

THE VIEW OF CONSERVATIVE RIGHT WING PARTIES TOWARDS EUROPEAN UNION IN TURKEY: THE CHANGE FROM THE IDEA OF CHRISTIAN CLUB TO CRADLE OF DEMOCRACY

Selahaddin BAKAN¹, Hakan ÖZDEMİR² and Yahya DEMİRKANOĞLU³

¹Assoc.Prof., Inonu University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,
Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Malatya-Turkey
Email: selahaddin.bakan@inonu.edu.tr

²Assist.Prof., İnönü University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,
Department of International Relations, Malatya-Turkey
Email: hakan.ozdemir@inonu.edu.tr

³Lecturer, Bitlis Eren University Adilcevaz Vocational High School, Office Management and
Executive Assistant Program, Bitlis-Turkey
Email: y.demirkanoglu@beu.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to analyse the change in the view of right wing parties towards European Union in Turkey. To that aim, historical development of conservative right and Turkish- European Union relations are analysed first. The study is continued by handling the view of conservatives towards European Union. The study is resulted by the finding that National View Movement until mid-1990's saw European Union as a Christian club. The historical economic change which known as "24 January Decisions" brought up an open, liberal and export oriented economy replacing closed, state centred and import substitution policy. These liberal changes have also liberalised the mind of conservatives. Conservatives have started to change. Motherland Party of Özal came in power. National View Movement (Milli G.H) felt also to change. Especially, Military intervention of 28 February Decisions made them change. At the beginning this century, from the national view Movement a group in the leadership of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan emerged and left the traditional wing of NVM alone. They introduced themselves as conservative democrats accepting liberal economic, social and political views. Erdoğan and his friend also believed that European Union matter was one of the legalising base of their politics. They would protect their newly established Justice and Development Party (JDP) against any possible intervention. This study has resulted that JDP has undertaken an historical role by accepting liberal European values and trying to accelerate the membership of Turkey to European Union.

Key Words: Conservative Right, European Union, Justice and Development Party, National View Movement, Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

European Union has been established to give an end to the Catholic Protestant war between France and Germany and to eradicate the hazards of the Second World War. Today European Union geared to develop political, economical and social integration among its members that reached to twenty eight countries. Starting from the reforms of 1839 (Tanzimat), Turkey as a muslim country has always implemented a Westernist foreign policy and apart from occasional short periods has always devoted itself to European Union membership and its principles on political, social and economical matters. Membership to European organisations and of course EEC has been a hard reaching utopia in the minds of Turkish intellectuals.

National View Movement entered to Turkish political life in 1969 named National Order Party and was against European integration. NVM's main aim was to establish a new Turkey and become the leader of Islamic world. Thus NVM from 1969 to mid 1990's implemented an anti-Western policy even declared the West as enemy in coalition governments and in opposition. EU or EEC was a Christian Club and Turkey was not going to become an equal partner but a colonial market in the eyes of NVM and its leader Necmeddin Erbakan. Economical and political liberalisation process of 24 January Decisions gave its fruits in the mid 90's. NVM was affected by the openness and restructuring process in Turkey. To protect itself from the Post modern military intervention of 28 February, NVM left its anti-Western policy in the hope that democratic, political and human rights might be protected through the support of the West to which Turkey was devoted in the last two

centuries. NWM's Welfare Party was economically liberal politically conservative with religious ingredients but not anti Western. Welfare Party was closed by the Supreme Court which was under the effect of Military Power. Virtue Party was established in the same political line and was closed by the Supreme Court again more or less for the same reasons. NVM established Felicity Party which still is in Turkish political arena. Short after the establishment the party was divided into two as conservatives and reformers. After losing the leadership of the party in the congress, reformers left the party and established the Justice and Development Party (JDP) which was going to rule the country in the next twelve years. JDP has been economically liberal, politically conservative and above all focused on the membership of European Union. JDP undertook a historical role in long way of European membership by changing lots of laws and by adapting some institutional arrangements.

This study aimed at explaining the view of conservative right parties towards European Union and historical analytical methods will be used. After giving some explanations about conservatives in Turkey, their view towards European Union will be analysed. The organisation of the study is going to be as follows. The first section is devoted to the historical development of the conservative right especially Islamic conservatives. The second section will try to analyse European Union adventure of Turkey. The last section is all about the view of conservative right parties, periodical changes in their views and the reasons for these changes. The study will end by a conclusive result.

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CONSERVATIVE RIGHT IN TURKEY: THE HISTORY OF A JOURNEY FROM NATIONAL VIEW TO CONSERVATIVE DEMOCRACY

The roots of conservatism can be traced back to Ahrar Party of 1908 and (Hürriyet ve İtilaf Partisi) Freedom and Agreement Party of 1911 (Erlor, 2007:129). As a matter of fact its roots go back to Tanzimat Period when social and economical groups in Ottoman reacted to westernised changes (Bakan ve Arpacı, 2012:134). It can be seen that conservatism in Tanzimat Period existed in Ottoman main political streams and to some extent effected the political life though not in the same way in Europe. The Rescript of Gülhane (Tanzimat Fermanı) proclaimed in 3rd November 1839 presented an opportunity to Turkish people to face with European way of state of law. This relationship with European thought brought tremendous changes in Ottoman. Turkish modernisation process also triggered conservatism and this process mainly formed around three political ideas: Turkism, Islamism and Westernisation (Safi,2007:11-112). Westernisation and Islamism tried to prevent the process of disintegration in Ottoman but they lost power against the raising idea of Turkish nationalism. The ideology of Turkism tried to protect traditional values while trying to build modern institutions from Tanzimat to Republic (Poyraz, 2010: 312). They had hoped and projected that they would have transformed traditional institutions into modern ones but this projection failed to a large extend and traditional values could not be related with new institutions (Akkaş, 2001:5).

In the early Republican period, conservatives were not against modernisation or westernisation but they did not want their values to be excluded and marginalised (Mert, 2007:166). Conservative reactions at that time were mainly to some changes like extinguishing sultanate, caliphate and Islamic monasteries that Westernist-Turkist coalition

saw these changes essential in the modernisation process and also these changes shook the existing traditional institutions (Erler, 2007:129). Founder Republican elite saw Islamists and Ottomanists as an enemy trying to retard modernisation process. Thus, conservatives at that time were afraid of declaring themselves as conservatives. They called themselves as “Traditionalists” and instead of standing as an independent party and fighting with Kemalists, they were afraid of Kemalists and preferred to stay in the group of Kemalists (Yıldırım, 2003:11). The reason for this behaviour of conservatists was also to affect the founder ideology of the Republic. Because of those developments, conservatism in Turkey tried to protect ethical and traditional values rather than political ones. Therefore, it can be said that political practice and expression of conservatism was quite weak (Safi, 2005:258). Thus, conservatism in Turkey could not become a challenging ideological and political side as in Western countries. Instead, Conservatism referred to Islamic values and preferred and stayed in traditional side in political, cultural and social matters rather than stay in modern side. Conservatism was formed by and reacted to secular imposition of republican elite. Although from conservative muslims to nationalists are all culturally accepted as conservative, it is known that politically conservatism in Turkey cannot be handled without Islamic thought and conservatism was and still is a problematic concept awaiting to be solved(Gürkan, 2011: 23).

Turkey where conservatism specifically are related to islam and the pillars of Western style conservatism are neglected. In the light of explanations above, it can be said that the turning point for the birth of political conservatism was the establishment of MNP (Milli Nizam Partisi- National Order Party) and following parties of Necmeddin Erbakan. Those parties are respectively RP (Refah Partisi- Welfare Party), FP (Fazilet Partisi- Virtue Party) and SP (Saadet Partisi-Felicity Party). The second phase in the development of conservatism in Turkey was the establishment of AKPARTİ (Justice and Development Party-JDP) that took over the power in 2002 (Okutan, 2006: 315-316). The second stage of conservative movement harboured some liberal values rather than state centered values as was the reality of first stage. That change shows us that conservatism in Turkey after mid-1990's have been greatly affected by the openness policy of Turgut Özal and growing globalisation process of 2000's. From the second constitutional monarchy to the late 1970's, conservatives gained political, social and cultural experiences and these experiences led conservatists to accept modern institutions of the Republic and tried to cover them with Islamic values. The establishment of National Order Party was an outcome of that idea. If islamists are not radical in Turkey contrary to some other Islamic countries in the world, Erbakan and his coterie is to be applauded. Because Necmeddin Erbakan and his friends have always stayed loyal to the rules and always stayed in the legal side in their political struggle despite their parties was closed in several times by the constitutional court. National View Movement (NVM) of Necmeddin Erbakan aimed to sustain and develop Islamic values by carrying those vales to the modern institutions of the Republic. All these explanations shows that NVM has been a carrying belt of the Islamic values of their ancestors trying to reconcile with modern times(Ermağan,2011: 227-228).

