

**Turkey's Conscientious Objectors and the Contestation of
European Citizenship**

Bahar Rumelili, Koc University

Fuat Keyman, Sabanci University

Bora Isyar, National University of Ireland, Maynooth

Abstract: The evolution of European citizenship reflects the limits and potential of European integration. Building on the analytical distinction between citizenship as status and citizenship as practice, this paper analyzes how conscientious objectors in Turkey enact themselves as European citizens as they pursue the right of conscientious objection. The European-level political activism of Turkey's conscientious objectors include litigation at the European Court of Human Rights and contacts established with European institutions, such as the European Commission and Parliament, and with like-minded European activists. Because this European-level political activism is also embedded in a discourse of Europeanness, it amounts to the practice of European citizenship in the absence of formal status. The paper invites a rethinking of European citizenship in ways that include such practices by non-EU citizen political actors and a reflection on their implications of their practices on European citizenship.

Introduction:

Since the Treaty of Maastricht, European citizenship has been presented as an important foundation of closer integration in Europe. However, European citizenship has failed to live upto these expectations because it has remained exclusionary – a status granted only to citizens of EU member states, and additional –offering only a limited set of rights in addition to national citizenship (Maas 2008; Shore 2000). This paper contends that European citizenship should not be studied merely as an institutional status, but also as a continuously evolving form of political practice. Citizens are not passive recipients of rights and duties that are granted to, and expected from them; rather, they enact themselves as citizens through practice (Isin 2002).

The distinction between citizenship as status and citizenship as practice paves the way for the possibility that individuals who do not possess citizenship status may nevertheless be enacting citizenship and through this enactment, constituting themselves as citizens (Isin and Nielsen, 2008). This paper analyzes how conscientious objectors in Turkey demand the right of conscientious objection in ways that also enact them as European citizens. The members of the said group are neither formal citizens of the European Union (EU) nor residents of EU member states, yet they enact European citizenship at least in three ways: They demand extended citizenship rights from the Turkish state by referring to rights that exist within Europe; they demand and claim citizenship rights at European institutions; and they question, challenge, and aim to transform European citizenship.

Conscientious objectors are only a subset within the wider groups of Turkish citizens, who practice European citizenship. Because Turkey is a founding member of the Council of Europe and has granted its citizens the right to individually petition the European Court of Human Rights, and because Turkey is a country negotiating accession to the EU, even those Turkish citizens, who are not residing in Europe, have access to numerous channels of European-level political participation. Different groups of Turkish citizens actively demand the expansion and proper implementation of their rights as citizens from the Turkish state through these channels. Although they may not associate their practices with European citizenship themselves, their citizenship practice, in effect, couples rights at the national level with participation at the European level, and takes on a multi-layered form (Yuval-Davis 1999).

In the following two sections, the paper begins with a comparative discussion on the state of the right of conscientious objection in national citizenship regimes within Europe and Europe-wide human rights conventions and in the Turkish Constitution and relevant laws. Following this background, the paper subsequently investigates how conscientious objectors in Turkey demand the right of conscientious objection in Turkey through European-level political participation. In addition to outlining their European-level political acts, which range from petitioning the ECtHR to contacts with like-minded activists in Europe, the paper analyzes how Turkish conscientious objectors ascribe meaning to their European-level political practice. As a result of this analysis, the paper contends that through their acts, the meanings they ascribe to their acts, and the potential European-level implications of their acts, conscientious objectors in Turkey are practicing European citizenship, and enacting themselves as European citizens.

Conscientious Objection and European Citizenship

Conscientious objection may be viewed as a right of European citizenship in the sense that it is firmly embedded in the national citizenship regimes in Europe. Among the 47 members of the Council of Europe, Turkey and Azerbaijan are the only two countries that do not recognize conscientious objection as a human right. In its origins, conscientious objection bore the character of a religious movement, through which different religious groups refused to engage in war due to their religious convictions (Bröckling 2008, 70). Right after the end of the First World War, conscientious objection became a movement with bigger support around the world, primarily thanks to various manifestos, signed by public figures such as Albert Einstein, Sigmund Freud, and Stefan Zweig (Göker 2008, 156). In 1921, Denmark recognized the right of conscientious objection (Speck and Friedrich 2008, 154). After the end of the Second World War, mostly thanks to developments in human rights and

strengthening of the conscientious objection movement, numerous European states have granted their citizens the right of conscientious objection. In these countries, the objectors have to serve an alternative service usually in the Ministries of Interior, Justice, Health or Social Work, for a period that cannot be shorter than the mandatory military service period. However, the European public debate on conscientious objection is far from over, as various groups contend that alternative service is still serving the ideology of militarism (Göker 2008, 164).

