

POLITICAL ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES, TURKEY AND NORTH CYPRUS

**EDDIE J. GIRDNER
RUSSELL EISENMAN
SEVGİN AKIŞ**

This study explores the attitudes of students in North Cyprus and the United States in ten areas of political attitudes; (1) Attitudes toward U.S. President Bill Clinton; (2) Attitudes toward the United States; (3) Attitudes toward the United Nations; (4) Attitudes toward secularism; (5) Attitudes toward terrorism; (6) Attitudes toward the military; (7) Attitudes toward democracy and the West; (8) Attitudes toward patriotism and nationalism; (9) Attitudes toward race and ethnicity; and (10) Attitudes on state of well-being compared to ten years ago. The study provides cross-national data on attitudes of students in each of the above areas.

It would be expected that students in a southern university in the United States would demonstrate very conservative political attitudes on most issues. Earlier studies have shown that Louisiana students tend to like David Duke, the former Klansman who gained prominence in Louisiana politics. (Eisenman, 1992, 1993). On foreign policy issues that reflect the global power of the US, these student would likely support the continued extensive application of US power in the global arena.

The Turkish students would be expected to have generally favorable attitudes toward President Clinton. This is because of the predominantly favorable attitude toward the US in Turkey (Rostow, 1987). The late President Turgut Özal cultivated a close personal friendship with former US President George Bush and provided extensive support, including military base facilities, to the US during the 1991 Gulf War. On foreign policy issues and those issues which affect Moslem nations specifically, one would expect that Turkish students might have reservations about the use of US power in

the Middle East. Similarly, the Cypriot students would be likely to suspect US motives in foreign policies, particularly in regard to reaching an agreement on the Cyprus problem.

In general, given the conservative trend in Turkish politics in recent years, one would expect that Turkish students would demonstrate attitudes more supportive of the military and the state and, thus, less liberal in their views than the Cypriot students. The historical legacy of British rule in Cyprus would tend to strengthen individualistic values over against strong support for the state and the military.

In any modern nation-state, individuals are enmeshed in the milieu of political régimes (Chomsky, 1988, 1989, 1992). These may operate to make the individual immune to seeing events and situations in a logical way. Students from the Eastern Mediterranean might be able to see problems that U.S. students, inoculated from objective reality by their own media and ideological milieu, would not perceive. By the same token, US students may, thinking logically, perceive events in the Eastern Mediterranean more logically than local residents in their own countries. We will attempt to observe for these effects in the findings.

Sample:

The sample consisted of 44 students at a state university in Louisiana, USA (37 white, 7 black; 43 American, 1 Lebanese; 13 male, 31 female) and 88 students at an university in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (65 Turkish, 23 Turkish Cypriot; 65 male, 23 female). The study was conducted in March and April of 1993, shortly after US President Clinton took office.

1. Attitudes Toward President Clinton:

Obviously the American students had access to a much larger volume of information on this issue than students in North Cyprus. Nevertheless, presidential elections tend to be covered widely in the national presses around the world, as well as on local television news.

It would be expected that the Louisiana students would not be favorable to the election of President Clinton. On the other hand, given the state of the US economy during 1992, a number of students, especially blacks, would likely see the new administration as a change for the better.

Many Turkish students would likely be favorable to the continuation of the Bush Administration but it is likely that a significant number would welcome a change of leadership. However, President Bush had long played a role in the global arena and had an international image, while President

Clinton was virtually unknown in Turkey until his nomination as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency.

On the question of whether it was good that Bill Clinton won the Presidency, the Turkish and Cypriot students were more favorable to Clinton's win than the American students, although a higher percentage said they did not know if it was good. The female Cypriot students were the most favorable of all the students, 81 % agreeing that it was good. Forty-six % of the respondents, independent of their nationalities, agreed that it was good that President Clinton won the election ($X^2 = 4.94$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$).

Also independent of their nationalities, a majority of the students agreed that the US and the world needed a change of leadership (73 % of the Americans, 68 % of the Cypriots, and 61 % of the Turkish students. $X^2 = 5.08$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). There is a statistically significant difference among the students that it is desirable to have a younger US president. The Cypriot students were the most favorable with 75 % in favor. The Turkish students agreed by a small margin (51 %), while only 46 % of the American students believed that it is desirable ($X^2 = 16.25$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$).

The students again differed significantly on the question of whether President Clinton's election will be good for the US ($X^2 = 18.63$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). Most of the Cypriot students (70 %) and 53 % of the Turkish ones believed that Clinton's election will be good for the US. On the other hand, only 25 % of the American students thought that it will be good for the US. Here, the conservative trend among the Louisiana students is likely reflected.

Independently of their nationalities, there was great skepticism among the students that President Clinton's election will be good for the world ($X^2 = 8.11$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). Only 15 % of the Turkish, 26 % of the Cypriot, and 14 % of the American students believed that this is true. Perhaps this reflects former President Bush's generally positive image as a global leader both in Turkey and the US, especially after the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe and the USSR, and after the Gulf War. Clinton, coming from a part of the US that lacks high visibility, had yet to develop an international profile.

