

# Istanbul Bilgi University

Jean Monnet Chair of European Politics of Interculturalism  
Department of International Relations  
European Institute

**Jean Monnet Chair Student Workshop II**  
**13 May 2014, Dolapdere, Istanbul**

**“Construction of European Identity the Metaphors that  
European Union Lives By”**

**Patrycja Hala**

**Istanbul Bilgi University**



**Jean  
Monnet  
Chair**



**Istanbul  
Bilgi University**  
LAUREATE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITIES

*The information and views set out in this paper is those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Institute of Istanbul Bilgi University. Neither the European Institute and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein*

# CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY THE METAPHORS THAT EUROPEAN UNION LIVES BY

Patrycja Maria Hala  
Istanbul Bilgi University  
MA in International Relations

## Introduction

The identity politics have gained a lot of attention in last years. In fact, question about European identity has not been so important since the very foundation of the European Union (EU). The rapid changes, the Eastern enlargement, reforms in the European Union, economic crisis have provided thrust to determine the European identity. In the time of growing world's fragmentation the identity politics pose a mean to create public support and social integration which is crucial for the legitimacy of the EU. The vision of Turkey's full accession to the EU has raised discussions on "Europeanness" of Turkey and the challenge that it poses to European identity because Turkey does not belong to the "European family". My research question is: What is the role of metaphors in the construction of European identity? In this paper I will argue that European identity is discursively constructed and metaphors plays crucial role in this process. Metaphors help to create the feeling of European unity and give the EU more emotional character. The aim is to gain more legitimacy through offering sense of belonging. I will start my paper with analysis of constructivist theories on identity formation. According to constructivist approach, international reality is socially constructed. Social processes maintain, construct, and reconstruct identity. For poststructuralists, identity is formed through difference; the individuals describe themselves and others in the world they live in, therefore identity remain fluid and fragmented. In next stage I will present briefly discourse analysis and the theories on metaphor in the discourse. Language is not neutral and is

used by those who hold power to shape the social and political reality. Metaphors, as distinguish linguistic tool, have been used by politicians in order to shape the sense of the world among citizens.. They reflect the understanding of the world we live in. In the last part, I will focus on commonly used metaphors in political discourse of EU, France and Germany. I will present how metaphors are introduced in order to depict Turkey as “other” that does not belong to Europe.

## **Constructivism and poststructuralism on identity**

Constructivists in International Relations argue that international reality is socially constructed by cognitive structures that give meaning to the material world (Adler 1997). According to Onuf (1989), the world we live in “is of our making”. Once identity is structured, it is maintained, modified, and reshaped by social relations (Berger & Luckmann 1966). Constructivism puts identity as the very core of International Relations. State acquires identity through the interactions with other states. The actors of International Relations, as individuals, can have many identities; however, each identity is social definition of the actor based in the theories that actors have about themselves and others. Those identities constitute the structure of the social world. Wendt highlights (1992), that identity is the basis of interests. The interests, on the other hand, are determined by the particular situations. The important claim of social constructivism is that the identity not necessarily is formed through the difference between states. Wendt stresses (1999) that states have pre-social corporate identities, such as bodies of territories, in addition to their social identities, and this corporate identities are self-organizing structures that remain aloof to Self/Other relations. He distinguishes two types of identity; “role identity”, which is constructed in relation to other states, and “type identity” is intrinsic to the state and does not requires interactions with others (Düzgit 2013).

On the other hand, according to poststructuralist approach, identity is constructed through discourse and difference. Connolly argues that (2002, p.64):

An identity is established in relation to a series of differences that have been socially recognized. These differences are essential to its being. If they did not coexist as differences, it would not exist in its distinctness and solidity...Identity requires difference in order to be, and it converts difference into otherness in order to secure its own self- certainty.