According to conscientious objection activists, the right to conscientious objection is embedded in the fundamental rights mentioned in Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) (Çınar 2008, 235), although as will be discussed shortly, the European Court of Human Rights has not interpreted Article 9 in that fashion. The first paragraph of the article states: “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance” (“European Convention on Human Rights”). The conditions of application of this otherwise inalienable right is outlined in the second paragraph in the following way: “Freedom to manifest one’s religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, for the protection of public order, health or morals, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others” (ibid).

The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) has up to date adopted a number of resolutions regarding the right to conscientious objection (235). These include the resolutions No. 337 (27 January 1967), No. 816 (7 October 1977), No. 1518 (23 May 2001), and No. 1742 (11 April 2006) (ibid). For our purposes, resolution No. 337 carries special importance as it sets out the European standards on conscientious objection as a

human right. Article A1 of the Resolution No 337 reads: “Persons liable to conscription for military service who, for reasons of conscience or profound conviction arising from religious, ethical, moral, humanitarian, philosophical or similar motives, refuse to perform armed service shall enjoy a personal right to be released from the obligation to perform such service” (“Resolution 337 on the Right of Conscientious Objection”). This right of conscientious objection is regarded to be deriving from the freedom of conscience as guaranteed by the aforementioned Article 9 of the ECHR and as such is to be treated as a fundamental human right (Schneider 2008, 268).

Conscientious Objection and Turkish Citizenship

On the other hand, the prevailing nationalist discourses in Turkey construct military service as an integral part of national citizenship. Military service and conscription in Turkey is first covered by the Article 72 of the Turkish Constitution, which states, “National service is the right and duty of all Turks. The manner in which this service shall be performed, or considered as performed, either in the Armed Forces or in the public service, shall be regulated by the relevant law” (*1982 Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anayasası*). The relevant law in question is Conscription Law No. 1111 (of 1927) where Article 1 states, “Every male citizen of the Turkish republic is to be conscripted once they reach the age of 18” (“Askerlik Kanunu”).

There are a series of exemptions made to the military service obligation. According to the changes made to the Law No. 1111 in 2009, male citizens whose siblings have died while serving in the military, whose fathers have died while “fighting against terrorism”, and refugees are exempted from military service (ibid). Finally, in accordance with the changes made in 1987, male citizens who are designated as “unhealthy” by the Turkish Armed Forces Health Regulations are also exempt from military service (ibid). Exemption due to health

reasons has been an object of immense debate in Turkey since the early 1990s. Those who are not fit to serve are determined by a committee comprising of civilian and military doctors. The illnesses that lead to exemption include the so-called “psycho-sexual diseases, namely homosexuality, transsexualism, and transvestism” (“Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Sağlık Yeteneği Yönetmeliği”). Acts proving that one is “suffering from such diseases” should be photographed or video-recorded in order for a citizen to be exempt from military service (“Eşcinsellere ‘hasta’ muamelesi”).

Thus, although the Turkish Constitution refers to the possibility of civilian service as national service, the national service referred to in the Constitution materially only exists as service in the Armed Forces. This means, in line with the said article of the Constitution, that every Turkish male, in actuality, has the right and duty to perform military service. In addition, although the Constitution stipulates that national service is the ‘right and duty of all Turks’, the relevant laws grant this right and duty only to male citizens. Thus, as Altınay (2008, 117) argues, even at the first glance, the legal discourses in Turkey construct a border between male and female citizens, identifying the former with Turkishness, and simply relegating the latter to a supporting role (of assisting the men especially in times of war or strife).

Although Turkey is a signatory to the ECHR, successive Turkish governments have denied recognizing conscientious objection as a right using the second paragraph of the Article 9 of the Convention, which, as mentioned above, stipulates public safety and order as legitimate grounds to limit the freedom to manifest one’s religion and belief. Specifically, the refusal to serve in the military has been interpreted within the frames of Turkish nationalist discourses as a threat to public order. Therefore, conscientious objection in Turkey has been seen as a movement which weakens the nation, makes it susceptible to threats, and endangers

the organic bond which brings together the members of the republic (Aydın 2008, 37; Üsterci and Yorulmaz 2008, 217).