Nationality of the respondents also determined students' views about whether or not President Clinton's election will be good for the Middle East. For the Americans, 43 % believed that Clinton's election will be good for the region, whereas only 22 % of the Turkish and 28 % of the Cypriots thought that it would be good ($X^2 = 9.55$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). On the other hand, a large proportion of each group of students (45 %) had no idea. Some comments from students reflected this skepticism. One Cypriot student commented that Clinton's policy would be "almost the same as that of George Bush and others." On US policy toward Iraq, another Cypriot student commented that

"old people and newborn children are dying." A Turkish student commented that "if the US policy is good for Iraq, why don't they make [a similar policy] for Bosnia?" Here students were making logical inferences that US students would not be likely to make, given the treatment of these issues by the US media and domestic propaganda apparatus (Chomsky, 1988, 1989). Nationality of the respondents also determined their views about whether or not Clinton's election will be good for Turkey. For the Americans, 37 % thought that Clinton's election would be good for Turkey, while 28 % of the Cypriot students believed so. Only 7 % of the Turkish students believed that Clinton's election would be good for Turkey ($X^2 = 30.70$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$).

Nationality of the students also determined their beliefs as to whether or not Clinton's election will be good for North Cyprus ($X^2 = 30.85$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). Only 2 % of the American and 5 % of the Turkish students thought that Clinton's election will be good for North Cyprus. On the other hand, Cypriot students were more optimistic, with 23 % of them saying that Clinton's election will be good for North Cyprus. The Cyprus issue was very obscure to the American students, with 66 % stating they did not know. The Cyprus issue, on the other hand, is more familiar to the Turkish and Cypriot students.

The reasons behind this rejection follow the general suspicion of the US and the UN on the issue, as the debate is carried out in the Turkish press. It is perhaps, significant, however, that the Turkish Cypriots were more favorable to Clinton's possible positive influence on the process than the Turkish students.

Nationality of the students also determined their expectations as to whether or not Clinton's election will be good for them ($X^2 = 10.98$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$), with 32 % of the Americans, 17 % of the Cypriot and finally 9 % of the Turkish students thinking that it would be.

2. Attitudes Toward the United States:

This group of questions was meant to explore the perceptions and orientations of the students toward the leadership role of the United States in the global arena in general and in the Middle East, Turkey, and the Eastern Mediterranean in particular. The US students, especially from the South, would be expected to be largely favorable to a greater US role in global politics. The Turkish and Cypriot students, on the other hand, would likely have a large degree of reservation, and perhaps opposition to the increased role of the US as the "world's policeman" and sole superpower in the New World Order. This would be particularly true to the extent that they regarded the role of the great powers as imperialistic.

In terms of Bosnia, the US students may not know a great deal about the situation, but should have been exposed to a good deal of news coverage of the events there over the months prior to this study. It is likely that this issue looms considerably larger for the Turkish and Cypriot students for a number of reasons. The issue has been covered extensively in the Turkish media, the prevailing perspective being that there are underlying religious communalist sentiments on the part of the West. Since the Serbs are Christian, the West has done nothing to intervene and help the Bosnian Moslems. The late President Turgut Özal and other Turkish politicians called for the intervention of Western nations to help the Moslems. Thus, communalist sentiments have entered here. This perception has fed suspicions about US and European foreign policy in the region, along with the perceived lack of action by the UN to stop the Serbian advances. This lack of action has been juxtaposed against the massive invasion of US forces in the Gulf war to save Kuwait, and obviously treated with rich cynicism (and justification) in the Turkish press. This had been the tone in the Turkish press for the previous months. Thus, the West, the US, and the UN had most of its credibility in Turkey on its policy in this area. Added factors are the possibility of the conflict spreading to Turkey, and the assistance being sent to the Moslems by some governments in the region.

An added dimension, about the time of the survey, was the concern in Turkey over the advances on predominantly Muslim Azerbaijan by Armenians in Nagorno - Karabakh, and calls in Turkey to help the Moslems there. While there are sentiments for the Moslems and a perception of communal discrimination by Christian nations, Turks are also very concerned at this time about threats of Islamic fundamentalist forces to the secularist values of Kemalism.

In terms of the role of the US in the world, we see a very striking contrast based on the nationality of the students ($X^2 = 52$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). While 100 % of the Cypriot and 91 % of the Turkish students believe that its role in the world today is too great, only 32 % of the American students agreed with this. One Cypriot student remarked that the US is an "old woman afraid of others and uses guns."