He adds (2002) that identity and difference are interrelated because one does not exist without the experience of the other. Furthermore, “identities are always constituted in relation to difference because a thing can only be known by what it is not” (Rumelili, 2004, p.29). In order to protect its own identity, state has to devaluate the other. In addition, Connolly maintains (2002) that no identity is true identity because every identity is particular and contingent. Campbell claims (1992) that foreign policy is one of boundary- producing practices significant for the production and reproduction of the identity in whose name it operates. However, foreign policy cannot be seen as constituting identity *de novo*. Production and reproduction of state’s identity involves the exclusionary practices, the discourses of danger, the representations of fear, and the enumeration of threats. He stresses that “the logic of identity more readily succumbs to the politics of negation and the temptation of otherness”(Campbell, 1992, p.71), therefore foreign policy does not construct identity from the beginning but rather reproduces the unstable identity at the level of the state, and the containment of challenges to that identity. Borders are created in order to define places that are safe and unsafe, to distinguish us from others. It is objectification of the self through the representation of danger. “To have a threat requires enforcing a closure on the community that is threatened. A notion of what ”we” are is intrinsic to and understanding of what we fear (Campbell, 1992, p.73). Campbell also says (1992) identity is not only derived from being in contradiction to difference but it is multi-layered depth, and comprises of many dimensions. Body politic is central

to the moral space of identity. The social is understood as a natural healthy body and difference as danger to the social. Metaphors like “mystical body of Christ” in Catholic rhetoric, have been used for centuries (Campbell, 1992, p.73). According to Weldes (1999, p.14) identities “emerges out of the process of representation through which individuals... describe to themselves and others the world in which they live”. On the other hand, Rumelili states as follows regarding Other: “the differences of the Other maybe represented through various, more or less favourable predicates, metaphors, binaries”, also “it is through these representational practices that the constructed Other maybe idealized, or completely denigrated, affirmed or negated, or even eroticised and exoticised” (Rumelili, 2004, p.36) . According to Düzgit (2013), identities may bring serious consequences for the world politics because actors may act as identities really exist. While, Vasquez claims (2006) that identity is related to power because usually those who shape identities have a power to impose their will on others.

## **European Union identity and Turkey**

EU can be described as “imagined community” that is constantly formulating its meaning. The founding fathers aimed to create peaceful union of the European states based on Kantian peace theory. The devastations of World War II forced European states to get together in order to avoid the catastrophe similar to what happened in the past. Therefore, each enlargement contributed to the European integration, peace project and added element to the forming European identity. The European integration did not finish on Western states but went further, to Central and Eastern Europe in order to form ideally unified Europe with common respect for democracy, human rights, and economic cooperation among member states. According to LaGro and Jorgensen (2007), the 2004 enlargement contributed enormously to the project of unification of Europe. However, when Turkey’s accession came to the agenda, tension between the member states became more and more

visible. The strong scepticism regarding accession of Turkey into EU has several dimensions: Turkey is seen as different in political, cultural and economic sense by many in the EU (LaGro & Jorgensen 2007). Arvanitopoulos claims (2009) that Turkish candidacy is in any respect an extraordinary process because it is expected that Turkey's integration would profoundly affect both the material and ideational components of the Union.

According to Kösebalaban (2007, p.97):

European identity did not emerge in vacuum; the European identity is defined through the "others", which are constructed through historical experience. The project of imagining Europe as a singular entity shifts the focus of shared memories from the level of nation-state to the level of European culture. While the shared historical memory of European nation-states primarily evokes a history of an intra-European construction of others, the construction of a European common identity depends on the existence of Europe's cultural others. European 'civilized' peoples are juxtaposed against a multitude of 'barbarians'.

Muslims, and Turks in particular were always depicted as "others", who pose serious challenge to politics and religion of Europe. This negative perception served as a common source of fear. Neumann highlights (1999) the fact EU- Turkey relations still carry the marks of exclusion of Turks related to the Europe- Ottoman Empire history. The memories of the past are among the factors operative in today's Turkish- European discourse. According to Kösebalaban (2007), imagined Europe is a civilizational project that let "others" in if only they can share the same Christian values, and Turkey is not viewed as a part of Europe because of its different civilization roots. According to Diez (2005, p.633): "historically, Turkey has mostly been part of the European set of powers, but it was also constructed as the Muslim enemy in front of the gates of Europe". He claims that Turkey is ideal "other" for the EU because it helps to construct Europe as a normative power promoting the rule of democracy, and respect for human rights. Interestingly, Arvanitopoulos

