regard, Atatürk:

"set into motion comprehensive reforms that were perfectly compatible with the goal of Westernization. These reforms, however, were so radical and intensive that they shook the foundations of traditional Ottoman/Turkish society and injected a strong ideational soul to the initially fear-driven Westernization process" (Oğuzlu & Kibaroğlu, 2009. P578)

Indeed, one of the big focus of those reforms was the secularization of the state and the instalment of democracy. Kemal's ideals translated in the end of Islam in the public sphere by banning religious education and schools, the elimination of Islamic institutions and the end of the Caliphate marked an important milestone in achieving European standards. Moreover, the Republic of Turkey also tried to align itself with the issues regulated by the Lausanne treaty of 1923 in a post-World War I context. Following the same ideals as during the Tanzimat era of the Ottoman Empire, there was an important part regarding the acknowledgment of minority rights (Aytekin, 2012). Indeed, we have article 38 that stipulates that "The Turkish Government undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Turkey without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion. All inhabitants of Turkey shall be entitled to free exercise, whether in public or private, of any creed, religion or belief, the observance of which shall not be incompatible with public order and good morals" or article 39 that explains that "Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities will enjoy the same civil and political rights as Moslems" (World War I Document Archive, 2009). As we can see, huge efforts have been made in the domestic realm of Turkey in order to follow European political standards and try to associate itself with the West.

We can overwhelmingly notice that the self-injection of western ideals is noticeable in both the Ottoman Empire and the modern-day Republic of Turkey. There is a continuity in the mindset developed from the Ottoman Empire to Turkey, in which they desire being associated with West, especially after Turkey's will of joining the EEC and then the EU through a full membership. There has been close to two centuries of westernization attempts to uphold to its European standards and affirm itself as a European power. Nevertheless, the self-westernization meddles with deep-rooted state traditions and sovereignty dating back from the Ottoman Empire which also translates a process of hybridization that comes with negative consequences. Indeed, the creation of a hybrid sovereignty through westernization developed an unstable and malfunctioning state system that illustrates itself through sovereignty crisis.

2) Symptoms of Hybrid Sovereignty

In order to prove an eventual hybrid sovereignty, we need to look at the survival of traditional patterns within the state (Bacik, 2007). In that regard, there is a clash between western sovereignty and traditional sovereignty, which explains the survival of those traditional patterns even though Turkey has been through intensive westernization periods dating back to the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, we will look at the role of the military in the political sphere in Turkey and the survival of primordialism through the Kurds in Turkish society.

First, the military always had an important role in Turkish society from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey. In fact, Narli explains the influence of the military:

"Turkey's military and political elites have long combined in an uneasy partnership to oversee the Republic's affairs. A number of factors have enabled the military to influence Turkish politics in the name of protecting national unity, democracy, and secularism, including the legacy of the vertically organized Ottoman social system, the role of the army in liberating, building, and modernizing the nation, relatively immature democratic culture and institutions, and numerous constitutional tools" (2000. P107)

As we can see, the military was considered as the "guardian of the regime" (Tekin, 2007. P8), in order to preserve Turkish identity, Ottoman values and then secularism and democracy (Narli, 2000). Nonetheless, for Turkey to join the EU as a full member, the EU imposes a strict separation between the military and civil affairs (Narli, 2000). Because of the closeness of the military with the state, the EU was very critical, and it hindered Turkey's capacity to join the EU in upholding EU standards. At first, during the Ottoman period, as stated above, they were the guarantor of the Ottoman's hierarchical system with the Caliphate. Nevertheless, after the creation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, and the rise of Kemalism, the military became the defender of the Kemalist state and values, namely secularism, democracy and Turkish identity (Narli, 2000). Moreover, we can see that the military is still very present, but they stage their presence through the event of military coups, which happened four times since 1960 (Narli, 2000). However, even though the military considered itself as the guardian of European values such as democracy and secularism, the EU still requires a strict separation between the latter and civil affairs. In that regard, Erdogan passed a bill in 2003 with a goal of reducing the power and influence of the military (Hamid, 2004). Nonetheless, in 2016, Turkey underwent a failed military coup, which shows still a strong presence of the military in Turkish civil affairs.