There was also a statistically significant difference between the nationality of students who believe that the US should intervene in Bosnia to help the Moslems ($X^2 = 54$, $df = 4$, $p < .50$). Almost all of the Turkish (91 %) and the Cypriot (93 %) students believed that the US should intervene in Bosnia, while only 30 % of the American students agreed with them. It is interesting that while the Turkish and Cypriot students see the US as too interventionist, on the question of Bosnia, they contradictorily want the US to intervene. This reflects the perception of the US as hypocritical in the Turkish press. As one Turkish student put it: "If they go to Iraq, they have to

go to Bosnia?" On the question of intervention in Bosnia, another Turkish student commented: "Of course."

Turkish and Cypriot students overwhelmingly saw the US as an imperialist nation, while the Americans did not ($X^2 = 35$, $df = 4$, $p < .50$). In the case of the Turkish students, 66 % believed that the US is an imperialistic nation, while 65 % of the Cypriots thought so. However, only 14 % of the American students thought that the US is imperialistic. It should be noted, however, that 52 % said they did not know whether it is an imperialistic nation or not. Some of the uncertainty is likely caused by not understanding the meaning of the term "imperialist." The Turkish and Cypriot students may have heard someone refer to the US as imperialist. Students from the American South, on the other hand, would see the US in a better light.

American students also rejected the notion that the US dominates smaller nations too much (36 % agreed), while the Turkish and Cypriot students overwhelmingly agreed (86 %). Also American students approved that the US is the world's sole superpower, while the Turkish and Cypriot students did not. Fifty-eight % of the Turkish and 65 % of the Cypriot students are not happy with the reality that the US is the world's only superpower now. Even though 34 % of the American students are not happy with it, we cannot say that the difference between the percentages is statistically significant ($X^2 = 8.44$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$).

On whether the US is fair in its dealings with other nations, the US students thought so, overwhelmingly, while the Turkish and Cypriot students rejected the notion ($X^2 = 26$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). Only a small group of Turkish (29 %) and Cypriot (16 %) students believed that the US is fair, while 66 % of the American students saw the US as fair.

The American students did not know whether the US dealt fairly with Turkey (91 %). The Turkish and Cypriot students, however, thought the US did not deal fairly with Turkey (48 %). Similarly, 91 % of the American students did not know about US dealings in Cyprus, while the Turkish and Cypriot students (63 %) saw the US dealings with Cyprus as unfair.

3. Attitudes Toward the United Nations:

The third section deals with perceptions toward the United Nations. While the image of the United Nations has never been very positive among conservatives in the American South, it is possibly seen as more favorable by them after its recent role in the Gulf war. On the other hand, the UN had very little credibility in Turkey and North Cyprus at the time of the survey, primarily as a result of the ongoing war in Bosnia and the perception of its role in Cyprus. The Ghali Plan (Set of Ideas) for the reunification of Cyprus

under a federated state plus the predominantly negative perception of Boutros-Ghali as the UN Secretary General were relevant factors. Behind this was the perception (and communalist prejudice), played out in the regional press that Boutros-Ghali, owing to the fact that he is a Coptic Christian married to a woman of Italian-Jewish descent (Meiser, 1992), is thus more likely to be favorable to Greece in any plan for settlement of the Cyprus problem. Much of this was exacerbated by the "rejectionist camp," who oppose any solution and tend to favor the status quo situation.

Nevertheless, 64 % of the American students, 54 % of the Turkish and 44 % of the Cypriots saw the role of the UN in solving global problems as positive. On the question of whether the UN policy toward the Middle East is fair, 55 % of the American students agreed, while only 27 % of the Turkish and 29 % of the Cypriot students agreed. Student perceptions of UN fairness in dealing with Iraq followed the same pattern.

On the issue of UN policy toward Cyprus, student attitudes were dependent upon nationality ($X^2 = 49.44$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). While 84 % of the American students believed that UN policy toward dealing with the Cyprus problem was fair, only 31 % of the Turkish and 16 % of the Cypriot students agreed with them.

The American students (89 %) stated that they did not know whether Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali was a good person to head the UN, while the Turkish and Cypriot students, not surprisingly, overwhelmingly (73 %) rejected his leadership. Again this reflects the suspicions toward Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali as seen in the Turkish and Cypriot presses.

In addition to Bosnia, another issue that has harmed the image of the UN in Turkey and Cyprus had been that of the exiled Palestinians in southern Lebanon since December 1992. The lack of action on this issue, in contrast to the UN role in the 1991 Gulf War, has been seen as yet another instance of hypocrisy. One Turkish student made the comment that UN policy "is fair for Israel but not for Palestinians." Most American students (55 %) said they did not know if UN policy toward Israel and the Palestinians was fair, while 55 % of the Turkish and 58 % of the Cypriot students said it was not.

Turkey has traditionally had good relations with Israel and was the first Muslim nation to establish diplomatic relations with Israel (Rostow, 1987). So, the issue of injustice to Moslems emerges.