and Keridis (2011) argue that Turkey's Europeness is questioned not only because of country's geography, demography, or religion but also because Turkey did not participate in World War II; this absence from the birth of the new Europe affected the international image of Turkey which has been perceived as an alien or other to Europe. The years of reforms and getting closer to Europe do not change the situation: "Yet, ironically, the more Turkey democratizes, the less secular it becomes. In other words, Turkey is faced with a great and often seemingly unsolvable paradox: the more it "Europeanizes" institutionally, the more it "Orientalizes" culturally. The more it heads to the West, the more it looks to the Islamic East". (Arvanitopoulos, 2007, p.56) According to Rumelili (2004, p.28): "while clear-cut self/ other distinctions may have been replaced within the EU by overlapping and mutually constitutive identities, the EU as a collectivity may be replicating the modern, Westphalian 'mode of differentiation' in terms of its external relations". In this respect it can be argued that European collective identity has introduced the construction of its outside as inherently different and as a threat to its identity; however, from post- modern perspective the EU's collective identity may not be based on fear of different outside, but rather on the common fear of disunity and that EU does not have fixed boundaries around itself.

Rumelili differentiates (2004) between exclusive and inclusive EU identity. Exclusive is seen in conditions for membership of being European in geographic sense- there is no way that the candidate state can change its geographical location. Other criteria have inclusive character, such as respecting the principle of liberty, democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms. In other words, those values are universal which means that any country can become democratic and respect human rights if successfully adopt the institutional tools. Rumelili also claims (2004) that Turkey is differentiated from Europe on the basis of both inherent and acquired characteristics, which emphasise the exclusive aspect of European identity based on geography and culture.

## **Discourse Analysis**

Language is not neutral but it is a powerful tool that contributes to the construction of social world. Therefore, language tells us not only about person that uses it but also about culture or institutions that person belongs to. Discourse Analysis is a method that analyses spoken and written language as it is used to enact social and cultural perspectives and identities (Gee, 2001). The word 'discourse' comes from Latin 'discursus' which denotes 'conversation' or 'speech'. According to Renkema (2004), discourse analysis is devoted to the investigation of the relationship between form and function in verbal communication. According to the distinguished professor of Discourse Studies Ruth Wodak: "discourse means anything from a historical monument, a lieu de memoire, a policy, a political strategy, narratives in restricted or broad sense of term, text, talk, a speech, topic- related conversations, to language per se" (Wodak, 2008, p.1). Discourse analysis offers deep perception into the functioning of bodies of knowledge in their specific situated context with regard to the power effects of the discourse of group of people (Cheek 1997).

Michel Foucault's works are at the very basis of many discourse analysis. Foucault talked about the order of discourse- the realm of discursive practices, that is a conceptual terrain in which knowledge is formed and produced through rules, systems, and procedures (Hook, 2001). Discursive rules are hence strongly linked to the exercise of power: discourse itself is both constituted by, and ensures the reproduction of, the social system, through forms of selection, exclusion and domination (Young, 1981 in Hook, 2001). Foucault stated that: " (...) the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and canalized in every society- and that is done by way of certain procedures whose task it is to subdue the powers and dangers of discourse, to evade its heavy and threatening materiality" (Rabinow, 1984, p.10-11). For Foucault (2002) discourse functions in several basic ways. First, discourse generates the world of everyday life through creating ways that people behave, and through producing understanding of world around us because discourse links people together and creates social reality. Furthermore, discourse forms knowledge and different truth because they do not exist independently from language. The truth, that discourse constitutes give social, cultural and sometimes political power and particular position



to the people that claim it (Foucault 2002). It is crucial to note that according to Foucault, discourse cannot be analysed only in the present, because the power components and the historical components create such a tangled knot of shifting meanings, definitions and interested parties over periods of time, therefore discourse must be seen from genealogical and power perspective (Powers, 2007).