Second, another symptom of hybrid sovereignty in Turkish society is primordialism. Bayar describes primordialism as a fixed ethnicity that persist in society, creating an ethnic distance between the ethnic minority and the country they live in (2009). Indeed, while Kemal Atatürk was in power, he pursued assimilationist policies to create a homogenous state of Turkish citizens, during which the Kurdish population protested but was violently repressed (Içduygu et al., 1999). The Kurds were trying to keep their ethnic identity in Turkey. This further illustrated itself in the violent Kurdish/Turkish conflict with the Kurdistan's Workers' Party (PKK) since 1984. The repression of Kurdish rights by the Turkish government supported a rise in ethnic nationalism by the Kurds within the state of Turkey. The failed assimilation of the Kurds during the Kemalist period and the failure of Turkey to uphold their rights created this ethnic distance between the Turkish state and the Kurdish population described by Bayar (2009). Moreover, this distance is still noticeable nowadays in the lack of Kurdish rights recognition by the state through discriminatory practices.

As we can see, we can identify the survival of traditional patterns in Turkey after going over long periods of westernization. This proves the hybrid sovereignty of Turkey. Hence, this hybridity is noticeable in the rise in sovereignty crisis that Turkey faces in its domestic realm. Those sovereignty crises hinder Turkey's ability to uphold its EU requirements that are necessary in order to join the latter. Consequently, the westernization process (described below), the hybrid sovereignty arisen from the latter is the main obstacle in Turley's upholding of EU standards through the many domestic sovereignty crises the latter creates.

3) The Rise of Sovereignty Crisis in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey

a) The Case of the Ottoman Empire

Shortly before the end of the Tanzimat reform period, the Ottoman Empire was having heavy economic issues. Indeed, in order to keep themselves afloat with a quasi-stable economy, they contracted loans from foreign banks and governments from the West (Eldem, 2005). Their first foreign loans were contracted in 1854 and 1855 amounting to a value of £3,000,000 and £5,000,000 through Dent, Palmers & Co. and Rothschilds of London, respectively (Eldem, 2005. P434). Those foreign loans were the starting point of a long series of loans contracted on the European market (Eldem, 2005). In 1860s, the sum of the loans and "in five years, the Ottoman government had contracted a debt of over £86,000,000, corresponding to 2.3 times the sums borrowed in the previous 11 years" (Eldem, 2005. P439). The Ottoman Empire was facing

a growing foreign debt in which "55% of its budget was absorbed by the foreign debt" (Eldem, 2005. P439). As a result, the Ottoman Empire announced its bankruptcy in 1875.

In order to avoid local banking institutions to shut down, the Ottoman government came out with a solution. In fact, the government came to an agreement with the local banks and the Ottoman Bank that they would give "its indirect revenues from stamp, spirits, and fishing taxes, the silk tithe, and salt and tobacco monopolies" (Eldem, 2005. P441). Hence, the foreign institutions, namely European banks, were very unhappy with the situation since they wanted to recuperate the sum they loaned and its interest. They expressed their discontent to their respective governments and the European powers decided to act. In 1881, the Ottoman Public Debt Administration was established through the declaration of the Muharrem Decree, and Eldem describes the start of this period in the Ottoman Empire as "one of the gloomiest periods of its history" (2005. P440). This decree nullified the previous 1879 settlement and transferred the ownership of those state revenues to the European powers alongside new ones. This meant that one fifth of the state's revenue would be conceded to the European banks in order to pay up their debt. Because of this transfer of 'ownership' over the Ottoman state's revenues controlled by the West, we can project that as a sovereignty crisis, the failure of central authority (failure of central authority translates that the state does not possess full authority over its territory,(Bacik, 2007)). Indeed, the failure and loss of the Ottoman government authority on its own state revenues through the OPDA, that was fully controlled by the Western powers, the Ottoman experienced a loss of sovereignty or as Eldem describes it:

"The Muharrem Decree and the Administration of the Ottoman Public Debt constituted a severe blow to Ottoman pride and sovereignty. For the first time in its history, the Empire had been forced to surrender a considerable part of its sovereign rights over revenues, by accepting the unconditional control of foreign representatives constituting a 'state within the state" (2005. P442)