4. Attitudes Toward Secularism:

Secularist policies are firmly established planks of public policy in both the United States and Turkey (Kinross, 1981). The First Amendment to the US Constitution states that Congress shall make no law respecting an

establishment of religion. This has been interpreted by the US Supreme Court through various decisions to mean that it is unconstitutional for the US Government to spend tax monies to promote religion. In the United States, secularism has been taken to mean virtual total separation of the state and religion.

Secularism in Turkey, on the other hand, has meant state domination of religion and at times the enforcement of secularism. The roots of this policy go back to the *Tanzimat* period of reform in the nineteenth century during Ottoman rule. Efforts to restore the Ottoman state led to efforts to weaken the *ulema*. Atatürk, while using the religious establishment to accomplish his efforts to create the modern Turkish state, abolished the Caliphate. Thus, state guidance of religion is deeply rooted in history and tradition. In practice, the role of the state in religious affairs in Turkey would violate both the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment to the US Constitution. Congress cannot spend money to promote religion, nor "prohibit the free exercise thereof." In Turkey, there is a state-run Religious Affairs Directorate to carry out tasks connected with the "beliefs, divine services and the moral principles of Islam and to enlighten the people on religion." In March, 1993, this organization was launching a "major project to interpret the Koran for better understanding by [a] younger generation of Turks." There is a supreme board within this directorate that can issue religious orders or *fatwas*. A concern of the director, Mehmet Nuri Yılmaz, was to take legal action against religious personnel involved in politics. The view of pro-Islamic groups in Turkey is that the Religious Affairs Directorate represses religion (Gökalp, 1993).

Since the assassination of Uğur Mumcu, a prominent journalist and writer in Ankara by a car bomb in January 1993, the growing alarm among urban elites that Islamic fundamentalism is growing stronger in Turkey has been prominent in the Turkish press. The press was instrumental in the effort to pin the blame for the assassination on Iran. There has, by the same token, been growing dread at the increasing strength of the pro-religious party (*Refah Partisi*) in the large cities, particularly Istanbul. Consequently, the issue of secularism had been on the public mind, particularly urban elites, since the events in January.

The late President Turgut Özal was also instrumental in accommodating the religious right by allowing certain concessions such as mosques on college campuses, while he was in office. Earlier, mosques were allowed to again give the call to prayer in Arabic.

This set of questions shows, as one would expect, that the Turkish and Cypriot students see religion as having a negative effect on politics, while the American students are more positive that religion could have a desirable effect on politics. On the question of whether it is acceptable to use

religious beliefs as a basis for political office, 43 % of the American students thought so, while only 18 % of the Turkish and Cypriot students agreed. This result likely reflects the resurgence of fundamentalist Christianity in the United States in the 1980s. The South is a part of the American bible belt. Two other factors are salient. First, a larger proportion of students attend private religious schools in the American South as a result of the attempt by the US courts to enforce integration of the races since the 1960s. Secondly, there were well publicized attempts to introduce the teaching of so-called "creation science" into the public schools in Louisiana. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled this to be the teaching of religion and thus a violation of the Establishment Clause.

The faction of the US religious right, led by Operation Rescue founder Randall Terry, has called for the United States to become a "Christian Republic." In a speech in San Jose, California, on July 14, 1993, Randall said the US Government was "too secular" and that the US must become a Christian nation guided by the Ten Commandments (Abortion Militancy, 1993).

On whether the government should protect the state from religious extremism, both groups of students agreed that it should. The American students are willing to see religion in politics, but also to use the state to control what they see as "extremism."

As expected, most of the American students rejected the use of public tax money to support religion (73 %). The Turkish and Cypriot students agreed (58 %). Unlike the US, however, in Turkey, tax money is used for religious instruction and to guide Islam. In fact, the share of tax money of the Directorate of Religious Affairs from the general budget has dramatically increased in recent years from 59.4 billion Turkish liras in 1986 to 950.8 billion in 1990 (*Statistical Yearbook of Turkey*, 1991, 577). The 27 % of the American students who desired going against the First Amendment prohibition on using tax money to support religion reflects both support for religion in the American South and the general trend toward conservatism of youth in recent years.

Again, both groups agreed that the state and religion should be completely separate. The Turkish and Cypriot students were, however, much more firm on this issue (82 %) than the American students (55 %), but by a much larger margin for the Turkish students. On the other hand, the US practice much more nearly accords with the secularist ideal.

5. Attitudes Toward Terrorism:

It was expected that both groups of students would agree that terrorism is a legitimate concern of modern governments and that strong governmental

measures to combat such activity is justified. When asked whether Iran is a terrorist nation, independent of their nationalities, a majority of the students agreed that Iran is a terrorist nation ($X^2 = 7.14$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). Agreement was strongest among the Americans (77 %), while 68 % of the Turkish and 55 % of the Cypriot students agreed. The Turkish and Cypriot students both agreed that Iran is trying to destroy democracy by spreading Islamic fundamentalism (75 % of the Turkish and 87 % of the Cypriots). The Americans were uncertain about this as 59 % said they did not know, while 27 % agreed. The media in both countries has presented an image of Iran as a terrorist nation.