## **Metaphors in the discourse**

There are different approaches to what metaphor is; however, general definition can be as follow: “metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else” (Burke 1945, p. 503). Metaphor for most of the people is just a tool of poetry, a part of imaginary rather than ordinary language. Nevertheless, Nietzsche argued that metaphor plays a foundational role in human understanding (Cantor 1982). Lakoff and Johnsen in *The metaphors we live by* suggest that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not only in language but in thoughts and actions. The authors make distinction between conceptual metaphors and metaphorical expressions. Conceptual metaphor makes people apply what they know about one area of their experience (source domain) to another area of their experience (target domain) (Drulak 2006). “While conceptual metaphor connects conceptual areas, metaphorical expressions provide bridges between constitutive elements of these conceptual areas” (Drulak, 2006, p.505). Some of metaphors are treated as universal metaphors because of sedimentation in the political discourse (Drulak 2006). “Metaphor is a solar eclipse. It hides the object of study and at the same time reveals some of its most salient and interesting characteristics when viewed through right telescope” (Paivio as cited in Mio, 1997). According to Edelman (1971, p.67):

Each metaphor intensifies selected perception and ignores others, thereby helping one to concentrate upon desired consequences of favoured public policies and helping one to ignore their unwanted, unthinkable, or irrelevant premises or aftermaths. Each metaphor can be a subtle way of highlighting what one wants to believe and avoiding what one does not wish to face.

According to Chilton (1996), metaphors locate one understanding of the reality in the privileged position to other. On the other hand, White (1978), who writes about role of metaphors in history telling, claims metaphors give direction to find images in our experience in order to find out how we feel about particular things.

The language of politics uses many linguistic strategies to influence recipient to understand something in specific way. One of the strategies used in the language of politics is metaphor. This strategy helps to make people to identify with or make them believes in something. Politicians use metaphors in their speeches in order to make their words more convincing and understandable. Message will be well received by audience if politicians play with desires, emotions and needs of people. Some metaphors may be specific for particular culture because of social or ethnic dimensions, but others are cross- cultural metaphors which are common for various cultures or languages, for instance, the container metaphor is near- universal because it works on extremely general level (Kövecses 2005). Metaphor is important tool for creation of social realities: “metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor. This will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make experience coherent. In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.156). From the perspective of Critical Discourse Analyses, the metaphor is advantageous for identity construction, because it emphasises the threat or danger to the identity. The state is a healthy body and the threat is an illness (Musolff 2012.) Conceptual metaphors, such as state as a person or world as a community are used intentionally in political discourse in order to give the state, organization or institution humane character (Drulak 2006).

## **Metaphors in the construction of European identity**

Metaphor which calls to the emotions and feelings of people plays important role in identity construction. At the time, when Europe becomes a contested notion, metaphors seem to be a tool to make EU more approachable and give to it humane characteristic which may create emotional bond between the organization and European citizens because still European project remains only abstract for majority of people. The imagination of European unity is crucial for citizens' identification with EU. The aim is to make people feel united although they live in various part of the continent, and to imagine Union's borders with "others" behind those borders. The metaphors used in identity construction discourse should be universal and should reflect thinking of European civilization. Judge (1989, 1999) originates EU in collective consciousness and imagination of European citizens which can be effectively achieved through the use of metaphors. Hülse (2006) in his study claims that EU is an imagined community and its collective identity is displayed in the discourse through metaphors because metaphors are the means that people imagine and the way that social reality is constructed.

In this chapter I will analyse common metaphors used in discourse in EU and in member states.

Tekin (2008) in her study analyses the French discourse on picture of Turkey through which European Self is constructed. Traditionally, in France there is strong emotional attachment to European integration because France was one of the founding states of European Community; moreover, France has been 'the driving force' of European project. However, Turkish possible membership makes France to be concerned about the future of EU. It gives impression that current EU is not the EU that it used to be (Tekin 2008). Turkey's candidacy caused the raise of tensions in French politics and hot debates on possible membership. In the French discourse, in and out groups metaphors are used because French people identify themselves with Europe, they think about

themselves as Europeans. According to Van Dijk (2000) in and out groups categories are strongly ideological and are used to display the norms and values. The positive values are attached to the Self and a negative characteristic to the Other, which is well known as an important strategy in identity formation (Tekin, 2008). Elias explains (in Tekin, 2008) that members of the group depict themselves as a more civilized and better than others, they feel about themselves as superior to the other. Tekin specifies (2008) that France and Europe are shown as superior to Turkey through describing themselves as a home to human values, high culture, rationalism, and liberalism. Furthermore, description of Europe as a 'democratic club' is another strident instance of glorification of European Self as a homogenous entity that is more democratic and more tolerant than any state, any place in the world (Tekin, 2008). In order to show the negative characteristics of Turkey which does not fit into Europe and poses a threat to European culture and values, French discourse uses the metaphors of disaster, aggression and war (Tekin, 2008). It is noteworthy that in the French discourse metaphors arouse strongly negative images of possible Turkish membership in the EU. Tekin concludes (2008, p.750):

Metaphors of disaster, aggression and war are most of the time employed in the opposition discourse in order to accentuate better on the risks and danger associated with Turkish accession to the EU. Disaster metaphors are associated with the vocabulary of natural disasters such as floods, earthquakes and fire. Through the use of these metaphors, Turkey's EU membership is likened to a natural catastrophe that would damage the European integration project.

In order to emphasise the threat that Turkey poses for the integrity of EU the words of bomb and blowing up are introduced:

The combination of the size of Turkey and its non-European nature create a time bomb.

(Goulard, 2004: 102 as cited in Tekin 2008)

Turkey is a time bomb.

(De Villiers, 2005: 97 as cited in Tekin)

Container metaphors belong to the group of special metaphors that play significant role in political and public discourse (Chilton 2004). “The container being a closed entity to which one either belongs or not, this group of metaphors serves primarily to demarcate the borders of in and out groups. Container metaphors are employed in quite different ways, for the conceptualization of groups of all sizes from families to states” (Tekin, 2008, p.751). The EU as a container suggests that it is fixed unit and functions similarly to the state; the EU issues resemble the domestic issues of the state (Drulak 2006). These metaphors show that what is inside is valuable and right, while what is located outside is negative or illegal.

Metaphor of family (container metaphor) is the most universal one because it carries strong emotional meaning. In other words, it gives power to the European integration. Europe is depicted as a family of the member states and European people. According to Tekin (2008), family metaphor raises the debate on Turkey’s accession from the cold grounds of interstate politics to the much emotional grounds of family affairs.

If, like me, you have the feeling to be a part of the European family, isn’t this the moment to prove that we are there to defend and to protect it rather than to denature and put it in danger? Then, for me, for the deputies whom I represent in this tribune, No to Turkey in Europe.

(Philippe Pemezec, UMP deputy, Assemblée Nationale, 14 October 2004 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

These evolutions make Turkey a friend, not a member of the European family.

(Jean-Louis Bourlanges, European deputy, UDF, DNA, 13 December 2004 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

The statement of French scholar Sylvie Goulard regarding 1999 Helsinki decision on Turkey's candidacy displays how emotional the issue was in French discourse

Admirable decision which without a preliminary debate disturbs the destiny of Europe! Since then, the Union has its family secret. Created in the mystery, the child grew up in the darkness.

(Goulard, 2004: 19 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

Granting Turkey the candidacy status was something shameful, the "family secret", that should be hidden (Tekin 2008).

Another distinguish metaphor is marriage metaphor. According to Hülse (2006), those who are not members of the family, can become a part of it through marriage. Again French discourse consists of marriage metaphors because of its emotional power:

We thus incontestably have interest in integrating Turkey. Here, I talk about a marriage of convenience!

(Pierre Moscovici, socialist deputy, interview, *Le Figaro*, 4 October 2004 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

And I do not question the fact that, taking into account the current dispositions of the Turks, their history, their culture, I am completely persuaded that we will arrive at the end of this common way, for a marriage which will be favourable to both of the parties.