As we can see, as a result of weak institutions and poor reforms regarding the taxation system and financial markets, the Ottoman government was confronted with a hybrid state sovereignty that failed to keep its central authority over their own state revenues. Indeed, the Western powers owned the OPDA and the empire's revenues and the Ottoman government had no rights to intervene until its debt was settled. This shows the intrinsic consequences of hybridization through westernization and its clash with the traditional model of governance and sovereignty. This example illustrates precisely the theory advanced by Bacik. Moreover, we

will see that this theory works in the continuity of the Ottoman Empire, namely modern-day Turkey.

b) The Case of Turkey

Turkey has been an advocate to join the EU for over half a decade or for a century in a half if we go back to the Ottoman Empire and its will to join the concert of Europe. Nevertheless, in order to join the EU, Turkey needs to uphold certain standards described by the Copenhagen criteria. Those requirements comprise the upholding of human rights and of a stable democracy. Those standards are the one the Turkish government fails to guarantee. This stems from the unwillingness of the State to sacrifice any of its domestic sovereignty by accepting the requirements set by the EU, since they experienced loss of domestic sovereignty in their past through the OPDA in the Ottoman Empire for which they still hold grudges and remain distrustful of the West. The westernization process hybridized Turkish sovereignty and created sovereignty crisis through problems with minority rights and failures of citizenship. In that regard, we will look at the repression of the freedom of speech and censorship by the Turkish government. Indeed, it fails to uphold these rights to the entirety of its population, namely the population that is opposed to the current Erdogan government and openly criticizes it.

The Freedom House Index assesses if a country is 'free' by looking at its political rights and civil liberties and marked different categories from 0 to 4, with a final grade out of a 100. Turkey scored a 32/100 and is considered not free. For the categories surrounding civil liberties, namely freedom of expression and belief, Turkey scored a 1/4 for the subcategories "Are there free and independent media?" and "Are individuals free to express their personal views on political or other sensitive topics without fear of surveillance or retribution?" (Freedom House, 2021). These very low grades for basic citizenship rights reflect the repercussion of the failed coup of 2016 in Turkey. Indeed, during and after the coup, President Erdogan declared a state of emergency and massive wave of arrests and conviction followed the failed coup (Human Rights Watch, 2016). Among those arrests, many journalists that did not take part in the coup but criticized the government were arrested and prosecuted. According to Amnesty International, by the end of 2016 1/3 of the world's jailed journalists were in Turkey (2017). Moreover, according to the Human Rights Watch, in the late 2016, thanks to the use of the state of emergency, the Turkish state "shutdown of 23 TV and radio stations popular among Kurds, Alevi's and supporters of opposition parties" (Human Rights Watch, 2016). Following this event, the government detained and later arrested 12 journalists from the *Cumhuriyet* newspapers, thought to be one of the last independent newspapers in Turkey (Human Rights

Watch, 2016). Following these arrests and shutdowns, the post-coup period amounted to the closing of 140 media outlets and 29 publishing houses (Human Rights Watch, 2016). As we can see, the intensive crack-down on the rights of freedom of speech and opinion and the matters involving censorship clearly indicate the failure of the state to uphold equal rights among all its citizens, favouring only the medias and journalists that are loyal to the state. Those events translate in sovereignty crisis that stem from the hybridization of the Turkish state. Moreover, it seems quite paradoxical that Turkey would believe that they could join the EU in such a context. Indeed, the main focus point of the EU in allowing Turkey to be a full member of the latter was the development of human rights and of a stable democracy. However, the intervention by European powers in the domestic realm of Turkey dissatisfies the government. Furthermore, the announcement of a state of emergency could be seen as used to get rid of the political opposition in Turkey by detaining, arresting and shutting down any journalist or media outlet that would criticize the government. The recourse of violent means to legitimise the government's authority is a power-based mechanism that is used by the state to safeguard its power and respond to sovereignty crisis. Those methods coupled with the lack of democracy norms and rights usually safeguarded by the state illustrate the vast consequences of hybrid sovereignty.