A high percentage of the students (81 % of the Turkish, 84 % of the Cypriot, and 93 % of the Americans) agreed that the government should use as much force as necessary to deal with terrorists. There is no significant difference among the nationalities ($X^2 = 6.15$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$).

6. Attitudes Toward the Military:

While conscription for the military forces ended in the US in the 1960s, military service is still mandatory in Turkey and is largely supported by the public. One would expect stronger support for required military service in Turkey. On the other hand, the perspective of students in a conservative state like Louisiana would likely be more pro-military than in other sections of the US outside the South.

Turkish (82 %) and Cypriot (70 %) students strongly agreed that the military should stay out of politics. The perspective of Atatürk was that military should leave politics to the civilian sphere. While the Turkish military has entered the political arena three times since the 1950s, it has done so only as a temporary measure under the rationale of restoring order and making possible the continued movement toward a democratic state. Fifty % of the Americans said the military should stay out of politics.

Further, the American students strongly rejected the proposition that everyone should be required to serve in the military, only 7 % in favor. Clearly, while quite a number of students from the South enter the military voluntarily, they definitely want to be able to make a choice. The Turkish and Cypriot students, on the other hand, supported required universal military service by 57 % and 47 % respectively.

Both groups of students strongly supported the freedom for women to serve in the military. Ninety-one % of the Americans, 75 % of the Turkish, and 87 % of the Cypriots agreed military service should be open to women. However, when one breaks down these numbers by sex, it is significant that the strongest opposition to women in the military came from Turkish males. Twenty-three percent of Turkish males were opposed to women serving in

the military. On the other hand, of the 30 Turkish and Cypriot women in the study, only 2 opposed military service for women. The breakdown by sex was not available for the Americans.

Both groups of students were opposed to allowing homosexuals to serve in the military. Sixty-six % of the Turkish, 43 % of the Cypriot, and 52 % of the Americans rejected admission of gays into the armed services. Again, 72 % of the Turkish males opposed this proposition, showing the strongest bias.

All groups of students believed that men make better soldiers than women, independent of nationality ($\chi^2 = 9.12$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). More than half (56 %) of the Turkish students agreed that men make better soldiers than women. For Cypriot and American students, the proportions agreeing were 37 % and 59 % respectively. This result more than likely reflects the tradition in both countries of objectifying the fighting soldier as a man, (associated with power, missiles, bullets, conquests, etc.) and it is certainly presented this way in both countries. If one looks at the Turkish and Cypriot women, however, it is seen that only 30 % of this group agreed that men make better soldiers. Apparently, Turkish and Cypriot women are ready to fight.

The sharpest difference in this section is seen in the desire to serve in the military, with the Turkish and Cypriot students saying they would like to serve (34 % and 17 % respectively), while only 18 % of the American students wanted to serve. The military in the US tends to draw in a disproportionate share of lower socioeconomic groups, and minorities, who have trouble finding jobs elsewhere (Bartling and Eisenman, 1992). Further, the image of the military in the US has still not recovered from the Vietnam era, in spite of (probably partly because of) Operation Desert Storm.

7. Attitudes Toward the West:

Democracy carries very positive values in Turkey, as the population wants to believe that Turkey is becoming more democratic. The unleashing of capitalism from extensive state control through greater liberalization of the economy and privatization has been promoted by the late President Turgut Özal and Prime Minister Tansu Çiller. It is not clear, however, how deep support for such radical economic liberalization runs among the general population. One might expect a critical view toward such reform among many college age youth. One might also expect Turkish students to hold their more Western-oriented values as superior to those of Arabs. Arabs do not have a highly positive image in the Turkish press. This is mostly due to the strong support of the sharp break made by Atatürk from traditional Islamist values and the reform of Turkish society toward the values of

Europe. While one would expect strong support for "modern" values, there might also be fairly strong support for "traditional" values.

On whether or not democracy is the best form of government, not surprisingly, independent of their nationalities, students believed that democracy is the best form of government ($X^2 = 7.53$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). Seventy percent of the Turkish, 80 % of the Cypriot, and 68 % of the American students agreed.

When asked whether "western-style" democracy was best for their countries, 68 % of the Americans, 46 % of the Turkish, and 45 % of the Cypriot students agreed. Results were very similar on the question of whether US-style democracy was a good model for other countries (68 % of Americans and 47 % of Turkish students agreeing), except for the Cypriots in which only 19 % thought the US was a good model.

Only 11 % of the American students said that Western values are superior to Arab and oriental values, although 55 % said they did not know. For the Turkish and Cypriot students, 40 % and 53 % respectively said Western values are superior. A stronger pro-Western bias among the Turkish and Cypriot students is seen when they were asked whether their country is more like Europe than Asia. While only 57 % of the Americans thought so, 82 % of the Turkish and 69 % of the Cypriots said their country was more European than Asian. One student, quite rightly, remarked that it depended upon whether one means western Turkey or eastern Turkey. It is quite likely that the high percentage of Turkish students identifying with European culture reflects not only historical links, but a strong strain in Kemalism and the desire of most in Turkey to have closer economic and trade relations with the West.