Despite the close association legally and ideologically established between military service and Turkish citizenship, some Turkish citizens have chosen to practice their citizenship not by performing military service, but by demanding the right of ‘conscientious objection’. In Turkey conscientious objection became a public issue in the early 1990s with two objectors, Tayfun Gönül and Vedat Zencir, publicly announcing their objection to perform military service on conscientious grounds (Üsterci and Çınar 2008, 9). Currently there are 61 public cases of objection, 12 of which are by women and 49 by men (ibid). From the time the first objections were made onwards, In the 1990s, a number of conscientious objection associations were established. The first of these was İzmir Anti-War Association, which was established in 1992, with the mission to resist all forms of militarism in Turkey (Üsterci and Yorulmaz 2008, 218). However, the governorship of Izmir shut down the association on the grounds that militarism did not exist in Turkey and as such there was no need for an association that aimed to combat militarism (ibid). In 1994, another anti-war association was formed in Istanbul, but was dismantled in 1996 as in the latter year The Anti-Militarist Initiative was founded in Istanbul and various objector groups decided to join the Initiative.

Conscientious Objection and the Enactment of European Citizenship in Turkey

In many ways, conscientious objection in Turkey is a struggle that could have been effectively pursued solely at the national level. After all, national authorities are the main addressee of the right demands, and the laws that restrict ‘national service’ to military service are open to challenge on constitutional grounds. What is interesting for our purposes is the very fact that the conscientious objection movement in Turkey, from its very inception, chose to pursue its demands also at the European level. The European-level political activism of

Turkey's conscientious objectors included cases brought before the European Court of Human Rights and intense contacts established with objectionist movements and organizations in Europe.

Given Turkey's firm embeddedness in European legal and political structures, the European-level activism of Turkey's conscientious objectors may be regarded as a wise strategic choice. However, we contend that their European-level activism cannot be reduced to the strategy of using the European Union and the Council of Europe as leverage points to pressure the Turkish state. Turkey's conscientious objectors have remained as European actors even as the European Commission reports and the ECtHR judgements have failed to fully meet their expectations. They have not turned away from Europe in disappointment, but rather they have persisted in their European-level activism to question, challenge, and transform the dominant European interpretations of conscientious objection. Their activism calls for a re-thinking of European citizenship, in ways that include such practices by non-EU citizen actors.

Following the first public announcements of conscientious objection in Turkey, the objectors have been tried in military courts, charged with breaching Anti-Terrorism Law, Article 318, which states that "cooling down the citizens' enthusiasm for military service" is a crime punishable by terms served in military prisons (Üsterci and Yorulmaz 2008, 220). Among the imprisoned objectors, Osman Murat Ülke took his case to the ECtHR, and this case has been an important turning point in the struggle for the right of conscientious objection in Turkey.

Ülke was called to report to the Conscription Office in August 1995 and on September 1, 1995 he publicly declared his objection ("AİHM'nin Vicdani Retçi Osman Murat Ülke Kararı"). He was charged by the Military Courts in 1996 and after three years of repetitive charges and imprisonment, he spent a total number of 701 days in military prisons (ibid). In

1997 he made an application to the ECtHR on the grounds that the Turkish Republic was in breach of Articles 3¹ and 9² of the ECHR (ibid). In his speech at the court hearings, Ülke stated that the recent developments within Europe have shown that conscientious objection was a fundamental human right, which could not be denied to any human being, irrespective of the country they belong to (ibid). As such, he argued, the ECtHR bore the responsibility to force Turkey's hand to come to terms with the developments in Europe, and grant the rights that EU citizens enjoy regarding conscientious objection, to its own citizens (ibid).

Litigation at the ECtHR is a European-level political act. Moreover, Ülke's speech at the Court clearly indicates how his act is constituted by an overall discourse of Europeanness. Ülke demands to enjoy rights that EU citizens enjoy, claims them from the Turkish Republic and at the same time calls a European body to act in his name to ensure that as a citizen of the republic he can enjoy these rights. By demanding the rights of European citizens while not formally being a European citizen, Ülke is constituting himself as a European citizen, and enacting European citizenship.