Moreover, Turkey faces other sovereignty crisis issues regarding the problems with minorities, specifically with the Kurds. The Kurds are an ethnic minority that were part of the Ottoman Empire and have long faced a geographical crisis after the disintegration of the latter in a post-World War I context. Indeed, the Kurds have never possessed their own country and are divided mostly throughout Iraq, Tukey, Iran and Syria (Gunter, 2003). The Kurdish population is the largest ethnic and linguistic minority in Turkey, representing an estimated of 10 to 23 percent of the national population (Minority Rights Group International, 2018). Even though the Kurds occupy a large portion of Turkish society they are persecuted by the state and do not possess equal rights (Minority Rights Group International, 2018). In that regard, Turkey's sovereignty crisis comprehends problems of minority rights and failure of citizenship.

The Kurdish population was part of the vastly heterogenous population of the Ottoman Empire. However, after World War I and the disintegration of the latter, during the creation of the Republic of Turkey, one of the main objectives of Kemal Atatürk was to create a homogenous state of Turkish citizens. In fact, they "pursued aggressive assimilationist policies towards its Kurdish minority" (Içduygu et al., 1999. P993). The Turkish state was trying to focus entirely on making its population solely as Turkish citizens disregarding the Kurdish

culture, language and identity (Içduygu et al., 1999). To counter this attack on identity, the Kurds tried to protest, but got strongly suppressed by the government of Turkey (Içduygu et al., 1999). This state defiance was arguably tribal, and they fought the secularization and assimilation of Turkey (Içduygu et al., 1999). Nonetheless, the emergence of Kurdish nationalism started in 1984 with the creation of the Kurdish Workers' Party (PKK) with at its head Abdullah Ocalan, that started a guerrilla war between the Kurdish opposition and the state of Turkey (Içduygu et al., 1999). Indeed, the conflict between the PKK and the Turkish government was based on violence and coercive means from both sides. On one hand, we had the PKK fighting for its identity and self-determination as they did not want to adhere to the assimilationist policies put forward by Turkey, and on the other hand, we have the Turkish government that justifies its violence through security issues and fear of separationist tendencies. From 1984 to 2016, the overall death toll of the Kurdish/Turkish conflict is estimated to be between 30 000 and 40 000, but there are a lot of unknown in the data since human rights agencies struggled to verify those numbers (Mandiraci, 2016). Moreover, between 1984 and 1996, over 3000 villages were destroyed causing the displacement of over 3 million inhabitants (Beriker-Atiyas, 1997). Nevertheless, a cease fire started in 1999 after the arrest of the head of the PKK, Abdullah Ocalan in Kenya (Congressional Research Service, 2019). However, in 2004, the PKK deliberately put an end to the cease fire to restart their armed struggle against the Turkish government (Congressional Research Service, 2019). In order to put an end to the conflict, the Turkish government came up with the "Solution Process" in 2009 and with the "Resolution Process" in 2013 (Congressional Research Service, 2019). Nevertheless, the Kurdistan Communities Union (KCK) an affiliate organisation of the PKK resumed its armed struggle in 2015, disregarding the "Resolution Process", starting new attacks on Turkish armed forces (TRTWORLD, 2019).

As we can see, there is a long history of Kurdish armed conflict and struggle in Turkey. From 1984 to nowadays, there has been a lot of up and downs regarding the rights the Kurdish population possessed. The legal policies did not translate themselves practically, which defeats the purpose of de-alienating Kurdish rights (Toktas & Aras, 2009). Indeed, the strongest opposition to Kurds were against their cultural rights and the repression of the Turkish language (Minority Rights Group International, 2018). Indeed, in order to preserve Turkish culture, Kurds were not allowed to use the letters Q, X and W in their names since they do not exist in the Turkish alphabet, even though there are dominant letters for Kurds (Minority Rights Group International, 2018). Furthermore, Kurdish broadcasts were limited to only 45 minutes per day