There are statistically significant differences among the proportion of students who think that their countries are democratic ($X^2 = 22.67$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). Almost all of the American students (82 %) thought that the US is a democratic country. On the other hand, only 52 % of the Turkish, and 42 % of the Cypriot students believed that their country is democratic. The skepticism among the Cypriot students might reflect the recent controversies over allegations of political corruption in the North Cyprus Government along with political disputes between Prime Minister Derviş Eroğlu and President Rauf Denktaş.

The proposition that "my country has the best democracy in the world" evoked laughter among at least one Turkish Cypriot student. There is a statistically significant difference between the students with respect to this statement ($X^2 = 36.84$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). While most of the Turkish (82 %) and Cypriot students (81 %) did not think that their countries had the best democracies in the world, only 27 % of the Americans said their country's

democracy was not the best. Among the rest, 48 % of the Americans thought the US had the best democracy, while 25 % did not have any idea about it.

When asked about capitalism as the best form of economy, 41 % of the American students said it was best, while 50 % of the Turkish and 13 % of the Cypriots agreed. The relatively higher proportion of Turkish students desiring capitalism might be related to the background of many students in the university where the question was asked and also the influence of Turkish politicians like the late Turgut Özal.

It is also interesting that American students were more favorable to traditional values than the Turkish and Cypriot students. Not having a knowledge of modern Turkey, most Americans would likely think of Turkey as still "traditional." On the other hand, "modernism" is an important aspect of Kemalism. It is likely, then, that the concept of "tradition" has more positive connotations in the American South than in Turkey. When asked whether traditional values are better than modern values, 45 % of the Americans, but only 18 % of the Turkish, and 10 % of the Cypriot students said traditional values were better. When one breaks down the figures by sex, however, it is seen that of the 9 Turkish women, none was favorable to traditional values, while 22 % of the Turkish men liked traditional Turkish values.

8. Attitudes Toward Patriotism and Nationalism:

On the values of patriotism and nationalism, one would expect largely similar results across national boundaries. Not surprisingly, all three groups of students demonstrated effective processes of political socialization by agreeing strongly that one should "love their country" (93 % for the Americans, 89 % for the Turkish, and 87 % for the Cypriots). A large percentage of the Americans thought their country was the best place to live (80 %), while 65 % of the Turkish and 35 % of the Cypriots thought so. Sixty-six % of the Americans, 25 % of the Turkish, and 19 % of the Cypriot students said their country was the greatest country. Americans also thought their country was the "most free" (82 %), while 11 % of the Turkish and 19 % of the Cypriots said their country was most free.

The proportion of students desiring to live abroad was highest among the Cypriot students (39 %) while 27 % of the American and 24 % of the Turkish students said they would like to live abroad.

The question on whether one's country should be more religious is perhaps more important, given the increasing concern about the role of religion in politics. Students from the American South, who go to private religious primary and secondary schools in large numbers, would be expected to see a positive role for religion in the US. Turkish students, on the other

hand, would be expected to reject the proposition that their country should be more religious. On this question, there are statistically significant differences among the views of students ($X^2 = 53.65$, $df = 4$, $p < .50$). In this respect, American students are more conservative (52 %) than the Cypriot (10 %) and the Turkish (19 %) students. On the other hand, it shows that the Turkish state has been successful in inculcating the secularist values of Kemalism into a generation of students, which is in turn, used to preserve the power and ideological hegemony of the state. This is important as the government and elites are apprehensive about the growing strength of religious groups and political parties. This questionnaire was given shortly after huge crowds had marched in the streets of all of Turkey's major cities in support of secularism, after the assassination of journalist Uğur Mumcu.

9. Attitudes Toward Race and Ethnicity:

Since the Civil Rights Movement, beginning in the 1950s in the US, the US Government has sought to promote equality and civil rights for blacks in the US and integration in public facilities. On the other hand, this is a time when "ethnic cleansing" is reshaping what was once Yugoslavia, and fears abound that this sort of ethnic holocaust will be repeated elsewhere. While attempts are ongoing to find a way to reunite Greek and Turkish Cypriots, the two communities have lived separately for almost 20 years.

While whites and blacks, for the most part, live in separate areas of towns and cities in the American South, and the society remains essentially racist, Americans even in this area have come to acknowledge the justice of racial equality and that it is not acceptable to express racist sentiments in public. Support for former Klansman David Duke, on the other hand, and lifestyles, shows that when it comes to personal lifestyles, white and black societies are largely separated.