In order to understand the stand of NVM and its charming political concept “Just Order”, one has to look at backgrounds of the movement. A relative reaction to Republicans nationalist and secular implementations made them radically react to Islamic and ethnic formations. At the same time these ethnic and Islamic formations were perceived as a threat

to the principles of the Republicans collective mind. As a result of this, Islamic societies formed in a semi-political manner though not totally illegal. Instead of establishing a political party, between the years 1925-1950 different Islamic movements were established. Some are: “Houses” of Süleyman Hilmi Hodja, “Classes” of Said Nursi and “mosques” of nakşi and kadiri sects (tarikats) such as İskenderpaşa, Mahmut Efendi, Sami Efendi etc. All these are politically followed different strategies (Yavuz, 2015: 591-592). Political life in multi-party period made political Islam develop and gain a relative legal political ground (Akdoğan, 2005: 621). 27 years of ruling power of RPP came to an end and Democrat Party (DP) came to power in 1950. After 1950’s political Islam came to light due to plural political and economical liberal blow. Democrats allowed “Ezan” (call to prayer) to be read in Arabic instead of Turkish as originally was read for years in the past and obligatory religious classes in schools restored (Poyraz, 2010: 313). Such practices of Democrat Party led Islamic communities, such as Nur Group, Süleyman Group, Nakşibendi Group etc., to support democratic developments and made them stay in legal positions. Military intervention of 27 May 1960 pushed Islamic communities back to the position of opposition as in the early years of republic. In 1963 when democratic political life restarted, Islamic communities supported Justice Party-JP (Adalet Partisi) which they thought that it was predecessor of Democrat Party (Yavuz, 2005: 593). Justice Party’s rule brought the party in a liberal position in economical and political matters in the system. Justice Party harboured the bourgeoisie from new developing state supported industry and commerce. This development made JP attain an important position in the right wing political area. JP at the same time harboured big land owners and this solidarity of aristocrat- bourgeois provided a capitalist process creating a functional division in society. The first reaction came from the newly emerging small bourgeois who felt that they gained the least proportion from the economic development. Apart from this, 1961 Constitution included relatively more political freedom and social rights such as right of organization, trade union rights etc. Fertile political environment of 1961 Constitution allowed Islamic groups, beside nationalist and socialists, to organise under an Islamic party. National Order party (NOP) emerged as a result of those developments (Sarıbay, 1985: 96-97). As pointed above, liberal political and economical support of Justice Party to relatively big industry and trade groups distracted small and newly emerging tradesman and industrialists. National Order Party and its predecessor National Salvation Party were mainly based on developing middle class. As a matter of fact, the birth of those two parties were the result of this dissociation. Western sided industrialists and tradesmen in big cities of Turkey supported Justice Party Süleyman Demirel and confronted newly emerging Islamic bourgeoisie (Yavuz, 2005: 592).

The emergence of National Order Party was also as a result of specific confrontation occurred in the Chamber of Trade and Commerce. Necmeddin Erbakan, who was the president of industrial branch of the Chamber between 1966-68, despite big industrialists and tradesman, with the support of small industrialists and tradesmen he became the President of Turkish Chamber of Trade and Commerce in 1968. Big industrialists in big cities especially in Izmir and Istanbul reacted to the elections and Trade Minister of Justice Party did not recognise his presidency. He was distracted from the post and his application for the membership of the Parliament from Justice Party was vetoed. After these developments, he joined 1969 general elections in Konya province as an independent candidate and became a

member of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (Sarıbay, 2005: 576). Erbakan with preponderate Islamic figures tried to present their ideas in right wing Justice Party but vetoed. Thus, he and his coterie established National Order Party in 16th January 1970. With the affiliation of two Deputies from Justice Party, NOP was presented in the Assembly by three deputies. Because being a rightist was perceived as being Islamic, Erbakan and his friends were accused of dividing the right wing and cause fit between people by some Islamic communities (Cemaaats). As a result of those developments and the reaction of deep state who was not ready for an Islamic party yet, his party was closed by the Constitutional Court on 20th May 1971 following the military memorandum on 12th March and he had to immigrate to Germany and then Switzerland (Çakır, 2005:545-547). He stayed in Switzerland until political atmosphere turned to normal. No one from his party, including him, was punished by the military. As a matter of fact he was allowed to establish the National Salvation Party on 11th October 1972 and the party gained the right to join the general elections of 1973 (Ahmaf, 2011:188). However, under the effect of the closing decision, NOP executives stayed unflappable and Erbakan did not take office in the establishment of NSP. The party was established under the presidency of Süleyman Arif Emre. The NSP became the third out of seven in 1973 general elections by having 48 Member of Parliaments out of 450 Parliaments. NSP leaned towards Western technology but ignored the political values of the West which was the paradigm of Republic. By doing so, NSP made a breach in the ideal of the Republic to reach to contemporary civilization and turned its face to Islamic countries. NSP tried to take the lead in the world especially in Islamic countries and also tried to establish a new foreign policy block among Islamic countries (Çaha, 2007: 147). NSP followed parallel policies as its predecessor NOP and based its policies on small industrialists and traders. In a short time after its establishments, NSP was stigmatised as an opponent of Atatürk and its revolutions (Kongar, 2006:179-180). Despite being rejected by the establishing regime of the republic, NSP had been very successful due to the fact that small industrialists and tradesmen were not happy from limited liberal developments and some other social economical inequalities made those faithful mass support the NSP. Upon these developments NSP made an unexpected success in 1973 elections and Erbakan became the leader of the party by the decision of general administration of the party in the meeting of 20th October 1973 (Poyraz, 2010: 136).

In the general elections of 1973, no party obtained the absolute majority and Turkey went into an uncertain political process. Until the military intervention of 12th September 1980, short lived several coalition governments were established first one of which was the coalition between Erbakan's NSP and Ecevit's RPP (Republican Peoples Party). President of the Republic Fahri Korutürk nominated almost all party leaders to establish a coalition government, after four months of talks it could hardly be established. It hardly could be established because of the fact that different political wings did not want to be misperceived by their voter at that harsh political climate. RPP-NSP coalition established on 7th February 1974 and received vote of confidence in the Grand National Assembly (Demirel, 2013: 75). As a matter of fact, this coalition cost the NSP a lot and lost its MP's by half in the elections of 1977 due to fact that the NSP was accused of collaborating with a leftist party by the faithful middle class and even stigmatized as being green communist which was not correct at all. It was not correct because the coalition partner of NSP, RPP, was the establishing party of

the republic and ruled it in the one party period for almost thirty years. Let alone being communist it was even hard to call the RPP as a leftist party. Hence, the coalition lasted only ten months because religious middle classes' political, economical and social demands could not be met by the settled bureaucratic elite and vice versa (Heper, 2006:207). After the fall down of the RPP-NSP coalition, NSP took part in the coalition of First Nationalist Front established by the head of Justice Party. (Safi, 2007:286). Beside NSP and JP, the First Nationalist Front was also supported by Nationalist Movement Party (NMP) and Republican Trust Party (RTP) and the coalition lasted until the 5th June 1977 elections (Safi, 2007:286). NSP based its election strategy on theme that "intervention to Cyprus was decided by the small partner of the coalition, NSP, and its leader Necmeddin Erbakan was the conqueror of Northern Cyprus. This idea did not convince the electors and the NSP lost its MP's by half. NSP's vote dropped from % 11.8 to % 8.6 and the number of its deputies dropped from 48 to 24. However, NSP maintained its position of being and playing a key role as no other two big parties (RPP and JP) had the necessary majority. After long negotiations, the Second Nationalist Front was established between JP, NSP and NMP. The non-concessive attitude of NSP as being a key party disgusted the big partner of the coalition. 11 deputies of JP resigned in 1978 and the government fell down. RPP's Bülent Ecevit established its second government by persuading 11 resigned independent deputies in the lobby of Güneş Hotel. Almost all of the resigned deputies were pleased by attaining to different ministerial posts. This coalition also was short lived due to corruptive treatment of some ministers and also due to harsh political climate. Demirel's JP established a minority government with the support of NSP and NMP. NSP's leader Necmeddin Erbakan declared its Unwilling Support (Kerhen Destek) to the minority government to show the people how bad they are going to govern and this will bring the success to NSP in the coming elections. However, increasing political destabilisation and civil war like conflict between right and left wing politicians were ended by the intervention of military on 12th September 1980 and all the parties were closed (Ermağan, 2011: 229).

In 1983, military strikers decided to re-establish plural democratic life. National View Movement decided to establish Welfare Party (WP) to replace the NSP and WP played an important role in Turkish political life as a new party of NVM (Poyraz, 2010:317). The WP was established on 13th July by 33 people in the leadership of Ali Türkmen who was not popular and familiar in political circles. Military junta vetoed the party and the WP could not take part in 1983 elections. WP was able to take part in the elections of 1987 when political bans are lifted and Erbakan re-elected to the leadership of the party again in the second congress on 11th October 1987. Welfare Party became relatively successful in the elections of 1989 by having % 9.8 of the votes and also obtaining the municipalities of Konya, Urfa, Sivas, Van and Maras provinces. The elections of 1991 were the turning point for Welfare Party as it gained %16.2 of the votes (Çakır, 2005: 548-549). Furthermore, it advanced its success by gaining %19.1 of the total votes and municipalities of 28 provinces (Yavuz, 2005: 596). That Welfare Party gained metropolitan municipalities of Ankara and Istanbul was interpreted as the victory of political Islam in political environs. Newly emigrated rural residence of metropolitan cities could not adapt to the life in those cities and believed the WP will bring moral values back saw the party as an ethical shelter. Intense political propaganda of the party convinced the voters in shanty towns of the big cities and increased the success

of the party (Ay, 2004: 7). The result of the 1994 elections shocked all the other parties. The partners of the coalition (True Path Party and Social Democrat Peoples' Party) at the time were completely felt defeated. Beyond the vote rate, there was a practical result that Welfare Party was going to govern Istanbul and Ankara municipalities, electors of which made up one third of the votes in the whole country. As a result, all the other parties' election expectations went wrong (Türköne, 1994: 66) and the success of the WP in local elections paved the way for another and bigger success in the general elections of 1995 by having %21 of the total votes. That is because WP gained the municipalities of 6 big cities, 20 cities, 92 districts and 207 towns in the local elections of 1994 and the party became first in southern Kurdish region. WP rehabilitated (Çalmuk, 2005: 551-552) its relations with this region peoples of which were fed up with terror and terrorist operations. In other words, the success of 1995 election was a reflection of the political wind and success of local administrations (Akdoğan, 2005: 622). Despite being the first party in the general elections, WP could not establish a government as the other parties did not want to collaborate with. Thus, the second and the third party (Motherland Party and True Path Party) established the 53rd government of the republic (Poyraz, 2010: 318-319). Minority government of those two parties did not live long because of the fact that both parties were on the right wing and based on the same classes of the society, so one did not want to lose in favour of the other because governmental failure. Motherland Party's leader Mesut Yılmaz decided to withdraw from the government and an another coalition government between TPP and WP established on 6th June 1996 and called as Welfare Way (Refah Yol) government. Welfare Way government faced with the problems of mafia and terrorism, and the accident happened in Susurluk, a district of Balıkesir province, caused a lot of reaction by the people who were against the government especially to Erbakan's WP. Religious rhetoric of Erbakan irritated military and some traditional republican bureaucrats and people from throughout the country reacted to WP and accused them of being backward (Tekin and Okutan, 2011:220). Prime Minister Erbakan's visit to Kaddafi's Libya, Iran's President's visit to Turkey, Erbakan's fast-breaking meal to religious cult leaders and Sincan Mayor's Jerusalem night activities ignited the wick among military and traditional republican environs who were not used to such facilitations throughout the republican political life. As a result military menaced the government by passing the tanks through the middle of Sincan district of Ankara in a so called military exercise. Waxing Anatolian bourgeoisie (MÜSİAD- Independent Industrialists and Businessmen's Association) against (TÜSİAD- Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen's Association) and NVM's non-adaptation to Post World War period (Bölükbaşı, 2012: 175-1769 were two important factors that had accelerated the political end of WP. Beside this, WP did not support the activity and protests of people against mafia and political corruption called "one minute darkness for perpetual lightness". WP did not support the protest in the sake of maintaining the government and its coalition partner because some MP's and Ministers of TPP were responded to protest and some of them were accused of backing the mafia and accelerating the terror in Turkey, so the country went into a "28th February Process" and this had been the end of Erbakan's WP (Örmeci, 2008: 106).