with a weekly allowance of 4 hours (Toktas & Aras, 2009). Regarding education, it proved itself difficult for minority schools to choose their own teachers, and they did not get any governmental funds. Nonetheless, during the "solution process", Erdogan tried to increase Kurds rights by completely allowing Kurdish broadcast and education (Öniş, 2008). Nevertheless, after the restart of hostilities in 2015, discrimination against the Kurds resumed. In fact, there has been a "fatal stabbing in Istanbul of a 21-year-old Kurdish man by a gang who had overheard him speaking Kurdish on the phone", so we can observe the extent of the violence perpetrated against Kurds (Minority Rights Group International, 2018). Moreover, the Turkish government banned Kurdish demonstrations and banned access to medias relating to it (Minority Rights Group International, 2018). Turkey also imposed a curfew on the dominant Kurdish city of Cizre which from their access to basic services such as electricity, food and medical treatment (Minority Rights Group International, 2018).

Through out Turkey's EU integration campaign, we can notice that there are still some severe issues to be addressed and solved in order to be in line with the Copenhagen Criteria. Moreover, the severity of the failure to uphold fundamental rights, such as freedom of speech and opinion, and minority rights, with discriminatory policies against the Kurds after the 2016 failed coup proved once again that the accession to the status of EU member might prove itself difficult for Turkey. Nonetheless, the will of Turkey to integrate itself in Europe is still alive. In that regard, instead of joining the EU as a full member, Turkey and the EU might opt for the establishment of an advanced and privileged partnership between them with for example the development of the Customs Union of 1995 into an updated version that would benefit Turkey.

IV/New direction for Turkey: Advanced partnership with the EU

The prospect of joining the EU for Turkey seems unrealistic and even unattainable. Indeed, the negotiations between Turkey and the EU are completely stalled in what is considered the "biggest political crisis in bilateral relations" (Altay, 2018. P179). Number of factors explain this crisis such as the rising populist nationalism in Europe, the departure of the UK with Brexit and the stronger will from EU members to deny the accession to the EU for Turkey (Altay, 2018). Those issues put a stop any future prospects of Turkey joining the EU. The political crisis in Europe and the growing anti-Turkey accession groups affected Turkey's commitment to continue and embrace the process of EU membership. In that regard, Serdar Altay confirms that "In the face of the changing balance of power in Europe that strengthened the anti-Turkey camp, Ankara lost its appetite for new reforms to align its domestic legislation with the EU" (2018. P182). Indeed, President Erdogan believes that Turkey will not strongly continue the accession process as he deems that a full membership is not needed ant more (Altay, 2018).

The downward trend of any possible accession to the EU created new incentives from EU to establish a privileged partnership with the EU instead of Turkey joining as a full member (Altay, 2018). The rise of a prospective privileged partnership started in the 2000s by some EU members that were reticent to the idea of Turkish accession (Altay, 2018). Nonetheless, the accession negotiations still started with Turkey in October 2005. Angela Merkel, the German chancellor and Nicolas Sarkozy, French president, were against the accession of Turkey in the EU (Altay, 2018). The concept of a privileged partnership would entail "strengthening ties in security and foreign policy as well as in justice and home affairs, ensuring continued reforms in Turkey toward uninterrupted democratization, and enhancing minority and human rights" (Altay, 2018. P185). However, since 2013, there has been a crisis of confidence between EU leaders and Turkey, in which the EU was very vocal and critical regarding the non-respect of human rights and the increasing authoritarianism especially after the failed coup of 2016 and the establishment of the state of emergency that granted additional political power to Erdogan (Altay, 2018). In response, Erdogan criticized the EU comments as trying to meddle with Turkey's domestic affairs (Altay, 2018). In that regard, even the privileged partnership goals of enhancing democratization and human rights seems doomed. Indeed, any personal criticism focusing on Turkey's domestic issues seems like an attack on the legitimacy of Turkish sovereignty, and the tradition of deep-rooted state sovereignty that exist in Turkey might be one of the issues creating this mistrust with European powers. Nevertheless, to further integrate

Turkey to the EU framework, the EU proposed an extension of economic partnership with a rework of the Customs Union.

The Customs Union is a trade agreement between Turkey and the EU. Their trade agreements started in 1963 with the Ankara Agreement and the EEC. This agreement preceded the establishment of the Customs Union (CU) of 1995 between Turkey and the EU to improve economic policies between both of them. This trade agreement includes all industrial goods except for agriculture, services, and public procurement (European Commission, 2021). Turkey has always been an economic ally to the EU by being their 6th biggest trade partner (European Commission, 2021). Moreover, the EU is Turkey's largest import and export partner (European Commission, 2021). However, the Customs Union was defective because it did not permit Turkey "to be part of the EU's internal CU and Single Market" (Altay, 2018. P187). In order to solve this issue, the European Commission worked on a CU 2.0 that would be an upgraded version of the first CU, it would increase economic incentives and would be considered as a start in the creation of a privileged partnership between Turkey and the EU (Altay, 2018). This economic partnership enhancement would revitalize the will of Turkey to further their integration with Europe (Altay, 2018). The upgraded CU declines itself in 3 different options. The first scenario would be that the situation does not evolve, and that Turkey would apply its own economic rules without any intervention from the EU (Altay, 2018). The second scenario includes a re-negotiation of the first CU by implementing new Free Trade Agreements (FTA) on the domains of agriculture, services, and public procurement, which was absent from the first CU (Altay, 2018). The last scenario would be the replacement of the 1995 CU with a new FTA framework that includes the EU's economic policies and developments (Altay, 2018). Nonetheless, Turkey would not be fully independent if the development of a privileged partnership goes through. Indeed, "Turkey's compliance with the EU rules, Ankara's implementation of its CU 2.0 obligations, and its domestic law-making processes would be closely monitored by the EU through new binding and non-binding enforcement mechanisms" (Altay, 2018. P192).

As we can see, the EU accession process is at a stop and future prospects of Turkey joining the EU as a full member seems impossible. Indeed, the rising criticism and anti-Turkey accession sentiment makes Turkey fall back on its EU accession demands and their will to join seems to fade. Additionally, the critics surrounding the domestic issues in Turkey such as non-respect for fundamental rights and minority rights, and the rising authoritarianism due to the implementation of the state of emergency after the 2016 failed coup frustrates the Turkish

government. They see it as an interference of the EU in the domestic realm of Turkey and undermining the state's sovereignty. In that regard, the growing concept of a privileged partnership seems more adequate. Nonetheless, this privileged partnership also requires the upholding of certain EU standards in the domestic realm even though the partnership is more focused on economic interest. I believe that from a moral point of view, the EU cannot allow itself to enhance its economic integration with Turkey if certain domestic standards are not upheld.

Conclusion

To conclude this paper, we can see that any future prospects of Turkey joining the EU as a full member seems doomed (Altay, 2018). Even the development of a privileged partnership still needs to be negotiated and certain requirements are still needed from Turkey to enhance their European integration. Indeed, the theoretical framework of Hybrid Sovereignty defined by Bacik helps us understand the underlying root cause of Turkey's failure to uphold domestic rights that hindered any possible EU accession.

First, Hybrid Sovereignty is defined by the injection of western ideals in a traditional structure of state sovereignty through a colonial process. The implementation of western-style sovereignty through a westernization process clashed with the traditional state patterns and created a hybrid sovereignty that is neither western nor traditional, namely hybrid. This hybridization translated itself in a poorly functional state with unstable institutions. Hence, hybridity is the root cause of sovereignty crisis that illustrate the failure of a central authority, the failure of citizenship or problems with minority rights. Nonetheless, after defining the theoretical framework. We need to see whether this framework is applicable to the case of Turkey.

Second, we argue that Turkey installs itself in this framework, even though there are differences with the definition of hybrid sovereignty stated by Bacik. Indeed, the main difference with countries such as Iraq or Kuwait chosen by Bacik is that Turkey was never colonised after the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, the western ideals, in the case of Turkey, were self-implemented, meaning that the Ottoman state and the Turkish state implemented western-style policies by themselves. This self-injection of an alien model was made with the will of resembling the West in order to integrate the concert of Europe for the Ottoman Empire and the will to integrate the EU for Turkey. Nonetheless, we need to justify the presence of traditional patterns within the state and society to prove symptoms of hybrid sovereignty. Indeed, first we have the strong influence of the military in Turkish politics and civil affairs. The military, since the creation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, consider themselves as the guardian of Ottoman values and of the regime, especially under the direction of Kemal Atatürk. Moreover, we can feel the pressure of the military through the 5 military coups that Turkey experienced since 1960, which the last one failed in 2016. This shows the recurrence of the military presence throughout Turkey's history. Moreover, the EU imposes a strict separation between the military and civil affairs, which is quite blurry in Turkey. Second, we have the survival of primordialism since the Ottoman Empire. Primordialism is defined by