The ECtHR found Turkey to be in breach of Article 3 of the ECHR and sentenced the Turkish state to pay a fine of 11,000 Euros ("AİHM'nin Vicdani Retçi Osman Murat Ülke Kararı"). The Court further noted that the Turkish state urgently had to come up with some legal arrangements regarding the right of conscientious objection (ibid), although no steps in this direction have yet been taken by successive Turkish governments ("BDP'li Tuncel Vicdani Retçi Aydemir'i Sordu"). These decisions were celebrated by various groups fighting for the right conscientious objection in Turkey ("Ya Çocuklarının Şehit Olmadıklarını

1 "No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

2 "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, wither alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance."

Farkedelerse”). However, at the same time, this decision’s lack of reference to Article 9 of the ECHR was met with criticism.

According to Ülke, the problem with ECtHR’s ruling was that, the court approached the issue of conscientious objection as merely one of the many rights-oriented relations between an individual and the state (“İnsan Hakları Gündemi Derneği Genel Sekreteri Hakan Ataman’ın Osman Murat Ülke’yle 26.07.2007 tarihinde e-posta üzerinden yaptığı söyleşi”). In its decision, the ECtHR did not refer to Article 9 of the ECHR, which is an article on freedom of belief and conscience, but merely found the Turkish state to be in breach of Article 3, which is an article on an individual’s right to be never subjected to torture or inhuman treatment (ibid). Ülke asserts that conscientious objection is a political and ethical stance against the militaristic structure on which not only the Turkish state, but all nation-states are built and as such it should not be approached as an individual’s struggle to have his rights recognized (ibid). Rather, what needs to be done by the ECtHR, for him, is taking a stance against the militarist order of the nation-state system (ibid).

Ulke’s interpretation of the Court’s decision indicates that his act of petitioning the Court was an act of European citizenship in terms of the actor’s intentions and the potential implications that the act carried. Ulke’s petition was not only intended to redress the inhumane treatment of the Turkish state, but to firmly ground the right of conscientious objection as a fundamental human right in Europe. In that sense, he was acting not only as a Turkish citizen, but also as a European subject, as he intended to affect the European legal interpretations concerning conscientious objection. Had the Court found a violation of Article 9, this would have severely constrained the ability of Turkey and other European states to limit conscientious objection.

Despite the Court’s decision, conscientious objectors in Turkey, such as Halil Savda, continued to remain in prison on the basis of Article 318 (“A Conscientious Objector in

Turkey: Interview with Halil Savda.”) Turkey subsequently made no legal changes to comply with the Court’s ruling in the Ulke case. Making a mockery of the cause of conscientious objection and the spirit of the Court’s decision, Savda was released in 2008 only after a military health council issued a “not fit for military service” report due to his “anti-social behaviour and lack of masculinity and Turkishness” (ibid).

The ECtHR’s Ulke decision has generated mixed reactions among Turkey’s conscientious objectors. Some, organized under Conscientious Objection Platform, and the Working Group Against Article 318, have, at numerous times, made public statements celebrating the ECtHR decision as they have seen it as an initial step towards the establishment of the right of objection. (“318. Maddeye Karşı Çalışma Grubu: Vicdani Red Hakkı Tanınsın”). Others, like Ulke, have been quite critical of the decision for not dealing with the question of conscientious objection in a truly progressive manner.

Savda, like Ulke, argues that if the ECtHR were really interested in the granting of the right of conscientious objection, Turkey would have been penalized for not merely breaching the law against torture of individuals but also for not allowing conscientious objection based on religion, conscience, or philosophy (“A Conscientious Objector in Turkey: Interview with Halil Savda”). Through the way he interprets the Court’s decision, Savda is enacting European citizenship in a number of ways. For Savda, the campaign for conscientious objection is not conducted for particular individuals and the compensation they get from the Turkish state.³ Rather, the campaign demands a transformation of the ground on which Turkish state and other nation-states are built: a militaristic structure, which glorifies killing and dying in the name of the nation (ibid). For him, Europe has a special duty and privilege

³ A similar stance was taken by various Kurdish groups in Turkey who asserted that it was not the individual cases that really mattered to them but the recognition of group rights (Rumelili, Keyman, and Isyar forthcoming).

in the materialization of such a transformation because it has already taken a step towards a nation-less community with the establishment of the EU (“Özgür İradenin Tadı”)