One would not expect the American students to know about the Kurdish issue. Turkish students may believe that the Kurds are also Turks (Ghassamlou, 1965). Atatürk's perspective, in accord with modern nationalism, was that all who lived within Turkey's borders were Turkish citizens. One would not expect to find significant support for a Kurdish state in the area now part of Turkey. Turkey has waged a wide war against "Kurdish terrorism" in recent months in southeastern Anatolia and Northern Iraq. One would also expect students who like David Duke to say that blacks should have their own state if they were consistent in their reasoning. However, individuals may hold to abstract principles of justice in their minds, while denying the principle to groups in their own country because of prejudice or state propaganda.

American students overwhelmingly agreed (98 %) that all races and ethnic groups should be treated equally, while 91 % of the Turkish and 87 %

of the Cypriot students agreed. When asked if blacks and whites should live together in the same areas, 78 % of the Americans, 98 % of the Turkish, and 97 % of the Cypriot students agreed. So, there are statistically significant differences among the students as to whether blacks and whites should live together ($X^2 = 16.55$, $df = 4$, $p < .50$).

But when asked whether Greeks and Turks should live together, one sees wider differences. While 59 % of the Americans and 50 % of the Turkish students agreed, only 26 % of the Cypriot students agreed. So, there are statistically significant differences among the proportions of the students on this question ($X^2 = 37.61$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$). It is interesting that while 83 % of the Cypriots agreed that blacks and whites should live together, only 26 % of them thought that Greeks and Turks should live together. Turkish Cypriot students often state that Greek and Turkish Cypriots cannot live together. This is likely due to a number of factors, among them, the history of ethnic conflict on the island before 1974, their parents' experiences, frequent demonstrations by Greek youth in the south seen on television, and the perception of the problem in the Turkish Cypriot press. On the other hand, they see no reason why blacks and whites should not live together.

Thirty percent of the Americans, the same percentage of Turkish, and 17 % of the Cypriot students said that nationality should be based on race and ethnic group. Why do Turkish Cypriot students living in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which is essentially based on ethnic group, reject so strongly the notion of nationality based on ethnic group? If asked, most Northern Cypriots would likely say it is better if the North remains separated from the south. Perhaps they did not understand the meaning of ethnic nationalism or do not see the contradiction.

The views on the question on Kurdish nationalism is also interesting. When asked if the Kurds should be free to have their own country, 36 % of the Americans, 21 % of the Turkish, and 48 % of the Cypriot students agreed. Here we see that the percentage, as would be expected, is lowest among the Turkish students. When asked, on the other hand, if blacks should be free to have their own country, 43 % of the American, 37 % of the Turkish, and 51 % of the Cypriot students agreed.

On the issue of Kurdistan, one Turkish male student commented: "Kurds and blacks are not [the] same people. Everybody wants [their] own countries, but if they deserve this country. I think Kurds aren't deserve for Türkiye" [sic]. A second Turkish male wrote that Kurds can have their own country "if they can find a place." Another Turkish male said they should be free to have their own country, "but not in our country."

10. Attitudes Toward Relative Well-Being:

Finally, the last section dealt with the question of progress in terms of well-being over time. While the students from Turkey and North Cyprus clearly and strongly felt that people were better off than ten years ago (81 % and 68 % respectively), only 39 % of the American students said they were better off. However, 59 % of the American students felt that their individual parents had made progress.

This is consistent with recent data on the US economy. More people have become poorer. Since 1978, the proportion of households falling below the poverty line has grown by 26.4 %. Among families with children, it has grown by 38.3. This is partly because the gains in income have largely gone to the rich. More than half of the additional income generated between 1977 and 1989 went to the top one percent of America's households (Hocker, 1993).

Fifty-nine percent of the American students thought that their individual parents had made progress, while 75 % of the Turkish and 61 % of the Cypriot students thought that their parents had made progress. Perhaps in the American case, the parents of the students in college are better off financially than most persons in the community. On the other hand, the Turkish economy has been growing much faster than the American economy in the past decade, and elites have disproportionately benefited from this.

While 31 % of the American students thought that most countries in the world were not better off than ten years ago, the proportions were 57 % for the Turkish and 52 % for the Cypriot students. Perhaps this reflects the general trends in their respective countries.

Summary and Discussion:

The US students were not favorable toward President Clinton's election and tended to see the results as less favorable for their country and themselves than for the rest of the world. They also supported a strong leadership role for the US in the world and for the most part believed that the US deals fairly with other nations. The US students were the most favorable to the UN's role in global affairs. They tended to see the role of religion in politics as positive. Like other students, they saw terrorism as a threat and supported strong use of government force to suppress it. The US students, while clearly conservative, tended to view the military less favorably than did the other groups of students. Not surprisingly, the US students tended to believe that the US has the best democracy and looked positively on "traditional values." In principle, the US students supported racial and ethnic equality, but were less supportive in practice. Reflecting economic

difficulties in the last two decades, the US students tended to believe the economic well-being of their families had suffered in recent years.