(Jacques Chirac, European Council, press conference, Brussels, 17 December 2004 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

Marriage metaphor carries several meanings, such as religious or cultural differences between spouses (Tekin 2008). In the eyes of many people in Europe, Turkey belongs to the different world; religion makes the Turkey- EU relations highly problematic or even impossible. In French discourse

this relationship is perceived as a “bad marriage”:

Turkey is unfamiliar to all these experiments which founded Europe as a civilization. To preserve the future of this formidable adventure which is the European Union, it is better to have a good ‘pacs’ rather than a bad marriage.

(Michael Cheylan, columnist, *Le Figaro*, 16 December 2004 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

Tekin highlights (2008) the using of forced marriage metaphor and its reference to the practices of forced marriages in Turkish society which is related to the social problems in related to domestic life in Turkey and Islam: honour killings, violation of human rights, the abuse of women.

House metaphor is another example of container metaphors which support the European integration (Tekin, 2008; Chilton & Ilyin, 1993; Hülse, 2006: 412; Musolff, 2004). Similarly to the family metaphor, house has its boundaries that protect inside (self) from outside (other).

European identity is disturbed faced with a country that naturally does not authenticate as a member of its household.

(*Les Dernières Nouvelles d’Alsace*, 22 November 2002 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

The alternative form of house metaphor is door metaphor. Turkey is depicted as a knocking the door of Europe:

For more than thirty years, Turkey knocks on the door of Europe.

(Jean-Louis Debré, UMP deputy, *Le Progrès de Lyon*, 19 December 2004 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

Other strategy is personification of EU and Turkey; giving the human characteristics through body metaphor, which stresses the capacity of EU:

In the name of what the European Union, as a political project, and not only as a free trade area, should absorb all Europe and die out of indigestion, victim of a blind bulimia?

(Yves Mény, *Le Monde*, 15 November 2002 as cited in Tekin, 2008)

The EU is like a human organism that has its “digestion” capacity. Turkey is too big country and EU should not accept it.

Turkey has long relations with the EU that started in 1959, however, Central and Eastern European states have been always perceived as members of Europe and were granted candidate status and joined EU. One can argue that the main reason lies behind culture and religion because from cultural and religious perspective, Central and eastern countries are very much alike with Western Europe, while Turkey represents Islam that has been always located in contradict position to Christianity. This shows the double standards that EU applies: different for Christian states and different for Islamic Turkey.

While Turkish candidacy has been always perceived as problematic for EU, the Central and Eastern European enlargement has been seen as one of the most important steps in European integration. According to Hülse (2006), political decisions about enlargement, future shape of EU boundaries or criteria of membership pose the question about European identity. In other words, the enlargement-discourse constructs European identity and may thus be read as an identity-discourse. German discourse on enlargement is very important in identity construction because of strong German support of membership of Central and Eastern countries and the significance of Germany in EU politics. While in French discourse family metaphor was used to strengthen the difference of Turkey, in German discourse Eastern enlargement is depicted as family reunion that was formerly split. Kinkel, Foreign Secretary, in 1994 stipulated about EU enlargement as “family reunion”. While Chancellor Kohl called the Central and Eastern candidate countries “our European brothers”, and Merz, member of CDU/CSU in 2000 stated that Central and Eastern countries belong to



“European family of nations” (as cited in Hülse, p. 2006).

[T]he Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Romanians, the Bulgarians and the Hungarians are our European brothers [y] and need to attain their European rights.

(Kohl, Chancellor, 15 December, 1994, 420 as cited in Hülse, p. 407)

The Central and Eastern Europeans need a European perspective: They want home to Europe.

(Haussmann, FDP, 6 November, 1991, as cited in Hülse, 2006, p.408)

Also, Chancellor Kohl described EU enlargement as enabling Central and Eastern European countries ‘homecoming to Europe’ (Kohl, Chancellor, 30 January, 1991, as cited in Hülse, p.408).

“Homocoming” is highly emotional because it gives EU, as a political and economic organization, more approachable character. Candidates countries, as a members of family, once separated, are getting united again (Hülse, 2006).

Hülse argues (2006) that European identity is based on primordial sources because family is characterized by a membership given by birth, members shares the same origins. In other words, family is natural collectivity. Family determines the boundaries, therefore if somebody is not a member, stays outside, it cannot become a member of the family. “This discriminates between countries that are considered to be original, natural European countries and countries that are not. Obviously, there is nothing in-between; if a country is not originally part of Europe, it will remain its other permanently” (Hülse, 2006, p.406). Hülse also implies (2006) that family metaphor may have different meaning as well. It can depict that EU has a civic base as marriage between spouses or parents and adopted children. Therefore, the boundaries of EU can be more open and under some circumstances country from outside can be accepted. To conclude, family metaphor plays a role in primordial and civic identity formation.

According to Düzgit (2013), while EU Commission reproduces discourse on “clash of

civilization” regarding Turkey, it integrated former ”Other”- the East into European “family”. It constructs Europe as a natural entity which is characterized by security, safety, and clear boundaries that exclude others. The inclusion of Eastern countries shifted the security to cultural/ civilizational differences, implying that Islam is monolithic religion which poses serious challenges to the Christian Europe (Düzgit 2013).

Düzgit analysis (2013) the metaphor of bridge which refers to the “clash of civilizations” discourse.

In my view, Turkey is a country that can build a bridge to the Arab World. I would therefore call upon us to act in the forthcoming process on the basis of Turkey’s being a ‘friend of Europe.

I see Turkey as a country which for the last 50 years has been a very good member of the NATO. In today’s world, she sits in very important geopolitical position, as a kind of bridge to the Islamic world.

(Seeberg, EEP-ED, 13 December 2004, as cited in Düzgit, p.2013)

Turkey was perceived by Swedish European Parliament member as loyal ally of Europe and NATO which demonstrates security importance of Turkey; however, the metaphor of bridge is very significant in this context. Bridge means something that you walk on, or something that connect two entities together without belonging to either one side or the other. This picture refers to Europe and Islamic/ Arab world that are in opposition to each other and the role of Turkey is to link those two entities. Turkey may have security value for Europe but it does not mean Turkey is European (Düzgit 2013). Bridge metaphor was also used by French President, Nikolas Sarkozy, to show his view on Turkey’ membership:

I wish we had the best relations with Turkey, of course. In my mind, it has an important role to play

in the world, a role of a bridge between East and West.

(Nikolas Sarkozy, 13 December 2011)

In the last few decades, migration has been hotly debated topic. Migration has been perceived as a source of fear and instability for the nation -state in Western Europe (Kaya, 2012). In other words, migration as a threat to the culture and religion has been securitized. The security discourse has been used by neoliberal politicians in order to shift blame for poverty, social inequalities, and economic difficulties from the state to the immigrants. Migrants are depicted as “others”, and those who are responsible for unemployment, violence, crime, drug trafficking etc. This attitude is reinforced by using terminology that dehumanizes immigrants (Kaya, 2012). Politicians in EU generate picture of Turkey, among other countries, as a source of ‘influx’, ‘invasion’, ‘flood’, or ‘intrusion’ of migrants. Therefore, immigrants are linked to the natural disaster for the European states. Nick Griffin, the leader of British National Party was referring to ‘pouring’ immigrant from Turkey:

It’s not just the Turkish population. There is an almost limitless number of Middle Easterners and Muslims who would pour in through Turkey if the peoples of Europe were daft enough to let the bureaucrats here bring the Turks in.

(Nick Griffin, 13 March, 2011)

## **Conclusions**

European identity is constructed through discourse and difference. Self is glorifying while Other is negatively characterised. Metaphor plays important role in identity construction discourse. Metaphors of house give impression that EU is not only a political and economic organization but it is united entity of European states. In the eyes of people EU gains more legitimacy because Europe is depicted as a safe and secured place for European citizens. While EU does not have official

boundaries, metaphors aim to construct imagined one. They protect people from what is outside- the Other. In my paper I proved that in European discourse Turkey is the Other that is not welcome in Christian European home. Moreover, Turkish candidacy is perceived as a shameful secret rather than something positive. This negative way of describing Turkey contributes to construction of European Self, as more developed, more sophisticated, and more civilized. The metaphor of bridge gives very meaningful message: Turkey can be a partner of EU in the dialogue with Islamic/ Arab world but it cannot become a member of EU family.

## Reference list

Adler, E, 1997. Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in the World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), 319-363

Arvanitopoulos, C, 2009. *Turkish Accession to the European Union. An Unusual Candidacy*. 1st ed. Athens: Springer.

Aydin Düzgüt, S, 2013. *The constructions of European Identity. Debates and Discourses on Turkey and the EU*. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

*BNP Party Political Broadcast*, 2011, BNPTV, March 2011, Available from: <http://bnptv.org.uk/2011/03/eu-turkish-membership/> [Accessed 21 April 2014].

Burke, K, 1945. *A grammar of motives*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Campbell, D, 1992. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. 1st ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Connolly, W.E, 2002. *Identity, Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox*. 1st ed. Minneapolis/ London: University of Minnesota Press.

Diez, T, 2005. Constructing the Self and Changing the Other: Reconsidering 'Normative Power Europe'. *Milennium: Journal of International Studies*. [Online]. 33 (3), 613-636. Available at: <http://sagepub/stable/234664> [Accessed 22 April 2014].

Drulak, P, 2006. Motion, Container and Equilibrium: Metaphors in the Discourse about European Integration. *European journal of International Relations*, [Online]. 12(4), 499-531. Available at: <http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/12/4/499> [Accessed 30 April 2014].

Edelman, M, 1971. *Politics as Symbolic Action: Mass Arousal and Quiescence*. 1st ed. New York: Academic Press.

Hüllse, R, 2006. Imagine the EU: the Metaphorical Construction of a Supra-National Identity. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, [Online]. 9, 396- 421. Available at: [http://www.gsi.uni-muenchen.de/personen/wiss\\_mitarbeiter/huelsse/5\\_publ\\_huelsse/pdf\\_huelsse/jird\\_2006.pdf](http://www.gsi.uni-muenchen.de/personen/wiss_mitarbeiter/huelsse/5_publ_huelsse/pdf_huelsse/jird_2006.pdf) [Accessed 30 April 2014].

Kosebalaban , H, 2007. The Permanent "Other?" Turkey and the Question of European Identity. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, [Online]. 18 (4), 87-111. Available at: <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/med/stable/10818> [Accessed 22 April 2014].

LaGro, E & Jorgensen E.K 2007, *Turkey and the European Union. Prospects for a Difficult Encounter*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lakoff, G, Johnson, M 2008, *Metaphors We Live By*, 1st ed. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Mio, S, 1997. Metaphors and Politics. *Metaphors and Symbols*, [Online]. 12(2), 113-133. Available at: <http://www.surrey.ac.uk/politics/research/researchareasofstaff/isppsummeracademy/instructors%20/Metaphor%20and%20Politics.pdf> [Accessed 17 April 2014].

Neumann, I.B, 1998. *Uses Of The Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation (Barrows Lectures)*. 1st ed. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.

Rabinow, P, 1984, *The Foucault Reader*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. New York, Pantheon Books.

Rumelili, B, 2004. Constructing identity and relating to difference: understanding the EU's mode of differentiation. *Review of International Studies*, [Online]. 30(1), 27-47. Available at:

<http://journals.cambridge.org/stable/0260210504> [Accessed 30 April 2014].

Tekin, B, 2010. The Construction of Turkey's Possible EU Membership in French Political Discourse. *Discourse Society*, [Online]. 19(6), 727- 763. Available at: <http://das.sagepub.com/content/19/6/727> [Accessed 30 April 2014].

Weaver, O, 1996. European Security Identities. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (1), 104-132.

Weldes, J, 1999. *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the production of danger*. 1st ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota press.

Wendt, A, 1992. Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, [Online]. 46(2), 391-425. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706858> [Accessed 14 April 2014].