Thus, through the expectations that he places on the European polity he is not formally a member of, Savda is enacting Europe as an alternative community. His comments attest to the depth of his political investment in Europe. Although he deems that the EU and other European institutions do not adequately address the question of conscientious objection in Turkey, that does not lead him to withdraw from Europe in disappointment. Rather, the inadequacy of the European response leads him to responsabilize Europe further and criticize the European institutions in order to transform Europe. The EU, according to Savda, still takes the existence of nations for granted, and leaves the implementation of human rights to the prerogative of nation-states (ibid). As such, national interests still override human rights, and the existence of the nation is seen as more important than the existence of its citizens (ibid). Savda argues that only when such an understanding is destroyed, will a true political system based on universal human rights be established (ibid). Because of its historical trajectory, Europe has the responsibility to realize such a system (ibid).

Thus, Turkey’s conscientious objectors, in addition to taking their case to the ECtHR, are enacting European citizenship through the ways in which they interpret the Court’s decision. Despite not formally carrying a European passport, they aim to transform European polity, governance, and citizenship. They demand to be part of an alternative Europe that is built on a nation-less ground, have a say in its policies, and actively shape how Europeans are governed within it. Through making such demands, Turkey’s conscientious objectors have in effect become European citizens although they do not possess it as a legal status.

In addition to petitioning the ECtHR, Turkey’s conscientious objectors are active in the European policy arenas, through their close contacts with their European counterparts. From their very inception, organizations advocating the right of conscientious objection in

Turkey have organised common anti-war rallies and festivals, and shared stories of various objectors in their countries with their European counterparts (221). For example, immediately after its establishment, the Anti-militarist Initiative immediately became part of the European Network of Objectors (220-1). These partnerships and contacts have been crucial in informing European institutions of the various pending cases of objection in Turkey (Interview with *Savaş Karşıtları*) and in pressuring the EU to include the issue of the right of conscientious objection in Turkey's membership negotiations ("Vicdani Retçi Savda: Devlet Yalan Söylüyor").

The question of conscientious objection does not appear in the European Commission's Progress Reports on Turkey until 2005. In the 2005 Report, the Commission notes that Turkey does not recognize the right of conscientious objection to compulsory military service and that it provides no alternative service and therefore asks Turkey to take necessary steps to implement European standards in this regard (European Commission 2005, 109). Although the Commission has been preparing these reports on Turkey since 1998, the fact that the issue starts to occupy the EU agenda after 2005 attests to the agenda-shaping effect of the *Ulke* case in the ECtHR and the Court's 2006 decision. In other words, had the conscientious objectors in Turkey pursued their struggles purely at the national level, it is doubtful that the issue would have made its way to the agenda of EU-Turkey relations at all. Hence, Turkish political actors are able to shape the EU policy on Turkey and thus enact European citizenship although they do not formally belong to the EU polity.

After the ECtHR announced its *Ulke* decision, the issue began to figure more prominently on the agenda of European institutions. The 2006 Progress Report of the European Commission noted that the Turkish government had taken no steps towards the recognition of the right of conscientious objection and demanded once again for necessary laws to be instigated in order for conscientious objectors to be free from prosecution

(European Commission 2006, 61). The European Parliament (EP) adopted a resolution on conscientious objection in Turkey on September 27th, 2006. In the adopted text, the MEPs stated: “The EP recalls that the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) advised Turkey to prepare a new legal framework for conscientious objectors and reminds Turkey that the right to conscientious objection is recognized in the European Charter of Fundamental Rights” (“EP Resolution on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession”). This was the first time the EP directly asked Turkey to take the necessary legal steps towards the recognition of the right of conscientious objection if the latter was to ever become a member of the EU.

On October 17th, 2006, the Committee of Ministers of the CoE held a special meeting on the current state of affairs regarding the right of conscientious objection in Turkey. In the press release, the Committee stressed that the Turkish government was not keeping its promise and legal obligation to draft a new law to prevent the repeated persecution of conscientious objectors (“The Council of Europe demands Turkey stops persecuting conscientious objector Osman Murat Ülke”). The CoE later warned Turkey that in the absence of such legislation, Turkey’s membership to the EU would be endangered (ibid).