The results, as indicated by the high percentage of "Don't Know" responses on some items, also reflected the fact that the US students were not well informed on issues of common interest to students in Turkey and North Cyprus. For example, 66 % of the US students had no idea whether President Clinton's election would be good for Cyprus, 52 % had no opinion on whether the US is imperialistic, 91 % did not know if the US deals fairly with Turkey and Cyprus, 59 % had no opinion on whether Iran was attempting to spread Islamic fundamentalism, and 89 % gave no opinion as to whether Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali is a good person to lead the UN. Nevertheless, a meaningful pattern for comparison emerges.

While the Turkish students were more favorable to President Clinton's election, they did not see it as favorable for their country and area of the world. Turkish students tended to be cynical about US foreign policy motives and believed that these policies were unlikely to change significantly with the takeover of the new administration in Washington. Although the students were Western in their outlook, they overwhelmingly viewed the US as exerting too much power over smaller countries. It is somewhat contradictory, then, that they supported US action to help the Muslims in Bosnia. After the massive intervention in the 1991 Persian Gulf War, US inaction in Bosnia was viewed as hypocritical. The Turkish students, unlike the US students, were highly distrustful of the United Nations, especially in regard to policies in Cyprus and Bosnia.

Turkish students clearly saw the influence of religion on politics as negative, reflecting the Kemalist tradition and current concern in Turkey that religious fundamentalism is on the rise. The Turkish students agreed with the Americans on the need to contain terrorism and tended to see the military as more positive. The Turkish students were somewhat more suspicious of the impact of women and homosexuals on the military than the Americans. While the Turkish students demonstrated a strong preference for democracy, they thought Turkey did not measure up to their ideals. They also showed a strong preference for modern rather than traditional values. Like the Americans, the Turkish students agreed to the principle of racial and ethnic equality, but a significant number doubted whether Greeks and Turks should live together. The Turkish students strongly rejected a separate state for the Kurds. Finally, the Turkish students felt their families had made significant economic gains in recent years, perhaps reflecting the faster rate of growth of the Turkish economy.

The Cypriot students, like the Turkish, believed that President Clinton's election would be good for the US but not for them nor the region where they live. Cypriot students also agreed with the Turkish that the US

exerts too much power over smaller nations. Not surprisingly, the Cypriots largely rejected the UN role in solving regional problems. Their perception of Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali was particularly negative. They also rejected the role of religion in politics. The Cypriots had a more positive view of the military than the Americans, but not as positive as that of the Turks. The Cypriots also saw their country as falling far short of their democratic ideals. Like the other groups of students, while accepting the ideal of ethnic equality, Cypriot students strongly rejected the idea that Turkish and Greek Cypriots should live together.

Chomsky's view that ideology and state/media propaganda prevents logical thinking on issues of public policy can be observed in the responses of US students to at least two items. While generally favorable to US policy in the Middle East, with the massive US intervention in the 1991 Gulf War, the Americans did not support intervention to help the Bosnian Muslims. The Turkish and Cypriot students were able to see much more clearly the biases in US foreign policy in favoring protection for Kuwait but not for Bosnia, and in favoring Israeli interests over those of the Palestinians. Also, the US students did not see the US as dominating the world or smaller nations too much, while US dominance was obvious to the other groups of students. On the other hand, the Turkish and Cypriot students tended to contradict themselves in calling for an assertion of US power in Bosnia.

That the Turkish students' views were also rendered illogical by state propaganda can be seen in their responses to the question of a Kurdish state. While they demonstrate strong nationalism as Turks, they deny that same right to the Kurds, reflecting the historical policy of Turkey on the issue. The Cypriots also demonstrated how their minds have been shaped by propaganda on the Cyprus issue. While they believe in ethnic equality and that nationality should not be based on ethnicity, they believe that Turkish and Greek Cypriots cannot live together.

This study has explored the attitudes of three groups of students on several contemporary issues, cross-nationally. There is not much documentation on the attitudes of students in North Cyprus, to which this study seeks to contribute. Turkey presents an interesting case as it does not fit neatly into the stereotypes of areas of the world that Americans tend to demonstrate. While situated in the Middle East, its citizens tend to be Westernized and profoundly shaped by the Kemalist values of modernism and secularism. Moreover, most Americans are not very aware of Turkey, perhaps partly because of the above. As such, it presents an interesting case for comparison. It is instructive that students in Turkey demonstrated values and orientations significantly more modern, secular, and progressive, on a number of contemporary issues, than did students at a university in the US.

References

- Aga Khan, Sadruddin, "A Fig Leaf on Serbian Genocide," **New York Times**, April 12, 1993, p. A 17.
- Armstrong, G. Blake, et. al., "TV Entertainment, News, and Racial Perceptions of College Students," **Journal of Communication**, 42/3 (Summer 1992), pp. 153-176.
- Bartling, Carl A. and Eisenman, Russell, "Attitudes of American Youth Concerning Military and Civilian Jobs," **Adolescence**, 27/106 (Summer 1992), pp. 407-412.
- Bishku, