WHERE DO EUROPE'S BORDERS END?
Özdem Sanberk[*]

The European Union is a movement for all of Europe, even if not all European countries plan to join it. Europeanicity is one of the main criteria for joining and something one might call the "European spirit" has been its driving force for several generations. So what is really meant when we talk about Europe is not simply a geographical area, nor even, a cultural entity where countries share cultural values, but about an active living Europe which is a forum for constant interplay between its members. It is for this very reason that we cannot see Europe simply in terms of Christian tradition.

The values of democracy, pluralism, freedom of thought, humanism, tolerance, and scientific rationality are the views which will provide the moral basis of the new Europe and the movement towards European integration. These have grown out of the common Christian culture of Europe, but they have also long since transcended it and created a society in which there is often pluralism of metaphysical beliefs, but basic agreement on matters of essential rights and freedoms. These are matters which we in Turkey, a major European power for centuries, but also a late-comer to modernity, have long reflected upon. We believe that the cultural/political frontiers of Europe are not to be defined by narrow denominational or confessional labels any more, but by a common political, intellectual, and legal culture.

Another criteria for appartenance to Europe should be the desire to participate in the life of Europe. We need to look at who participates and how along the edges of Europe. For this I propose a new concept that of a"Europe of Players". "Players" in this case means countries that make active contributions in one or more fields in the life of the continent and who do not make an equivalent one elsewhere. This concept gives us a better working definition when trying to answer the questions "Where does Europe end?" By this definition, it is clear that based on its past, its present role and future aspirations Turkey is well within the boundaries of Europe.

---

[*] Ambassador (ret'd), Director of the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation, TESEV.

Problems of European Countries not in the EU but on the periphery

The question of Europe's frontiers is one which will inevitably generate debate and even complaints in the years ahead. This is the result of the expansion of the EU to include 27 countries. Along the eastern and southern extremities of Europe, there are now populations which find themselves on the wrong side of a division which could in its way be almost as painful and unwelcome as the Iron Curtain of the Cold War era. Moldova, Ukraine, Turkey and Russia are the potential victims. These are countries and peoples who are quite certain of their European identity, and yet are now outside the "new Europe" that the EU is creating.

There are two injustices here: one is that borders, boundaries, and divisions are being imposed which did not exist in the past. Although Turkey is part of a customs union with the EU, on an individual level we have much less access to Europe than we did twenty years ago. Second, the EU has decided to take on some countries and will inevitably make them much more prosperous, even if regional and social funds in the future are not available to the degree that they used to be, while other countries will be left out of this process: why should the people of Belarus, Ukraine, and Moldova be less entitled to a European standard of living than those of Estonia, Romania, and Bulgaria? Sooner or later these nations will wake up to the injustice and I wonder what Europe's response will be? Indeed, if one were cynical, one might even wonder whether it is not in the interests of Western Europe to allow these excluded countries to slumber in their backwardness for another generation: something which presumably we would all find morally repugnant. Yet all those countries and peoples consider themselves to be fully European, and did so long before there was any European Union and they feel this very strongly.

European Union analysts often sidestep this problem simply by saying that the European Union is not the same thing as Europe. This is true and at one level it is self-evident. And yet, there is no doubt that the European Union is a movement for all of Europe, even if not all European countries plan to join it. It is not a northern union, or a Protestant Union, or a Roman Empire Union, or a Latin-speaking union. Europeanicity is one of the main criteria for joining and something one might call the "European spirit" has been its driving force for several generations.

This is also apparent from the anti-European perspective. The Euro-sceptics and Euro-phobes of England hold the opinions they do because they are cool to the idea of a single Europe as such. They have tried and failed to create an alternative vision of Europe[1] and they fall back on Atlanticist and Anglo-Saxon ideals instead.

There are of course other criteria for EU membership, but it is fair to say that the process of enlargement has blurred these somewhat. It is obvious that the economic criteria in particular are no longer as rigorous as they once were. If you can allow Lithuania or Romania to be candidates for membership, how can you exclude Moldova or Ukraine?

Defining Europe
Let us turn the essential question and ask ourselves what is Europe and where does it begin?

I am sure that the realization of the fact that Europe is called a continent and that such a region exists on any map of the world does little to help us solve the problem. A continent with rigid fixed boundaries is supposedly defined by geographical characteristics. Australia, America and Africa, all have clear boundaries and a good deal of uniformity. They have identifiable characteristics from end to end, or at least seem to.