a fixed ethnicity and the creation of an ethnic distance between the ethnic minority and the country they live in. In our case, this concerns the Kurdish minority. This shows the failure of the process of assimilation by the state. Indeed, with the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the creation of the Republic of Turkey, we transitioned from a very heterogenous state to the will of forming a homogenous state comprised of Turkish citizens. In that regard, the state followed aggressive assimilationist policies, against which the Kurdish population protested but were immediately repressed. Furthermore, we can see that this primordialism and ethnic distance still exist between Turkey and the Kurds, with an on-going conflict with the PKK. Those traditional patterns prove the existence of Hybrid Sovereignty within the state of Turkey and its society.

Third, there is the presence of sovereignty crisis in the Ottoman Empire and modern-day Turkey. Indeed, through the establishment of the OPDA in the Ottoman Empire, the state lost its sovereignty over its own revenues in order to pay back the loans of foreign European banks. This experience complies with the sovereignty crisis of failure of central authority described by Bacik. Moreover, Turkey also faced sovereignty crisis through the problems of minority rights with the Kurds and the failure of citizenship with the non-respect of fundamental writes such as freedom of speech, even more discriminatory towards the Kurdish population.

Fourth, in the light of the impossible scenario of Turkey joining the EU as a full member, we explored alternatives of EU accession. Indeed, a new possibility would be the establishment of a privileged partnership between the EU and Turkey. A first step in creating this privileged partnership is the negotiation of an upgraded customs union from the one of 1995. This would incentivize new economic policies and further integrate Turkey in the European market. Nevertheless, the EU would closely monitor Turkey's domestic activities for the partnership to be viable as the EU would not want to collaborate with a country that does not uphold EU requirements. However, we can see that Turkey does not accept such interference in domestic affairs from the EU because of the resentment of previous experiences of loss of sovereignty such as during the establishment of the OPDA.

Finally, we can see that there is a continuity of Hybrid Sovereignty between the Ottoman Empire and modern-day Turkey. Moreover, the Ottoman Empire and Turkey respect the requirements of Bacik concerning Hybrid Sovereignty. In that regard, we can conclude that Turkey installs itself in the framework defined by Bacik. We can safely assume that the failure of joining the EU can be attributed to the domestic issues and sovereignty crises created by the

hybridity of the State. Indeed, this illustrates that the root cause of Turkey failure to comply to EU requirements that hinders its EU accession is Hybrid Sovereignty and its consequences.

Bibliography

Akgün, S. (1991). The Emergence of Tanzimat In The Ottoman Empire.

Altay, S. (2018). Toward a "Privileged Partnership" The EU, Turkey and the Upgrade of the Customs Union. *Insight Turkey*, *20*(3), 179-198.

Amnesty International. (2017). TURKEY: JOURNALISM IS NOT A CRIME**. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/campaigns/2017/02/free-turkey-media/**

Aral, B. (2004). The idea of human rights as perceived in the Ottoman Empire. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 454-482.

Aytekın, E. A. (2012). Peasant protest in the late Ottoman Empire: Moral economy, revolt, and the Tanzimat reforms. *International Review of Social History*, *57*(2), 191-227.

Bacik, G. (2007). *Hybrid sovereignty in the Arab Middle East: the cases of Kuwait, Jordan, and Iraq*. Springer.

Barigazzi, J. (2016, May 28). Threats, insults and praise: 9 Erdoğan quotes on Europe. Politico. https://www.politico.eu/article/threats-insults-and-praise-9-recep-tayyip-erdogan-quotes-on-europe/

Bayar, M. (2009). Reconsidering primordialism: an alternative approach to the study of ethnicity. *Ethnic and racial studies*, *32*(9), 1639-1657.

Beriker-Atiyas, N. (1997). The Kurdish conflict in Turkey: Issues, parties and prospects. *Security Dialogue*, *28*(4), 439-452.

Cambridge University Press. (2021). Supranational. The Cambridge Dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/supranational

Congressional Research Service. (2019, December 5th). Turkey, the PKK, and U.S. Involvement: A Chronology. https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11380

Eldem, E. (2005). Ottoman financial integration with Europe: foreign loans, the Ottoman Bank and the Ottoman public debt. *European Review*, *13*(3), 431.

European Commission. (2020, December 3rd). European Neighbourhood Policy And Enlargement Negotiations. Conditions For Membership. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/policy/conditions-membership_en

European Commission. (2021, April). The European Union – What it is and what it does. European Commission. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/com/eu-what-it-is/en/#:~:text=At%20the%20core%20of%20the,makes%20sense%20to%20work%20together.

European Commission. (2021, January 1st). European Neighbourhood Policy And Enlargement Negotiations. Turkey. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/countries/detailed-country-information/turkey_en

European Commission. (2021, June 3rd). Trade. Policy. Countries and Region. Turkey. https://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/countries/turkey/

Eur-Lex. (2021, Juin 17). ACCESSION CRITERIA (COPENHAGEN CRITERIA). Eur-Lex. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhague.html

Freedom House. (2021). Freedom in the World 2021. Turkey. https://freedomhouse.org/country/turkey/freedom-world/2021

Gunter, M. M. (2003). The Kurdish question in perspective. *World Affs.*, *166*, 197.

Hamid, S. (2004). From Erbakan to Erdoğan: The Evolution of Turkish Foreign Policy. *Insight Turkey*, 113-118.

Human Rights Watch. (2016, December 15th). Silencing Turkey's Media The Government's Deepening Assault on Critical Journalism. https://www.hrw.org/report/2016/12/15/silencing-turkeys-media/governments-deepening-assault-critical-journalism

Hurewitz, J,C. Inalcik, H. (1975). The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics: A documentary Record. New Haven. Yale University Press. https://www.artsrn.ualberta.ca/amcdouga/Hist112/add_rdgs/tanzimat_decree.pdf

Içduygu, A., Romano, D., & Sirkeci, I. (1999). The ethnic question in an environment of insecurity: the Kurds in Turkey. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *22*(6), 991-1010.

Ku, J., & Yoo, J. (2012). Globalization and sovereignty. *Ku J., Yoo J. Taming globalization: International law, the US Constitution, and the new world order*, 19.

Mandiraci, B. (2016, July 20th). Turkey's PKK Conflict: The Death Toll. International Crisis Group.https://www.crisisgroup.org/europe-central-asia/western-europemediterranean/turkey/turkey-s-pkk-conflict-death-toll

Minority Rights Group International. (2018, June). Turkey. https://minorityrights.org/minorities/kurds-2/

Narli, N. (2000). Civil-military relations in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, *1*(1), 107-127.

Oğuzlu, T., & Kibaroğlu, M. (2009). Is the Westernization Process Losing Pace in Turkey: Who's to Blame?. *Turkish Studies*, *10*(4), 577-593.

Öniş, Z. (2008). Turkey-EU relations: Beyond the current stalemate. *Insight Turkey*, 35-50.

Tekin, A. (2007, September). Sharing Sovereignty: Turkey's Sovereignty Culture and the EU Accession'. In *Presentation, ECPR Standing Group on International Relations, Sixth Pan-European Conference on International Relations, Turin, Italy*.

The World War I Document Archive. (2009 May 30th). The Treaty of Lausane. https://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Treaty_of_Lausanne

Toktas, S., & Aras, B. (2009). The EU and minority rights in Turkey. *Political science quarterly*, *124*(4), 697-720.

TRTWORLD. (2019, October 16th). A timeline of the PKK's war on Turkey: 1974-2019. https://www.trtworld.com/magazine/a-timeline-of-the-pkk-s-war-on-turkey-1974-2019-30618