In the 2007 Progress Report, the European Commission warned Turkey that it had to implement a legal framework recognizing the right of conscientious objection urgently as this was demanded by the ECHR to which Turkey was (and still is) a signatory (European Commission 2007, 12; 61). In the 2008 Progress Report, the Commission did not mention the necessity of a legal framework, which would guarantee the recognition of right of conscientious objection (Interview with *Savaş Karşıtları*) but merely referred to the need for a law that would prevent repetitive prosecutions and conviction of conscientious objectors (European Commission 2008, 13). Two other issues regarding conscientious objection were mentioned in the 2008 Progress Report. The first is the ill treatment of conscientious objectors in the hands of security officers, especially the army (European Commission 2008,

20). The EC demanded that in accordance with the Article 3 of the ECHR, Turkey was to refrain from using any form of inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment. The second issue is related to freedom of speech; the EC demanded that Turkey stops prosecuting those who make public statements on the right of conscientious objection⁴ (17).

Like the ECtHR decision, the references made to conscientious objection in the EU Commission reports on Turkey have only partly satisfied the Turkish activists. Although the EU was supported by conscientious objectors for raising various issues related to conscientious objection, it was also subjected to varying degrees of criticism for actually not addressing the rights-related character of conscientious objection. In other words, the EU was challenged as it did not demand from Turkey to recognize the right of conscientious objection as an inalienable human right and instead merely asked the latter to introduce measures to prevent “excessive” punishment of objectors and their supporters (Interview with *Savaş Karşıtları*). In 2009, same concerns were voiced about the lack of EC’s referral to the right of conscientious objection as a fundamental human right. In the 2009 Progress Report, the EC voiced the same concerns it had in the previous year’s report: excessive and repetitive prosecution of objectors (European Commission 2009, 15) and the implementation of Article 318 to persecute public supporters of conscientious objection (23).

Although the interventions of European institutions only partly satisfied the Turkish activists, and are yet to lead to the establishment of the desired legal framework recognizing the right of conscientious objection in Turkey, they led to the intensification of the debates on conscientious objection with a specific focus on European norms and values. In particular, after 2006, the debate on conscientious objection in Turkey started to revolve around

⁴ Any supportive public statement on the right of conscientious objection is subject to prosecution in accordance with Article 318 of the Turkish Criminal Code, which states that discouraging the public from military service is punishable by prison terms.

references to European ideals and thus got more firmly embedded in European citizenship debates.

Conclusion:

The case of Turkey's conscientious objectors shows that, contrary to its institutional limits, citizenship practice in Europe is increasingly becoming multi-layered and decoupled from nationality as well as territory. Although the Turkish conscientious objectors are neither EU citizens nor residents of EU member states, they are active in European politics through the channels of political participation open for them. In other words, they are engaging in political acts that one would associate with active European citizenship although they do not possess the formal rights of representation and participation granted to those who hold the legal status of European citizenship. Their European-level political activism transcends strategic transnational advocacy in the ways in which it is infused with a broader discourse on Europeanness. Although the activists may not interpret their political practices as 'acts of European citizenship', they are advancing a vision of not only an alternative Turkey, but also of a different European polity, and are responsabilizing European institutions for the realization of this alternative vision.

The case of Turkey's conscientious objectors also shows how Turkish citizens are becoming integrated into the European polity despite the obstacles on Turkey's EU membership and on the migration of Turkish citizens to Europe. Turkish citizens, who are excluded from the formal membership of the European polity as they are perceived to be a threat to European identity and integrity, paradoxically constitute the critical agency behind this integration. The recognition of this very fact calls for a rethinking of the prevailing paradigm which seeks to

achieve closer integration in Europe via the exclusion of those constituted to be foreign and different.

Interviews:

Interview with Savaş Karşıtları, 12 February 2009.

References:

“318. Maddeye Karşı Çalışma Grubu: Vicdani Red Hakkı Tanınsın.” *Birgün*, September 30, 2007.

“A Conscientious Objector in Turkey: Interview with Halil Savda.” *The Guardian*, April 16, 2009.

“AIHM’nin Vicdani Retçi Osman Murat Ülke Kararı.” *Savaskarsitlari.org*, January 25, 2006.

“Askerlik Kanunu.” 1927. Available at <<<http://www.asal.msb.gov.tr>>>

Aydın, Suavi. 2008. “Toplumun Militarizasyonu: Zorunlu Askerlik Sisteminin ve Ulusal Orduların Yurttaş Yaratma Sürecindeki Rolü.” In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

“BDP’li Tuncel Vicdani Retçi Aydemir’i Sordu.” *Anka*, January 4, 2010.