Although Economical performance of the Welfare-Way government was a lot better than expected, some statist entrepreneurs started to criticise the government as their interests were being harmed by liberal changes. Thus, some so called Kemalists and solders called out

that the coalition government became the centre of religious facilities and religious reactionism and fundamentalism were being grown up. Military also stressed that Turkey's Westernised foreign was being changed in favour of Islamic countries (Erdoğan, 2007: 19). Turkish Armed Forces who played a wafting game for a while stated in the meeting of 26th December 1996 that some precautions should immediately be taken against fast rising political Islam. To that aim a "Western Action Group" established in order to investigate and keep a record of the people who has Islamic political ideas. At the same time, a regulation was made in the Prime Ministry Crisis Centre on the 9th January 1997 in order to observe religious actions and some reports were prepared (Örmeci, 2008: 107). Under those circumstances, Turkish Armed Forces imposed some policies on the coalition government by using National Security Council and also by having the President of the Republic: Süleyman Demirel. Beside the facilities of Western Action Group and Crisis Managing Centre, Military had also forced Necmeddin Erbakan to sign the Military Training Agreement with Israel and that showed the determination of the Army. On the other hand, Prime Minister Erbakan thought that signed another tune and assumed a humble attitude against the Army in the sake of protecting the coalition soften the situation. However, despite all normalising efforts of Erbakan could not prevent "**28th February Decisions**" taken in National Security Council (Erdoğan, 2007: 19) that these decisions perceived as a military memorandum effect of which lasted for years. "**28th February Decisions**", later on, called as post modern coup d'état. Memorandum in brief stated that the constitution and Kemalist nationalist state were in danger, democratic and social republic will be protected and observed and social peace will be protected under any circumstances. At the same time, memorandum stated that laicism was not only assurance of the regime but also it was comfort of the people and it was an essential principle of the republic. Memorandum had also stated that Turkey should be and is in the membership list of the European Union thus all civil and official bodies should focus on the membership and any speculation which might tarnish the image of Turkey should absolutely be avoided. Measures that must be taken will be notified to the Prime Ministry (Akin, 2000: 101-102). Welfare-Way government squeezed by this memorandum and all its activities supervised by the National Security Council whose members are mostly soldiers. Furthermore, Welfare Party came to a deadlock because Chief Prosecutor of the Republic, Vural Savaş, on 21st May, made a plea to close Welfare Party accusing the party of being the centre of anti-laicism. As the coalition protocol was due, Prime minister Necmeddin Erbakan resigned from the post on 18th June 1997 to give an opportunity to his coalition partner, Tansu Çiller, to take the turn. However, the resignation of Erbakan created a formal excuse to remove the government. President Süleyman Demirel's help eased the process and Welfare-Way government was put aside (Erdoğan, 2007:19). Süleyman Demirel nominated Mesut Yılmaz from the opposition whose party, Motherland Party, ranked third instead of nominating Erbakan's coalition partner, Tansu Çiller. The process of 27th February Decisions were also called in the media as soft coup d'état.

On 16th January 1998, Welfare Party was close by the Constitutional Court for being the centre of anti-laicism and Erbakan and his four friends banned from politics. Erbakan's lawyer, İsmail Alptekin, who won his approval during the judicial process allowed to establish the Virtue Party with his thirty friends on 17th December 1998. Excluding politically banned ones, all the other Welfare Party parliamentarians transferred to the new party

(Karaalioglu, 2001: 10-11). By the subscription Welfare Party parliamentarians, Virtue Party represented in the Parliament and Erbakan's long-time pal Recai Kutan was appointed to the leadership of the party. Despite having %15.4 of total votes in general elections of 18th April 1999, Virtue party's destiny was the as its predecessor Welfare Party. After the elections, Merve Kavakçı, parties elected parliamentary, came to the National Assembly with her headscarf on to oath-taking ceremony and turban disputes flared out. Chief prosecutor started to collect files of data (Mert, 2008: 80) and more or less for the same excuses Virtue Party also was sued. The main excuses were the violation of laicism and the violation 69th and 88th article of the constitution which lays that a closed party's administration cannot administrate another party and Virtue Party was also became the centre of anti-laic practices (Akyol, 2009: 258).

However, the only problem was not confinement of the party but who should lead the new party. It was clear that top management of the Movement will stay but who was going to lead as some of the veterans of the movement were getting older and Turkey was under a tremendous political and economical change. Some thought that it is time for change and rhetorical politics should give place practice. Expected change did not come and Erbakan's long-way friend became the leader of the fifth NVM party: Felicity Party. Erbakan's traditionalist stand triggered the division in the party as traditionalists and modernists and in the congress hold on 14th May 2000 Abdullah Gül, who was going to become the president of the republic, gained 521 votes and lost against existing president, Recai Kutan, who gained 633 of total votes (Karaalioglu, 2001:11-12). The loss of modernists was a narrow margin and this encouraged them for a separate party. As a matter of fact, that was the first time that a congress hold by the two candidates and this was against the political custom of the Movement. The demand of the modernists join the elections interpreted as a brave action and showed a big fraction in thirty-year Movement (Bulaç, 2009: 548). Modernist wing thought that being against to traditionalists was not enough in carrying out their policies, they should also question the mistakes of NVM and turn their faces to West and Western democratic, social and liberal policies. Erbakan was hold responsible for the closure of the Welfare Party and revolutionary changes were observed in the traditionalist line of NVM (Tekin, 2004: 53). Short after the division between traditionalists and modernists, modernists found out that they were not going to implement a policy they wished for. As a matter of fact, Welfare Party was closed on 15th December 2000 by the Constitution Court and modernists did not need to resign from the party anyway (Akdoğan, '005:624).

The decision of Constitution Court to close Welfare Party accelerated the establishment of Justice and Development Party (JDP). 28th February Process perceived as a defeat by Islamic environs and they continued their political life under different names and organisations the most powerful of which was the JDP. On the other hand, those who claimed that JDP founders took of NVM shirt established Felicity Party as a continuation of Welfare Party staying under the umbrella of NVM. However, political circles put forward an idea that any Islamic party "would be closed whenever comes to power" (Yılmaz, 2005: 615), so "Modernists" from NVM thought that the defeat was an ideological defeat and tried to establish more popular and modern political organisation to meet the need of changing society. Thus, Modernist – Separatists of the NVM established 39th political party of Turkey on 14th August 2001 by a invitation to country's all conservatives who had never supported

NVM. Although JDP's founders and its president Recep Tayyip Erdoğan were from NVM root, it included those politicians who left conservative Motherland Party of deceased Turgut Özal (Bingöl and Akgün, 2005: 6), and some politicians from the True Path Party and Nationalist Movement Party were also recruited to the JDP together with some industrialists, representatives of professional organisations and old politicians (Pamuk 2001:92). Having the idea that it is impossible to overcome military's veiled power by radical Islamic discourse, JDP adopted a new political manner harmonised with liberal economical changes and also suited to Turkey's European Union Membership. JDP authorities did not use some slogans as describing EU as "Christian Club" or an Islamic state with a common currency: "Islamic Dinar". JDP authorities thought that they can no longer sustain a policy that built on political rhetoric instead of action. JDP's this democratic and European sided new political manner named by political authorities as "Conservative Democrat" (Gürkan, 2011: 5). JDP's identity definition of being conservative democrat meant the rejection of political Islam and also rejection of political rhetoric of Erbakan's NVM. By putting forward and making conservative synthesis with the concepts of democracy, moral values, free market economy, pluralism, superiority of law, national identity and human rights, JDP became a political entity harmonising national, cultural and religious values with modern, progressive and liberal ones (Sambur, 2009: 121). By keeping a considerable distance to NVM and having somewhat artificial identity of conservatism, JDP tried to convince political circles, including military, that it was peacefully in line with the main political stream and it was a mass party rather than being an Islamic religious or ethnic party (Doğanay, 2007: 68). By doing this, JDP tried to create an opening in political arena without offending and betraying NVM circles. Thus, JDP showed up in the political area without denying its old identity and complying with Turkey's and World's new real-politics that voters would support with inner peace (Akgün, 2006:26). As a conservative democrat party JDP entered the general elections of 3rd November 2002, just 15 months after its establishment, and became the first in the elections. The victory of JDP created an earthquake effect in political circles in Turkish political life. Almost all parties that left their marks on the politics of Turkey after 1980's could not achieve to reach to the threshold of %10 of the votes and leaders of those defeated parties were all resigned from their parties. (Tekin and Okutan, 2011: 239). Some political and economical factors had been effective in JDP's victory in the elections of 2002. Firstly, because of deepening economical crisis, third party coalition had to transfer Kemal Derviş from the World Bank as a minister responsible from economy and most of the people described the coalition as awkward (Çınar, 2002: 41). Secondly, Supreme Committee of Elections hindered the founder of JDP, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, to join the elections and this caused the indignation among voters thus increased the "political anthropologic charisma" of him (Aktay, 2002: 53). After a successful election campaign JDP had %34.4 of all used and valid votes. Despite having third of the valid votes, JDP had the absolute majority in the Parliament because, apart from RPP, all the other parties were under %10 threshold set by the constitution.

JDP was on the crest of a wave between 2002-2007 and it increased its votes to %40 in the local elections of 2004. However, political atmosphere was deteriorated because of presidential elections. The head of Supreme Court interpreted the constitution, as never before, that 367 MPs should be ready in the parliament in order to select a president. Beside,

military gave an e-memorandum on 27th April and JDP had to decide for early election. In the early elections of 2007, as Kurt (2009:7) stated that republican meetings, 367 discussions, 27th April e-Memorandum created a political turbulence and JDP made a bundle by having %46.58 of the used votes. However, JDP, which faced with the problem of closer again for being “the centre of anti-laic implementations” and 2008 global economical crisis, gained %38.8 of total used votes in the local elections of 2009. JDP achieved to sustain its power by having %49.9 of total used votes 15 months after local elections. As Külebi (2011) stressed JDP’s third success showed and confirmed that voters wanted stability and continuity. People continued to support JDP who increased gross national product four times in ten year.

The success of JDP in 2011 elections continued in the local elections of 2014 held on 30th March and it was the first party again by gaining %45.5 of total used votes. JDP, who has been continuously successful since November 2002, has brought up pioneering chances in political and economical life. Some of those changes are: throwing aside a statist economy and accelerating privatization, increasing admissibility level of Islamic thought by bringing out the discussions of public space, preferring European Union policies and developing relations with European countries and the West which is completely different from its predecessor NVM and appearing reconciliatory about the new openings on religious freedoms instead of being insistent as National View did in 1970’s and 1980’s (Örmeci,2008: 95-96).

TURKEY’S EUROPEAN UNION ADVENTURE: TURNING OF UNDESIRED PASSION TO A BAD ROMANCE

Although the roots of integration thought goes back to 11th century, it could only find a scope of application after the social and political changes formed by Second World War (Akşemsettinoglu, 2011: 3). Europe came across with an another disaster just a quarter century after the First World War and the result of Second World War was a big poverty and hardship. European Coal and Steel Community established on the debris of Second World War by the initiation of France and Germany whose economy collapsed (Bozkurt, 2001: 53). The idea of establishing such an organization was to start the integration process by managing production and distribution of coal and steel both of which were the main cause of the war. As the organisation went well, Europe started to integrate on Agricultural, social and economic matters. The economical integration tried to be completed by establishing Custom Union, Common Market and Monetary Union. Later on, A political integration process started and European Economic Community named as European Community and then European Union in order to be effective in stunningly changing world (Hurmi, 2008: 42-43). Today, European Union has become an expansive organisation formed with 28 member states. Turkey’s relations with Europe had always existed as Turkey followed Western policies at the end of Ottoman Empire and the beginning of republic. However, Turkey’s concrete relations with European Union started when Greece decided to apply the community in 1959. Greek application, Western ideology, the existence of cold war and the economic and social matters have always been main effecting factors in Turkey’s relations with European Union (Bakan, 2005: 1128). 15 days after Greek application, Turkey applied to EEC for membership but Military intervention of 27th May 1960 interrupted the relations for a short while. After military junta, coalition governments of İsmet İnönü and Süleyman

Demirel membership talks restarted and lasted for four years. After four years of talks Ankara Agreement, which aimed to create an associated membership between two sides, was signed (Çayhan, 1997: 36, 46).

Ankara Agreement set forth three phases to take Turkey to full membership that those phases are: preparation period of five years, transitional period of twelve years and last period of five years. The first preparation period was planned to last five years but it lasted for nine years and European Community made some unilateral concessions on economical and trade matters in order to make up the difference between Turkey and EU (Karluk, 2002,: 484). Additional protocol, signed 23rd November 1970 and came into force 1st January 1973, meant the end of preparatory stage and the start of transition period. Unlike the first stage, the transition stage assumed that both sides take bilateral, mutual and balanced obligations. Additional Protocol started the transition period which aimed to prepare Turkish economy and to close the economical and social gap between Turkey and EC for the membership of Custom Union (Bozkurt, 2001: 263). Along with aiming the membership of Custom Union on industrial products, Protocol also aimed to; secure free movement of citizens between two sides, implement a preferences system of agricultural products, approximate the legislation and policies between Community Turkey and, lastly, start the process for free movement of services (Özer, 2009: 92). However, Turkish intervention to Cyprus and political crisis inside the country brought up some difficulties concerning the execution of Ankara Agreement and Additional Protocol. The hardship was not only political but it was also economical as well because Turkey's statist and fragile economy signalled s.o.s. and the inflation started to become a stubborn fact (Dedeoğlu, 2005: 28). Turkey terminated financial protocol because some developments happened in the 1970's, which are: Military embargo set by USA deepened the economic crisis, EC's rejection to lend some money to Turkey, 12th September 1980 Military takeover in Turkey and Greece's full membership to EC (Tecer, 2007: 173).

Turkish-European Community relations frozen and a process of uncertainty started because of 12th September 1980 military intervention and continued until Turkey established a civil democratic government in 1983. In the military intervention of 1960, European Community circles were not as resentful as it was in 1980's intervention because of the fact that Turkey was an important ally of the West in Cold War era. Although the overthrown Prime Minister Adnan Menderes and his two ministers were executed after 1960 intervention, Community regarded this as Turkey's domestic matter and did not want to involve in because of the very fact explained above. Turgut Özal's 1983 government started a liberalisation and privatization process and tried to fulfil the necessities of Ankara Agreement to become a full member as Greece did because Turkey could not leave Greece alone. Thus, Turkey applied for full membership on 14th April 1987 without finishing the necessary periods of Ankara agreement (Koç. 2001: 70) on the consideration that Turkey would lose some preferences against Greece. After two and half years later, 18th December 1989, Community rejected Turkey's application for full membership and stated that relations for full membership talks cannot be started but Turkey can be a member in an unseen future (Karluk, 2002: 501). It is important to note that the Community was undergoing a deepening process under the leadership of Jack Delors who declared himself as the prime minister of the Community. Under his presidency Community underwent two big deepening processes; Single European Act and Maastricht Treaty. Single European Act brought some micro changes and completed

the long lasting process of common market. Maastricht Treaty, on the other hand, brought macro economical changes restoring the economic Union and starting a political Union which the name of European Community changed to European Union. Turkey was disappointed by the rejection but was undaunted by this decision and tried to fulfil the necessities of Custom Union and became Custom Union Member by an agreement signed 6th march 1995 and entered into force on the first day of 1996 (Çalış, 2005:1155).

Turkey's aim and effort on the way of full membership, the membership of Custom Union and new economic and political developments created new dimensions. On one hand Turkey tried to fulfil its commitments of Custom Union, on the other hand he concentrated on widening process of the Union. However, Turkey's insistence on starting membership talks once again was rejected in the summit held on 12-13th December in Luxemburg, whereas old Russian satellite states of Central and Eastern European states, including Southern Cyprus, were agreed to start accession negotiations (DPT, 2000:43-44). Starting membership negotiations with those countries made Turkey angry and the Prime Minister of the time, Mesut Yılmaz, stated that situation as unacceptable reducing the relationship level to only Custom Union which was something what European Union wanted. By mandating new and different conditions to Turkey was wrongdoing and Mesut Yılmaz declared that Turkey will not join any talks concerning Cyprus, human rights and Aegean issue Usul, 2006: 193). Turkey's participation in Iraq and Gulf war, collaboration against PKK and closer USA-Turkish relations maintained USA's support on Turkey's European membership (Dedeoğlu, 2005:36). Besides having the USA factor, Turkey's pursuit for new regional organisations in the region and EU's decreasing capability of involvement in Turkey's own matters (Usul, 2006: 193-194) somewhat caused harassment in EU circles. Furthermore, abolishment of death penalty, aggravating the banning of political parties, social democrats accession to power replacing Christian democrats in Germany, Turkish-Greek convergence after the earthquake of 17th August 1999 left positive impression on Turkish-EU relations and the coalition government's Foreign Minister, İsmail Cem, and State minister M. Ali İrtemişlik put so much effort (Çalış, 2008: 344-347), in improving the relations. All these changes and efforts gave it's fruit and Turkey became an equal partner of the EU again, as the other candidate countries, in the summit of Helsinki held 10-11TH December 1999 (Özer, 2009: 93-94).

Helsinki declaration stated that Turkey will be promoted to prepare itself for pre-accession strategy being in the same boat with other candidate countries. To that aim, it is projected that Turkey's membership process, as in the other candidate states, would be conducted in the framework of accession partnership document. Concordantly, Accession Partnership Document that officially confirmed on 8th March 2001 stated tasks of Candidate countries and asked Turkey to make reforms on EU standards and regulations. Within this scope, EU emphasised that Turkey should do political, social, economical and fiscal changes. Copenhagen criteria advised and asked to be followed on political aspects. To conduct all this tasks Turkey needed to prepare a National Program and put it into effect in phases. In this regard, Turkey issued legislative regulations in Grand National Assembly on 19th March 2001 on political, social, economical and cultural aspects conduct of which regulated under the six main headings (Canpolat, 2011: 307-309).

In this manner, legal and regulative reforms on human and fundamental rights adopted and substantive changes made on freedom of worship for different religious beliefs. Beside Turkish, teaching of different languages and dialects started in private and state schools. In parallel with these developments, it is decided in the Summit held in Copenhagen On 12-13 December 2002 that if Turkey overcame the deficiencies and met the criteria decided in Copenhagen until 2004, accession negotiations would start in 2005. After all, it was decided in the summit of presidents held in Brussels on 17th December that accession negotiations could start between Turkey and EU (Balkır, 2013:19-20). Turkey officially began to accession negotiations after the decision taken on the accession conference held on 3rd October. Screening process was the first stage of accession negotiations and started on 20th October 2005. Screening process requested from Turkey to adopt EU regulations and lasted for one year. In the framework of negotiations 35 headings were determined and all those headings went through screening process. After the end of screening process, Turkey entered into the phase of accession negotiations and negotiations are still going between two sides (Bulut, 2006:47).

A VIEW TO EUROPEAN UNION FROM CONSERVATIVE RIGHT WINDOW IN TURKEY: CHANGING PANORAMA FROM NOP TO JDP

At the end of Ottoman Empire, including the early Republic, it should be noted that all pan-Islamist groups had been against the West in one way or another. The West was characterised as “one teeth monster” in the poems of independence poet Mehmet Akif who stressed that Turkish people should adopt scientific techniques of the West but strictly not cultural and religious. Despite several different Islamic behaviours existed in Turkey, least common denominator has always been anti-Westernism. The core of political Islam, though had limited power to realise its own civilisation, formed by a powerful self-reliance and challenge to the West. Its position against the West was perceived as temporary defeat and it should be and can be reversed if necessary equipment obtained. In the forthcoming years anti-Westernism extended and deepened in most of the Islamic countries and included the rejection of all Western phenomena including scientific techniques. Turkey had also affected from this anti-Western wave and, as will be analysed below, even NSP and some other Islamic sects and cults all rejected Western political, cultural and social life. NSP leader Necmeddin Erbakan rejected Turkey’s possible EEC membership and criticised the Common Market stating that “EC will share, we will be market”. After the military takeover of 12th September 1980, Welfare Party replaced the NSP anti-Western position did not change but did not worsen as well as some of the other cults and Islamic communities who were affected by Iran’s Islamic revolution. The breaking point in Welfare Party’s policy against the West was the “post-modern” military intervention of 28th February 1997. After the intervention, Erbakan’s Welfare Party was closed and Erbakan took the case to European Human Rights Court and renounced its long-lasting anti-Western rhetoric. Erbakan’s turn can also be related with the changing socio-economic structure in Turkey. Turkey went through a harsh liberal economic change and this change affected the NVM view as almost all the other parties in the country. Today, this change in conservative right JDP continued in a different manner (Yılmaz, 2005: 609-610) and even turned to a Western-oriented policy. As Çakır (2005: 546) stated, conservatism in Turkey handled as an Islamic and specifically related to religious

matters. Unlike the West, economical and social statue of the matter mostly disregarded. NOP drew an Ottomanist political line taking religious concern of the rural and also drew an opposition line parallel with rural opposition (Sarıbay, 2005: 579). NOP's Erbakan's twice interpellation was a clear evidence that the NOP represented the opposition in rural whose conservatism was religious not economical. Erbakan's interpellation against the existing government was about governments Western oriented policies and rejected in the Grand National Assembly (Çayhan, 1997: 70). Apart from NOP, all the other parties supported the Turkey's Ankara Agreement and stated that Turkey should comply with it. However, apart from the ruling party, Justice Party, all the other opposition parties stressed that Turkey should extend the preparation period of Ankara Agreement as it was not ready for transition stage. All these show that all the other parties wanted a Western oriented foreign policy but NOP tried to start a Middle Eastern oriented foreign and economy policy. Erbakan's opposition continued in 1970's but rejected again by the Parliament and its interpellation was not put on the agenda (Çayhan, 1997:85-86, 107).

After the military memorandum of 12th March 1971, NOP was closed and NSP was founded. In parties manifesto, Erbakan declared that their main aim was to develop the country materially and morally and to reach to contemporary civilisation without giving any concession from Turkish people's traditional and religious values. NSP was somewhat different from its predecessor NOP by highlighting liberal economic models and emphasising material welfare of their followers beside spiritual ones. For this aim, NSP's manifesto included material development, welfare of people, honest earnings, removal of wastefulness, struggle with exploitation and usury and respect for property right (NSP Program, 1972: 5-7). Erbakan, who claimed that material and spiritual development should be handled together, aimed to build "a big Turkey again" and established the NSP, second party of NVM after NOP,. Erbakan saw the West as an obstacle to reach to that aim and characterised the West as "Imperialist" or "Zionist". NSP programme projected a development programme through small and national enterprises. This was not certainly adaptable to the liberal economies of the West and Erbakan saw the West as a big deterrent in the national development of the country. According to him, the reason for Turkey's backwardness was Westernisation and laicism (Yavuz, 2005:593-594). He saw the Common Market as a "Christian Club" and was the only party in parliament saying that. To him European Community was a "Christian Club" established by Zionists and masons. Beside he emphasised that Armenians and Rums would also want to buy properties in Turkey, should Turkey enter the EC thus Turkey should establish an Islamic Common Market instead of being a member of EC (Üste, 2006: 336). Erbakan strongly emphasised that Islamic countries whose economies are more or less equal should establish a common market (Erbakan, 1973: 12-13, see, Arpacı, 2012: 257). The behaviour of NSP towards EC can be seen in the election manifest of 1973. NSP in the manifesto stated that a possible membership to EC will ease the foreigners' accommodation and they would buy properties in Turkey and that would deteriorate Turkey's homogeneity and Turkey would become a cosmopolitan place by other ethnic and national groups. If Turkey entered the EC, foreigners would buy properties and land in Turkey and this would cause to a problem of political sovereignty. NSP Election Programme also stated that Turkish industry and small craftsmen and little artisan would find it hard to compete with the big industrialists of the EC (NSP, 1973: 34-38). All these show that liberalism was only a

rhetoric of NSP in 1970's. Turkey in those years, because, was a closed country who was trying to implement an import substitution policy. This closeness affected the NSP and all the other parties in Parliament. This closeness lasted until 24th January 1980 when economy was liberalised by Turgut Özal and instead of import substitution policy an export oriented economic policy put into effect. NSP's anti-Western behaviour continued throughout 1970's. As a matter of fact, RPP-NSP coalition did not last long because of the fact that NSP urged in establishing a deep relation with Islamic countries. As a matter of fact, RPP had always wanted to develop good relations with the West and make Turkey a member of the EC (Akçay, 2012:39). But NSP stressed that Europe was trying to build a federal state, Turkey's signing the additional protocol meant the admission of defeat without entering the war (Usta, 2012: 3).

In the first National Front Government that NSP was a partner, all parties in the government were agreed upon the anti-communism and NATO membership but NSP's thought on the West was quite different from the other coalition partners. NSP thought that the Western sided policy was not against communism as it was deteriorating national usage and traditions. Thus, NSP inclined towards Islamic countries during this coalition. NSP described the Common Market and its Western members as a crusade mentality who was trying to assimilate Turkey for their very economic interests (Bagdonas, 2007:27). NSP's anti-Western policy continued in the Second National Front Government and irritated the other two partners. Because of NSP's anti western approach, Opposition parties had always criticised the whole Government for doing nothing about Turkey' EC membership. NSP established government with RPP in 1974 and then became the partner of National Front governments in 1975 and 1977. Thus RPP and JP criticised each other when in opposition because of NSP's anti-Western policies (Çayhan, 1997: 167,178-181).

As a matter of fact, during the minority government of JP, which was supported by NSP and NMP (National Movement Party), NSP's interpellation was supported by RPP and JP government had to change its Foreign Minister Hayrettin Erkmen and continued its ruling (Çayhan, 1997: 213-214). Thus NSP showed its anti-Western behaviour throughout 1970's effectively opposed to the coalition governments that it was a partner (Esen, 2009: 66). NSP's leader Erbakan declared that he will give the minority government "unwilling support" and he will control it with the sword of Damocles. The term "Unwilling Support" brought to the Turkish political life by Necmeddin Erbakan.

After the military intervention of 12th September 1980, NSP was closed by the Constitutional Court. At the same time decisions taken on 24th January 1980 started to liberalise the country. As all the other parties, NSP's forerunner WP went through a deep change, especially on European Matters. Welfare Party abandoned its state oriented economic model and started to support liberal ideas and plural and open society. WP's was because of Turgut Özal's liberal policies and they thought that Anatolian bourgeoisie can only be freed from the government by liberal policies (Yavuz, 2005:597). Those small emerging bourgeoisie would be a back garden of Welfare Party. Thereby, WP became an NVM Party who played a conciliating role between republican bourgeoisie and rural Islam and Özal's liberal economic policies eased that process (Bakan ve Arpacı, 2012: 136). At the beginning, this change did not show itself in the foreign policy and Western policy of WP, contrarily WP continued its harsh behaviour against the West. Erbakan in the second Congress of the

Welfare Party elected as president of the party and made a declaration that they would establish a “United Nations of Islamic Countries “. This organisation, he said, would be motivated by the “right” but not “might”. Welfare Party and his leader Necmeddin Erbakan had always stressed the importance of collaboration with Islamic countries instead of the West (Üste, 2006: 343).

Welfare Party’s anti-Western behaviour can be seen in Party’s members in Grand National Assembly. As a matter of fact, Party’s members in Turkish- EC joint Parliamentary Commission on 11th November 1992 did not abstain from declaring that they were against any collaboration with the EC. Beside, Oğuzhan Asiltürk, Party’s group deputy chairman in the Assembly, stated that Turkey’s membership to Common Market would mean economic devastation as concessions were given only by Turkish side and he continued his statement that politically Turkey would lose as the membership of the Custom Union would deteriorate Turkey’s independence. Upon those considerations, Welfare Party gave an interpellation to the government before the very agreement of Custom Union membership in 1995. In his speech in the Parliament, Erbakan had gone too far saying that Turkish membership to Custom Union was a plan to stop a future Welfare Party government (Çayhan, 1997: 378, 401-411). As a matter of fact, Erbakan continued his opposition to Custom Union and described the agreement as Making Turkey “Valet” and Welfare Party’s possible government would reconsider the Agreement and make it a Free Trade Agreement (Erbakan, 1995, from Arpacı, 2012: 257).

Although Erbakan and his Party was not in favour of Custom Union, in coalition talks with True Path Party (TPP) of Tansu Çiller, he declared that Turkey’s Custom Union Agreement would be implemented and Ankara Agreement for membership would also be followed parallel to protecting Turkey’s interests (Üste, 2006: 343; WP-TPP Coalition Protocol 1996) . Government Program of 1996 built a consensus between anti Western policies of WP and Western side policies of TPP. Reconciliatory behaviour of WP somewhat relieved the political circles in the West but Kemalist and secularist circles were very resentful to TPP’s Tansu Çiller for establishing a government with an Islamist party. All those anti-Islamist circles’ concern turned to paranoia and those circles were also successful in tempering the Military as well. Erbakan his friends’ political mistakes add to the state of tension and the military intervention of 28th February 1977, later on was called as “Post Modern Strike”, became inevitable(Erdoğan, 2006: 162-164).

Erbakan’s provocative statements and visits as a Prime Minister added to the 28th Military Process. For example, he visited Iran, Pakistan, Singapur, Malaysia and Indonesia in the beginning of his Premiership. Contrarily, almost all the other government leaders throughout the Republican time, made their first visit to the West. Later on Recep Tayyip Erdogan would not do this mistake and followed Western oriented policy for his premiership in the first period between 2002-2005. Erbakan’s visit to Islamic countries worried the Western media and they broadcasted against the government. United States also reacted to Erbakan’s visit to Iran with whom Turkey planned to make some agreements (Bulaç, 2009: 275). Erbakan’s visit to those countries provoked by some opposition circles in and outside the country and this gave no chance to WP-TPP government to stay in power (Erdoğan, 2006: 165). Hence, Coalition government was stalemated by the famous declaration of National Security Council on 28th February 1997. Beside, a closure case was started by the Chief

Prosecutor of the republic against WP on 21st May 1997. The closure case brought the coalition in a deadlock and Erbakan had to resign from Premiership. The resignation of Erbakan put the coalition aside and efforts of military circles succeeded and President Süleyman Demirel had to nominate Mesut Yılmaz from the opposition who was getting on well with military at that time.

28th February Process caused a differentiation between radical Islamic circles and moderates. Radical groups together with some Islamic cults stayed against European Union but most of conservative people leaned towards EU with the effect of Özal's openness and liberal policies. After the closure of Welfare Party, most of the partisans left the rhetoric of "Christian Club" and took an EU side stand. The concepts of Human rights and free democracy were noticed by the followers of Welfare Party and the application to European Court of Human Rights against the closure clinched the Euro-sided ideas in National View circles. Shortly, Western sided ideas were approved by Islamic circles because it is thought that freedom and democracy could be brought to Turkey through the pressure of the West and European Union's membership criteria would help to this very issue. Thus Religious and conservative sections thought that European sided behaviour would protect them from anti-democratic applications of military supported government and freedom and democratic rights would perhaps come through this way (Acar, 2001:79-80). It is important to look at Bülent Arınç's, who was called as second Erbakan, statements about European Union and democracy. He stated in an interview that he had been against European Union and membership of EU was a high treason but after the process of 28th February I understood that European Union membership is necessary. In the same way, Erbakan's old National View friends Abdullah Gül, who became the president of the country, and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, who is the President of the country, stated in different environments that 28th February process helped change their behaviour towards European Union. However, it was only Bülent Arınç who clearly declared his EU sided ideas. To put it more correctly, Bülent Arınç left the idea that EU was a "Christian Club" "they will be partner we will be market" and find the way out in EU membership. In other saying, Arınç find the salvation in more democracy and democracy was in EU countries (Yetkin, 2005).

After the closure of WP after 28th February Process, Virtue Party (VP) was established and followed a different political way concerning the membership of EU. VP became a Western sided, supporter of liberal economy and supporter of democratic constitutional state (Okutan, 2006:317). At this point, VP tried to continue its political life in a polarised political environment and it can be said that VP's Western sided politics was to show that it was not following up its predecessor WP (Toprak, 2005: 177; From Arpacı, 2012: 420). VP, unlike its predecessor, supported a liberal economic model left the old collective state centred economic model. Although WP used leftist discourse and stressed to democracy a lot, it had a lot of ideological problems with democracy. Economic model "Just Order" was a statist economic model which was worlds apart from democratic Western countries economic model. Beside, hatred to West sometimes meant and turned to suspicion to democracy. Whereas, Virtue Party eradicated any suspicion about liberalism and democracy by giving clear supportive declaration about democracy and liberalism even clearer than any other party. Likewise, Virtue Party was not happy about Turkish political system's democratic and human rights practices. Being aware of this fact, VP's main aim was

to integrate Turkish political institutions with the West so that democracy and other aspects of freedom raise (Çaha, 2000: 171). The change in Virtue Party can be more understood in Party's election manifesto in 1999. In the manifesto, it is clearly pointed out that geographical and historical location of Turkey requires it to maintain a sustainable relation with European Union. However, it is also emphasised in the manifesto that Turkey will reconsider the Custom Union Agreement and relation would be based on mutual understanding free from political and financial hypothecation (VP, 1999: 45).

Recai Kutan's, who was elected as the leader of VP because of Erbakan's political ban, statements coincides with the Party's manifesto. As follows, Kutan in the International European Union Council held on 3-4 May 2000 in Istanbul stated roughly that European Union membership for Turkey was an important issue because of the fact that Turkey was politically, geographically, historically and socially had to improve its relations. He continued saying that European Union reached to a place which is more than a religious and continental issue as it is covering universal values. Thus, these values are not against Islam but those are something that Islamic world also should pursue and Turkey is an only Islamic country to be nearest to those values. Kutan continued saying that Islam's handling of human being as noble creature and European Union's attribution of value to human rights resemble each other and this resemblance paves the way for Turkey. Finally, he noted that Turkey will not have a painful period on the way of full membership and Turkish people will be ready for the membership from religious and social aspects (Tetik, 2000: 26). NVM's VP exhibited a positive attitude towards European integration as they saw the Union an authority to defend human right through Human Rights Court. However, European Human Rights Court rejected the application of the Party about freeing the wearing of headscarf in public places. After the closure of Virtue Party by Constitution Court, the fifth party (Felicity Party-FP) was established by NVM's "traditionalist" followers and they turned their back to their old anti-European position (Ermağan, 2011:230). Looking at the party programme, it can be seen that NVM's FP became again anti-Europeanist and trying to build new relations with the organisation of Islamic Cooperation, D-8 countries and Black Sea Economic Region. It was also expressed in the manifesto of newly established party that European countries had not developed on respect to belief, freedom of religion, pluralism and living with different civilisations. FP manifesto continued stressing that European Union's attitude towards Turkey, Turkish people and Turkish values were not acceptable and Western countries could not give up their old imperialist habit. Thus, the process of full membership should continue on equal basis and Turkish independence should not be harmed and Turkey cannot be surrendered and capitulated as it might mean the division of the country (See, FP Manifesto, 2001).

Some modernists in NVM distinguished themselves and established the Justice and Development Party on 14th August 2001. Modernists rejected their National View past and tried to create some new ideas about Turkey's foreign policy and this caused to some problems for JDP. JDP tried to legalise itself by having a moderate behaviour to European Union and the Whole West including USA. Especially JDP tried to maintain USA support EU support because those supports would be a proof that they changed (Uzgel, 2013: 357-358). 28th February Process was still on the agenda and JDP was being scrutinised by the owners of the process in military and bureaucracy. The only way to exit from this military

operation was to establish a deep and continues relations with EU and USA. JDP thought that this behaviour would legalise itself because reports by EU was also declared that Kemalism was an obstacle in front of democracy. Leadership of JDP was pleased by the attitude of EU towards accepting religious and ethnic identity and extending the democracy and human rights might eradicate the political and social problems of 28th February Process. If one thinks that armed forces are in the centre of state in political and social terms, JDP's moderate attitude towards EU can be more understood. JDP wanted to make political and social alterations through having the support of European Union (Uzgel, 2013: 366-367).

JDP's founders committee mostly comes from NVM tradition but their behaviour to EU has always been quite different from NVM's old tradition. One can see the in JDP's party program. JDP's leader Recep Tayyip Erdoğan before the general elections held 3rd November 2002 declared in Party Programme that Turkey geographically and historically has always been close relations with Europe and Europe in Turkey's foreign policy will continue to take place at the top of Turkish Foreign Policy, so Turkey will try to implement all requisites on the way of full membership (JDP Programme, 2001). It is worth stressing that JDP after arising from the elections triumphant gave priority to the issue of European Union Membership but not the problem of "headscarf". Whereas JDP's predecessors used to call European union as a "Christian Club". Never in history before none of Islamic politician behaved to EU in such a moderate manner. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, JDP's leader, accepted all Copenhagen Criteria for the membership of Turkey and stressed that those criteria was necessary for Turkey's democratic and economic development, even if it might not bring the membership to Turkey. He conspicuously stated that If Turkey was not given a negotiation Calendar, Copenhagen Political Criteria would be implemented for the sake of Turkish political development. Beside he said in brief that Turkish legal reforms far away from European ones and the "essence and soul" of those reforms are missing. Thus, JDP undertook a historical role in Turkey's integration process to European Union (Dağı, 2003: 173-175).

Unlike Erbakan's Eastern sided foreign policy, JDP's Erdoğan made his first visit to White House during his political ban as a party leader. After his political ban recalled, he visited almost all EU countries as a prime minister. By doing this he tried to leave a durable perception that his party was in the centre of Turkish politics (Uzgel, 2013: 357). JDP, which changed its Islamic line to a right line, intensified on accelerating EU membership. In this context, Erdoğan showed his determination about Turkish membership to the leaders of Union countries before Copenhagen Summit. This determination gave its fruits and Turkey legislated 4,5,6,7th adjustment law packages (Akdoğan, 2005: 624-625) and in total 27 changes made in Turkish law. In 2004, the 8th adjustment law package, which was including comprehensive constitutional change, legislated in Turkish Grand National Assembly. In the framework of the programme for alignment with the *acquis*, Turkish people started to perceive this as an adjustment policy. In other words, it was understood that European integration was not only something to affect the governments of European countries and their decisions but social relations between Turkey and EU should be developed. JDP's intensive work on getting negotiation that gave its fruits (Dedeoğlu, 2005:41). With the effect of JDP's effort, it was advised by Union side to start negotiations and later on 3rd October 2005 the start of negotiation process was decided (Bingöl ve Akgün, 2005: 20).

The start of negotiation process was a turning point for JDP government. Despite its Islamic, National Viewer and conservative background, JDP chose European Union as paradigm in convincing USA and the other Western countries that it was going to implement liberal political and economic policies. For this reason, the decision taken on 17th December 2004 could be accepted as a complete success for JDP government (Kaygusuz, 2013: 418).

After starting accession negotiations on 3rd October 2005, reform process speeded up without any delay. Ninth reform package and constitutional change entered into force by a referendum held 12th September 2010 were two very important changes put into practice by JDP government. Beside constitutional changes, harmonization packages, legal reforms to adopt Turkish law system and changes on human rights issues, protection against torture, freedom of press and expression, right of association, right to congregate and demonstrate, strengthening cultural rights, equality of women and men and consolidating democracy were all developments made by JDP government (Prime Ministry European Union General Secretary, 2007:22).

CONCLUSION

Turkey, as an Islamic country, started concrete integration relations with European Union in 1959. Turkey's Westernization movement goes back to 19th century and starts with reform movements of Tanzimat. However, National View Movement whose conservatism has always mixed with Islamic constituents has been generally anti-Western. Although NVM was, and still is, anti-Westernist, its existence prevented radical religious formations in Turkey and religion became a part of social and democratic life. As a matter of fact, the change towards European side has been slow and smooth because of functioning democracy however tutelary it was. NVM's leader, Necmeddin Erbakan, was harshly against European Union during 1970's and 80's and expressed his feelings in NSP's manifesto and party speeches. NVM parties has always been against European Union and concretely showed themselves in opposition by severe Assembly speeches and giving interpellations. When NVM parties were partners in governments, this anti-Western attitude continued. NVM has always called European Union as a "Christian Club" and talked about the unity of Islamic countries. The establishment of D8 countries during Erbakan's Premiership in 1996 is an important proof of this idea.

However, 28th February Process was a turning point for NVM followers and some religious- conservative people who used to support them. After so called Post Modern Military Intervention of 1997, some of the NVM followers thought that democracy was the only solution to their problems and it could only be secured via European Union. After the late 1990's, NVM and religious- conservative masses in Turkey started to support the EU membership of the country. Liberal economical changes were also very effective in this change. Because of social and political liberation and free market economy, some newly emerged middle class bourgeoisie reconciled with the political system. The beginning of 21st century brought the Movement to a junction. Those who were resentful to the West because Human Rights Courts rejected the "headscarf case" so they continued to their anti-Western political life in NVM's fifth party "Felicity Party". On the other hand, those who called themselves "Modernists" separated from the NVM and declared that they took of NVM shirt and they will continue to their political life in a different course. After

establishing the JDP, modernists made a road map which was going to European Countries first. To prove themselves, JDP politicians took the issue of membership at the top of their political agenda. After establishing a strong one party government in November 2003, JDP played a historical role in Turkey's long running EU membership adventure. It can be said that separatist –modernist old NVM followers played a catalytic role in harmonising and adapting the newly emerging religious middle class to the changing world. It can also finally be said that JDP made Turkey more democratic and politically liveable by making constitutional, legal, economic and social changes. It is vitally important to give credit where it is due, If Turkey never had radical and fundamentalist political movements, thanks to NVM whose political activities has always been inside the democracy and in legal framework. Despite the closure of four NVM parties, they established the fifth one and continued to their political life. As a matter of fact JDP is an outcome of this democratic and legal culture that is gradually being deepened.

REFERENCES

- ACAR, Mustafa (2001), "Avrupa Birliđi Üyeliđi'ne Tepkiler: Türkiye'nin Daha İyi Bir Alternatifi Var mı?", *Cumhuriyet University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, vol: 2, no: 2, pp. 75-91.
- AHMAD, Feroz (2011), *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*, (Translator. Yavuz Alogan), İstanbul: Kaynak Publishing.
- AKÇAY, Ekrem Yaşar (2012), "1970'lerde Siyasi Partilerin Gözüyle Türkiye'nin AET'ye Bakışı: AP, CHP, MHP, MSP, DP2, TKP Örnekleri", *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences*, vol: 4, no: 7, pp. 25-45.
- AKDOĞAN, Yalçın (2005), "Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi", (JDP), Bora, Tanıl ve Murat Gültekingil (Editor), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce İslamcılık (Volume 6)*, İstanbul: İletişim Publishing, pp. 620-631.
- AKGÜN, Birol (2006), "Türkiye'de Merkez Sağ Siyaset Geleneđi ve AK Parti", *Conservative Thought*, no: 9-10, pp. 23-37.
- AKIN, Kenan (2000), *Milli Nizam'dan 28 Şubat'a Olaylı Adam Erbakan*, İstanbul: Birey Publishing.
- AKKAŞ, Hasan Hüseyin (2001), "Türk Modernleşme Tarihinde Muhafazakâr Siyasi Düşünce", *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences*, vol: 3, no: 2, pp.1-12.
- AK Parti (Justice and Development Party), (2001), "Parti Programme", [http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/akparti/parti-programi#bolum_\(12.05.2014\)](http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/akparti/parti-programi#bolum_(12.05.2014)).
- AKŞEMSETTİNOĞLU, Gökhan (2011), "Avrupa Bütünleşme Projesinin ve Genişleme Sürecinin Deđişen Dinamikleri", *Ankara Review of European Studies*, vol: 10, no: 1, pp. 1-18.
- AKTAY, Yasin (2002), "Karizmanın Aşırı Gerçekliđi", *Birikim*, no: 163-164, pp. 53-61.
- ARPACI, Işıl (2012), "Türk Siyasal Yaşamına Etkileri Bakımından İslamcılık ve Necmettin Erbakan", Malatya: İnönü University Institute of Social Science, Department of Public Administration Unpublished PhD Thesis.

- AY, Şadiye (2004), “Türkiye’de Siyasal İslam”, *Mevzuat Journal*, no: 83, pp. 1-13.
- AYKOL, Hüseyin (2009), *Türkiye’de Siyasi Parti Kapatmanın Tarihi*, İstanbul: İmge Publishing.
- BAGDONAS, Özlem Demirtaş (2007), “Türkiye’nin ‘Vazgeçilmez’ İki Davası: Kıbrıs ve ‘Batı’/ ‘Avrupa’ya Yönelim”, *International Law and Politics*, vol: 3, no: 11, pp. 17-40.
- BAKAN, Selahaddin (2005), “21. Asrın Eşiğinde Türkiye Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri”, Adnan Küçük, Selahaddin Bakan, Ahmet Karadağ (Editor), *21. Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türkiye’de Siyasal Hayat II. Volume*, Bursa: Aktüel Publishing, pp. 1121-1141.
- BAKAN, Selahaddin, Işıl, ARPACI (2012), “Liberal Değişim Sürecinde Dönüşen ve Dönüştüren Muhafazakârlık”, *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Journal of Faculty of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, vol: 2, no: 2, pp. 131-140.
- BALKIR, Canan (2013), “Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği Gümrük Birliği: İçerik ve Uygulama”, Rıdvan Karluk ve Betül Yüce Dural (Editor.), *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye İlişkileri*, Eskişehir: Anadolu University Faculty of Open Education Publishing, pp. 26-51.
- BİNGÖL, Yılmaz ve Şener, AKGÜN (2005), “Demokratlıktan Muhafazakâr Demokratlığa: Demokrat Parti ile Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisinin Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analizi”, *Kocaeli University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, no: 9, pp. 1-33.
- BOZKURT, Veysel (2001), *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye*, Bursa: Publishing of Supporting Foundation of Uludağ University.
- BÖLÜKBAŞI, Mustafa (2012), “Milli Görüş’ten Muhafazakâr Demokrasiye: Türkiye’de 28 Şubat Süreci Sonrası İslami Elitlerin Dönüşümü”, *Journal of Human and Social Sciences Research*, vol: 1, no: 1, pp. 166-187.
- BULAÇ, Ali (2009), *Göçün ve Kentin Siyaseti (MNP’den SP’ye Milli Görüş Partileri- NVM Parties From NOP to FP)*, İstanbul: Çıra Publishing.
- BULUT, Müge (2006), *Avrupa Birliği Rehberi*, İstanbul: Istanbul Chamber of Commerce Publishing.
- CANBOLAT, İbrahim S. (2011), *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Uluslararası Sistemle Ortaklık*, Bursa: Alfa Aktüel Publishing.
- ÇAHA, Ömer (2000), “Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler ve Avrupa Birliği”, *Journal of Islamic Research*, vol: 13, no: 2, pp. 163-170.
- ÇAHA, Ömer (2007), *Dört Akım Dört Siyaset*, Ankara: Orion Books.
- ÇAKIR, Ruşen (2005), “Milli Görüş Hareketi”, Bora, Tanıl ve Murat Gültekingil (Editor), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce İslamcılık (Volume 6)*, İstanbul: İletişim Publishing, pp: 544-549.
- ÇALIŞ, Şaban H. (2005), “Türkiye’nin AB’ye Üyelik Konusu ve Helsinki Kararları”, Adnan Küçük, Selahaddin Bakan, Ahmet Karadağ (Editor), *21. Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türkiye’de Siyasal Hayat II. Volume*, Bursa: Aktüel Publishing, pp. 1143-1161
- ÇALIŞ, Şaban (2008), *Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri Kimlik Arayışı, Politik Aktörler ve Değişim*, Ankara: Nobel Publishing and Delivery.
- ÇALMUK, Fehmi (2005), “Necmettin Erbakan”, Bora, Tanıl ve Murat Gültekingil (Editor), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce İslamcılık (Volume 6)*, İstanbul: İletişim Publishing, pp. 550-575.

- ÇAYHAN, Esra (1997), *Düünden Bugüne Türkiye Avrupa Birliđi İlişkileri ve Siyasal Partilerin Konuya Bakışı*, İstanbul: Boyut Publishing.
- ÇINAR, Menderes (2002), “Seçimlerin Ardından: Siyaset Yeniden”, *Birikim*, No: 163-164, pp. 40-43.
- DAĞI, İhsan (2003), *Batılılaşma Korkusu*, Ankara: Liberte Publishing.
- DEDEOĞLU, Beril (2005), “Düünden Yarına Türkiye-Avrupa Birliđi İlişkileri”, *Siyasa*, No: 1, pp. 23-45.
- DEMİREL, Ahmet (2013), “Çok Partili Hayat, Siyaset, Partiler, Seçimler”, Demirel, Ahmet ve Süleyman Sözen (Editor.), *Türk Siyasal Hayatı*, Eskişehir: Anadolu University Faculty of Open Education Publishing, pp. 60-95.
- DOĞANAY, Ülkü (2007), “AKP’nin Demokrasi Söylemi ve Muhafazakârlık: Muhafazakâr Demokrasiye Eleştirel Bir Bakış”, *Ankara University SBF Journal*, Vol: 62, No: 1, pp. 65-88.
- DPT (State Planning Organization) (2000), “Uzun Vadeli Strateji ve Sekizinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı 2001-2005”, <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkinma%20Planlar/Attachments/2/plan8.pdf>, (11.03.2014).
- Erbakan Hükümeti Koalisyon Protokolü (RP-DYP)* (1996), <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukümetler/KP54.htm> (17.06.2014).
- ERDOĞAN, Mehmet Murat (2006), “Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında Türkiye Avrupa Birliđi İlişkileri”, Ankara: Ankara University Institute of Social Science, Department of Public Administration Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa (2007), “28 Şubat Darbesi”, Birey Yayıncılık (Der.), *28 Şubat Postmodern Bir Darbenin Sosyal ve Siyasal Analizi*, İstanbul: Birey Publishing, pp. 17-28.
- ERLER, Özgün (2007), “Yeni Muhafazakârlık, AKP ve “Muhafazakâr Demokrat” Kimliđi”, *Journal of Strategic Research*, No: 10, pp.126-132.
- ERMAĞAN, İsmail (2011), “Bir Medya Aktörü Olarak Milli Gazete’nin Avrupa Birliđi Algısı”, *Süleyman Demirel University Faculty Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences*, No: 24, pp. 225-245.
- ESEN, Erol (2009), “Ortaklıktan Üyeliđe Türkiye-Avrupa Birliđi Tartışmaları”, Erol Esen ve Necati İyikan (Editor), *Türkiye-AB İlişkileri Nereye Gidiyor Müzakereler, Reformlar ve Demokrasi*, Ankara: Phoenix Publishing, pp. 57-106.
- FP (Fazilet Partisi) (1999), “Fazilet Partisi Günışığında Türkiye 18 Nisan 1999 Seçim Beyannameesi (Virtue Party Manifesto)”, [http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/\(03.05.2014\)](http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/(03.05.2014)).
- GÜRKAN, Alper (2011), “Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi’nin Muhafazakâr Demokrat Kimliđinin Oluşumunda Sosyal Politikanın Etkileri”, *OPUS Turkey Journal of Social Policy and Working Life Research*, No: 1, pp. 1-13.
- HEPER, Metin (2006), *Türkiye’de Devlet Geleneđi*, Ankara: Dođu-Batı Publishing.
- HURMİ, Bahar (2008), “Avrupa Birliđi ve Demokrasi Açığı Sorunu”, Rasim Özgür Dönmez ve Gökhan Telatar (Editor), *Küreselleşen Dünyada Avrupa Birliđi*, Ankara: Phoenix Publishing, pp. 36-80.
- KARAALİOĞLU, Mustafa (2001), *Hilal ve Ampul Fazilet’ten Saadet ve AK Parti’ye Bir Hareketin Öyküsü*, İstanbul: Bakış Publishing.

- KARLUK, S. Rıdvan (2002), *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye*, İstanbul: Beta Publishing.
- KAYGUSUZ, Özlem (2013), “Türkiye-AB İlişkilerinin “Möbiud” Şeridi: AKP Reformculuğu ve AB Çokkültürlülüğü”, İlhan Uzgel ve Bülent Duru (Der.), *AKP Kitabı: Bir Dönüşümün Bilançosu (2002-2009)*, Ankara: Phoenix Publishing, pp. 410-438.
- KOÇ, Yıldırım (2001), *Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri*, Ankara: Türk-İş Training Publications.
- KONGAR, Emre (2006), *21. Yüzyılda Türkiye 2000’li Yıllarda Türkiye’nin Toplumsal Yapısı*, İstanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- KURT, Ümit (2009), *AKP Yeni Merkez Sağ mı?*, Ankara: Dipnot Publishing.
- KÜLEBİ, Ali (2011), “2011 Seçimleri ve AKP’nin Başarısı”, <http://www.alikulebi.com/Sayfa.asp?islem=2&SayfaNo=469>, (8.03.2014).
- MERT, Lütfi Yener (2008), *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kapatılan Siyasi Partiler Kapatma Davaları, Gerekçeleri ve Sonuçları*, Ankara: İlkim Publishing.
- MERT, Nuray (2007), *Merkez Sağın Kısa Tarihi*, İstanbul: Selis Books.
- Milli Selamet Partisi Programı* (1972), Ankara: Elif Printing.
- MSP (Milli Selamet Partisi) (1973), *Milli Selamet Partisi 1973 Seçim Beyannamesi*, İstanbul: Fatih Publisher Press.
- OKUTAN, M. Çağatay (2006), “Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi: Muhafazakâr Demokrat mı, Hıristiyan Demokrasinin Müslüman Versiyonu mu?”, *Dokuz Eylül University the Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences*, Vol: 8, No: 1, pp. 307-324.
- ÖRMECİ, Ömer (2008), *İttihat ve Terakki’den AKP’ye Türk Siyasal Hayatı*, İstanbul: Güncel Publishing.
- ÖZER, Akif (2009), “Avrupa Birliğine Tam Üyeliğin Eşiğinde Türkiye”, *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, Vol: 16, No: 1, pp. 89-105.
- PAMUK, Muhammed (2001), *Yasaklı Umut Recep Tayyip Erdoğan*, İstanbul: Birey Publishing.
- POYRAZ, Fahrettin (2010), “Milli Nizam Partisinden AK Parti’ye “İslami Hareketin Partileri ve Değişim””, Uzun, Turgay (Editor.), *İttihat ve Terakki’den Günümüze Siyasal Partiler* Ankara: Orion Orion Publishing, pp. 311-338.
- Prime Ministry General Secretary of European Union (2007), *Türkiye’de Siyasal Reform Uyum Paketleri ve Güncel Gelişmeler*, Ankara: M&B Promotion Services Publishing.
- SP (Saadet Partisi) (2001), “Program/V. Dış Politika”, <http://www.saadet.org.tr/kurumsal/v-dis-politika/687> (08.05.2014).
- SAFİ, İsmail (2005), “Türkiye’de Muhafazakârlığın Düşünsel-Siyasal Temelleri ve ‘Muhafazakâr Demokrat’ Kimlik Arayışları”, Ankara: Ankara University Institute of Social Science, Department of Public Administration Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- SAFİ, İsmail (2007), *Türkiye’de Muhafazakâr Siyaset ve Yeni Arayışlar*, İstanbul: Lotus Publishing.
- SARIBAY, Ali Yaşar (1985), *Türkiye’de Modernleşme Din ve Devlet Politikası “MSP Örnek Olayı”*, İstanbul: Alan Publishing.
- SARIBAY, Ali Yaşar (2005), “Milli Nizam Partisi’nin Kuruluşu ve Programının İçeriği”, Bora, Tanıl ve Murat Gültekingil (Editor.), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce İslamcılık (Vol 6)*, İstanbul: İletişim Publishing, pp. 576-590.

- SAMBUR, Bilal (2009), “The Great Transformation of Political Islam in Turkey: The Case of Justice and Development Party and Erdogan”, *European Journal of Economic and Political Studies*, Vol: 2, No: 2, pp. 117-127.
- TECER, Meral (2007), *Avrupa Birliđi ve Türkiye Sorular-Yanıtlar*, Ankara: Public Administration Institute for Turkey and Middle East Publishing.
- TEKİN, Üzeyir (2004), *AK Parti'nin Muhafazakâr Demokrat Kimliđi*, Ankara: Orient Publishing.
- TEKİN, Yusuf and Çađatay OKUTAN (2011), *Türk Siyasal Hayatı*, Ankara: Orion Publishing.
- TETİK, Gaffar (2000), “Uluslararası Avrupa Birliđi Şurası”, *Diyanet Aylık Dergi*, No: 114, pp. 25-26.
- TÜRKÖNE, Mümtaz'er (1994), *Modernleşme Laiklik ve Demokrasi*, İstanbul: Ark Publishing.
- USUL, Ali Resul (2006), “Helsinki'den Müzakerelere Türkiye-AB İlişkileri”, Zeynep Dađı (Ed.), *Dođudan Batı'ya Dış Politika AK Partili Yıllar*, Ankara: Orion Publishing, pp. 189-217.
- USTA, Metin (2012), “Yetmişli Yıllarda Türkiye Avrupa İlişkileri”, <http://www.metinusta.net/events/aet1.pdf> (13.05.2014).
- UZGEL, İlhan (2013), “Dış Politikada AKP: Stratejik Konumdan Stratejik Modele”, İlhan Uzel ve Bülent Duru (Editor.), *AKP Kitabı: Bir Dönüşümün Bilançosu (2002-2009)*, Ankara: Phoenix Publishing, pp. 357-379.
- ÜSTE, Bahar (2006), “Türkiye'de Siyasal İktidara Gelen Partilerin AET/AT/AB İlişkileri Hakkındaki Görüşleri ve Yönetim Yapısına Etkileri”, *Dokuz Eylül University the Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences*, vol: 8, No: 3, pp. 332-349.
- YAVUZ, M. Hakan (2005), “Milli Görüş Hareketi: Muhalif ve Modernist Gelenek”, Bora, Tanıl ve Murat Gültekingil (Editor), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce İslamcılık (Vol 6)*, İstanbul: İletişim Publishing, pp. 591-603.
- YETKİN, Murat (05.06.2005), “Beni 28 Şubat AB'ci Yaptı”, *Radikal Gazetesi*.
- YILDIRMAZ, Sinan (2003), “Muhafazakârlık, Türk Muhafazakârlığı ve Peyami Safa Üzerine”, *Journal of Historical Studies*, No: 1, pp. 9-18.
- YILMAZ, Nuh (2005), “İslamcılık, AKP, Siyaset”, Bora, Tanıl ve Murat Gültekingil (Der.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce İslamcılık (Vol 6)*, İstanbul: İletişim Publishing, pp. 604-619.