But when you ask where Europe begins, the geographical boundaries are not so clear. Historically there have been times when countries which are now included in everyone's conception of Europe were not automatically brought in. The Germans thought of themselves as outside of Europe for a very long time. The reason for this in my opinion is that the Europe we are talking about is a sort of cultural club which has emerged since the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.

Let us look at the geographical frontiers. The Ural mountains, the Black Sea, the Caucausus and the Caspian are the boundaries which are traditional, but Europe of course is part of the Eurasian landmass. And it is not quite clear whether the word 'Asia' is very helpful either. Is Asia the Middle East or the Far East or the Northern Tier? In other words, the European identity has an

---

[1] For example the Bruges Group was Margaret Thatcher's attempt to create a group of likeminded continental Europeans who were opposed like her to European integration. But the idea failed to find people who would support it.

important cultural and community component to it as well as a physi-geographical one.

The origins of Europe
A brief examination of the history of the concept of 'Europe' reveals that the word 'Europe' was used in ancient times. It is one of the many contributions of Greece to the world and that the word was first used in a Homeric Hymn to the God Apollo. It is doubtful whether the author of that hymn had heard of Britain or Germany. He was thinking of something much more local. The Roman Empire talked about itself as "Romania" the Roman lands of the Roman Empire, when referring to itself as a territorial entity and that, of course, did not refer to just what we now call 'Europe'.

In the Middle Ages, the idea of Europe was less widespread than that of Christendom which for western Christians meant generally the lands of the western church. Medieval Christendom was divided between east and western wings. It was in reaction to spirit of exclusion that the Greek Orthodox and the Muslims at times drew closer together. To give one example, the mother of Ahmet III, the monarch of the Baroque Tulip Period, who ruled between 1703 and 1730, was a Cretan Greek girl whom we in Turkey know as Rabia Gülnuş Emetullah Valide. And she acted as a sort of Greek lobby at the Ottoman court for Greek interests, persuading the Ottoman Government to take military action against the Venetians.

That was part of the European diplomacy of those days. The western world had moved a long way from the medieval model of Christendom by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and when people hypothesised about a Utopia-like future union of Europe, they assumed that the Turks would be in it, for Turkey was part of the European system, in a way that North Africa, Egypt and the Middle East were not. This is a past which be seen very clearly in the writings of historians like Ferdinand Braudel, for whom Turkey is a natural part of the European economic and social landscape.

It was only after the enlightenment that a common European life based on a shared platform of sentiment, culture, opinion, and material and economic life has been gradually and sometimes painfully emerging. But, it has been a steady process, born of the idea that a Europe fractured into small nation states cannot enjoy its inheritance to the full.

For since the age of the Enlightenment, the history of Europe has, for the most part, also been a history of the rise of nationalism and national states and of the clashes between these states.

By and large, the nation state and national identity had been firmly established by the early modern period in Western Europe. Despite this there were extremely destructive conflicts and wars right up until the middle of the twentieth century. Most western Europeans overlook the fact that the conflicts in Eastern Europe were even more complex and painful, since they often involved population transfers. Though the primary participants in the two World Wars were the countries of Western Europe, it was specifically the conflicts and territorial rivalries in Eastern Europe which brought them into collision with each other. These wars arose from the fact that in Eastern Europe, ever since the demise of the three great empires, we have been trying to establish homogenous nation states in areas with a population adhering to different faiths and speaking different religions.

In Eastern Europe, the rise of nationalism and the disintegration of empires into homogenous states opened a Pandora's Box of conflicts. In a region inhabited by different linguistic and religious groups, the problems of defining territorial and national identity and of guaranteeing the authority and the legitimacy of state authority have been unimaginably more complex than anything Western Europe has ever known.

The EU and Europe

The political and economic European Union grew out of a grouping of Atlantic seaboard countries which wanted to overcome their recent bitter legacy of wars and rivalries which had brought them all to the brink of destruction. The Roman Empire may have served as some sort of model in this process, though the Empire of Charlemagne may have been more important to them, which means that originally only northern and western Europe were intended.

When the enterprise undertaken by the founders of the EU was crowned within the short span of a few years not just with peace but also with prosperity, other countries wanted to join too. Consequently, there were a series of waves of expansion. This is the underlying cause of nervousness on the part Western Europeans, who are now asking themselves when this

process will stop? If it does not stop, then presumably some day "Europe" would reach the shores of the Pacific.

First Britain made a belated application to join and with it came Ireland. Now there was a question in some people's mind's about whether Britain was European in quite the same sense that Germany or France were. President de Gaulle felt those hesitations very strongly and decided to exclude Britain, I am not sure whether his action showed prophetic foresight of the subsequent troubled relationship between Britain and the rest of the EU, or whether it helped to cause those problems. What is clear is that there was some sort of question about the European identity of this great Anglo-Saxon motherland. Yet it was not a real question about borders. For Ireland, which lies beyond Britain, did not have its credentials questioned in this way. Perhaps it was the strong Catholic faith which led everyone to accept the Irish as a part of European. And so they have proved to be, readily accepting the requirements and customary practices of the rest of the European Union and taking their place in the forefront of important developments, such as monetary union.

After Britain and Ireland, came approaches from Greece and Turkey which culminated in the Associate Membership arrangements of the early 1960's. Then after the fall of its dictatorships, came the countries of the Iberian Peninsula. Finally, there were European countries such as Austria and Finland which had not been founder members but sought membership nevertheless. It became clear that European Union was an ever widening process. It was also apparent that, though there would be some exceptions, most notably Norway, which rejected EU membership in not one but two referendums, if a country was European, it would want to join the EU.

The reasons behind countries' application for EU membership were not simply confined to European identity. They were based on the prosperity and security which comes with membership to the European Union. Consequently, countries like Israel and Morocco also applied for membership and the European Union gave a polite but emphatically negative response. They could not join because they lay outside the borders of Europe.

Looking at the Christian countries around the extreme periphery of Europe, it is clear that there are some countries which see themselves as having a strongly and specifically Christian identity, for example Georgia and

Armenia, and which are also attracted to the goal of eventual membership of the Union. They will form very interesting tests of membership if by that date Turkey is either still not a member or, worse still, excluded from membership. And certainly if those two countries apply, then there is no doubt that the third Caucasian state, Azerbaijan will also apply.

Indeed this is not a hypothetical or speculative question. For the Council of Europe has already expanded to include those countries, just as it has taken in Russia. So if membership in an organisation is regarded as a test of where the borders of Europe end, perhaps we should be looking at the Council of Europe rather than the European Union. But for most people the Council of Europe is a rather shadowy body, about which they know little or nothing. Yet now that the 27 member European Union has come to the fore, most other types of European forum will be, to a great extent, because forums such as the Council will be insignificant in comparison to the 27-member Union. So what is really meant when we talk about Europe is not simply a geographical area, nor even, a cultural entity where countries share cultural values, but about an active living Europe which is a forum for constant interplay between its members.

There are people who might be regarded as impeccable Europeans in cultural terms but who live outside Europe. The overseas French or English, or for that matter the Greek Diaspora, considered 'European' a hundred years ago. But no one today thinks of the Australians or the New Zealanders as Europeans. Their identity is now grounded in the geographical regions in which they find themselves. That is not quite true of the French overseas possessions of course, but they are very small and most Europeans are not aware that they exist.

Equally there are many people in Europe who are now important and permanent features of the European landscape but whose culture was once considered neither European or Christian. Take the people in Britain from the Indian sub-Continent, for example. There are nearly one and a half million of them. No one could say that they are not fully European. That would be unacceptable. It would also be unfair since a good deal of their culture, from cooking to the decorative arts, has become part of the fabric of modern British life. And now those people are taking their place in European forums such as the European Parliament. Increasingly in Britain, religious and cultural identity are used to define sub-communities, and the word Asian in England was only a sort of courtesy, because Pakistanis and Bangladeshis

did not want to be referred to as Indians. However, they are now an intrinsic part of the Europe. The old cultural and religious polarities are no longer appropriate.

Europe and Christianity

It is for this very reason that we cannot see Europe simply in terms of Christian tradition. The values of democracy, pluralism, freedom of thought, humanism, tolerance, and scientific rationality are the views which will provide the moral basis of the new Europe and the movement towards European integration. These have grown out of the common Christian culture of Europe, but they have also long since transcended it and created a society in which there is often pluralism of metaphysical beliefs, but basic agreement on matters of essential rights and freedoms.

These are matters which we in Turkey, a major European power for centuries, but also a late-comer to modernity, have long reflected upon. We do not want to see religious war and the clash of civilisations or a return to a theocratic and intolerant social and political order.

The world 'secularist' is unpopular in Western Europe, because it is identified with the cultural battles of northern Europe in the 19th century and a particular kind of intolerance towards other people's beliefs. But I believe that we are all secularists now, in the sense that we accept the fact that we live in a world dominated by consensus on democratic and pluralistic values and not in one where religious metaphysical imperatives are allowed to rule society nakedly as they did in the Middle Ages.

This is certainly the case in Turkey and has been since the days of Kemal Atatürk. In Turkey, as in all countries, there are those who want to give religion, or the values derived from religion, a greater place in public life, but the pluralism of our society is irreversible. For those who question this, I have one simple answer. Turn on your television and peruse the 30 or so main channels of Turkish TV. They reflect a society which belongs irrevocably to 21st century Europe. There is no turning back.

The cultural/political frontiers of Europe are not to be defined by narrow denominational or confessional labels any more, but by a common political, intellectual, and legal culture.

Europe of Players

Do we have other tests? The desire to participate in the life of Europe is one of them. We need to look at who participates and how along the edges of Europe. For this I propose a new concept that of a"Europe of Players". "Players" in this case means countries that make active contributions in one or more fields in the life of the continent and who do not make an equivalent one elsewhere. This concept gives us a better working definition when trying to answer the questions "Where does Europe end?" For example, Iran is a great nation and has been, for three millennia, an important neighbour of the European world, as the Greeks know so well! However, it has never been a European player. It is not like Russia or Spain. It does not see itself as European, but Iranian. Russia on the other hand has been always a player in European affairs, and particularly in European culture, even though its political expansion took it in other directions and even though some of the far eastern regions perhaps are too distant to look to the west.

Turkey and the Frontier of Europe

Where does Turkey belong in this grouping? The opinion of certain Europeans today, of whom the late Lord Jenkins in Britain was one and former president Valery Giscard d'Estaing is another, Turkey lies outside the boundaries of Europe.

Let us for a moment suppose that they are correct. Close your eyes and think of a Europe which excludes Turkey and the Turkish people. Europe without Turkey is a Europe which is seriously compromised and incomplete. It is a Europe whose southeastern flank becomes inherently problematic and untenable since it is the home of a very large non-European nation. A very important regional trading and strategic power is outside the system. A trade hub of the Balkans and the Caucasus and the Eastern Mediterranean countries, all of whom are deemed to be inside Europe, is left outside the continent. What is true of economics is also true of strategy.

- Turkey is part of Europe economically.
- It is part of Europe in terms of heritage, monuments, and history.
- It is part of Europe in terms of its security architecture.
- It is likely to become part of the energy supply infrastructure of Europe.

Now all this is something which most people in Turkey see as a process which has included us and which is the basis of our way of life and our identity. There is bitter resentment, especially among young people in Turkey, at what is perceived as our unfair treatment by the EU and above all there is a clear sense that recognized or not, we are part of Europe and its system and there is no other future for us which makes sense.

For, in the last resort, communities—national and international communities as well as small ones—are voluntaristic. They depend on choice and self-identification. All new nations have had the problem of how to define themselves. In the 1930s we debated who or what was a Turk. The best answer we could find was that a Turk was someone who speaks Turkish and wants to be regarded as a Turk. I think other countries have found comparable answers for themselves.

Europe does not speak a single mother tongue, but it also rests on voluntary self identification. The Turks have shown for forty years that they make that self-identification and its effects have been benign. The European Union has been a powerful engine for social and political and economic advance in our country just as it has been everywhere else.

So where do Europe's borders end? They end where people stop having a sense of themselves as European and wanting to play a part in Europe. But above all, it is important that they do not end with armed frontiers, watchtowers, border posts, minefields, international confrontation, and resentful people living separated from their neighbours by barbed wire. I am hopeful that despite all the difficulties and setbacks that we have faced in this generation, we shall ensure that Europe and the European Union do not have those sorts of frontiers.

Filename: TPQ2003-2-sanberk.doc
Directory: C:_Turkuaz Marketing\clients__TPQ\archive\TPQ 2003 -
    Vol 2\2003 Vol. 2 N.2
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\Eser Turan\Application
    Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: WHERE DO EUROPE'S BORDERS END
Subject:
Author: Barchard
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 7/14/2003 10:07:00 AM
Change Number: 4
Last Saved On: 7/22/2003 6:36:00 PM
Last Saved By: Sinan
Total Editing Time: 19 Minutes
Last Printed On: 11/21/2007 7:20:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
    Number of Pages: 10
    Number of Words: 3,869 (approx.)
    Number of Characters: 18,886 (approx.)