Bröckling, Ulrich. 2008. “Çarklardaki Kum? 21. Yüzyılın Başında Vicdani Red.” In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Council of Europe (1950). “The European Convention on Human Rights.” Available at <<www.hri.org/docs/ECHR50>>

Council of Europe (1967). “Resolution 337 on the Right of Conscientious Objection.” Available at <<<http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta67/EREs337.htm>>>

“Council of Europe demands Turkey stops persecuting conscientious objector Osman Murat Ülke.” Available at <<<http://refusingtokill.net/Ossi/PressReleaseNov07.htm>>>

Çınar, Özgür H. 2008. “Avrupa Konseyi Ülkelerinden Vicdani Red Hakkına Genel Bir Bakış.” In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

“Eşcinsellere ‘hasta’ muamelesi.” *Özgür Gündem*, May 19, 2004.

- European Commission. 2009. *Turkey 2009 Progress Report*. October 14, 2009. Available at <<http://www.ihb.gov.tr/english/turkey_progress_report_2009.pdf>>
- European Commission. 2008. *Turkey 2008 Progress Report*. November 5, 2008. Available at <<http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/press_corner/key-documents/reports_nov_2008/turkey_progress_report_en.pdf>>
- European Commission. 2007. *Turkey 2007 Progress Report*. November 6, 2007. Available at <<http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2007/nov/turkey_progress_reports_en.pdf>>
- European Commission. 2006. *Turkey 2006 Progress Report*. November 8, 2006. Available at <<http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2006/Nov/tr_sec_1390_en.pdf>>
- European Commission. 2005. *Turkey 2005 Progress Report*. November 9, 2005. Available at <<http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/key_documents/reports_2005_en.htm>>
- European Parliament (2006) “Resolution on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession.” European Parliament Archives, Doc. No: P6_TA(2006)0381.
- Göker, Gamze. 2008. “Basının Vicdani Reddi.” In E. Dağtaş (ed.) *Türkiye’de Sivil İtaatsızlık, Toplumsal Hareketler, ve Basın*. İstanbul: Ütopya.
- Isin, E. (2002). *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Isin, E. and Nielsen, G. (2008). “Introduction.” In Isin, E. and Nielsen, G. (eds) *Acts of Citizenship*. (New York: Zed Books).
- “İnsan Hakları Gündemi Derneği Genel Sekreteri Hakan Ataman’ın Osman Murat Ülke’yle 26.07.2007 tarihinde e-posta üzerinden yaptığı söyleşi.” Available at <<http://rightsagenda.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=195:takmansan-haklar-guendemi-dernei-genel-sekreteri-hakan-atamann-osman-murat-uelkeyle-26072007-tarihinde-e-posta-uezerinden-yapt-soylei&catid=65:takmavicdaniret&itemid=87>>
- Maas, W. (2008). ‘Migrants, States, and EU Citizenship’s Unfulfilled Promise’. *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 6, pp. 583-596.
- “Özgür İradenin Tadı.” *Postexpress*, June 2009.
- Rumelili, Bahar, Fuat Keyman, Bora Isyar. 2010. “Multi-Layered Citizenship in Extended European Orders: Kurds Acting as European Citizens.” *Journal of Common Market Studies* (forthcoming).

Schneider, Friedhelm. 2008. "Vicdani Red Hakkında Avrupa Standartları ve Alternatif Hizmet." In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. (London: Routledge).

Speck, Andreas and Rudi Friedrich. 2008. "Dünyada Vicdani Red Hareketi Deneyimleri." In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

"Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Sağlık Yeteneği Yönetmeliği." 1986. Available at <<<http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/20176.html>>>

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anayasası. 1982. Available at <<<http://www.anayasa.gen.tr/1982ay.htm>>>

Üsterci, Coşkun and Özgür Çınar 2008. "Sunuş." In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Üsterci, Coşkun and Uğur Yorulmaz. 2008. "Türkiye'de Vicdani Red." In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

"Ya Çocuklarının Şehit Olmadıklarını Farkederlerse." *Star*, February 15, 2010.

Yuval-Davis, N. (1999). 'The 'Multi-Layered Citizen''. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 119-136.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. 2008. "Hizmet Etmeyi Başka Biçimlerde Reddetmek: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Son Dönemlerinde Asker Kaçaklığı." In Ö. Çınar and C. Üsterci (eds.) *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red, Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler*. İstanbul: İletişim.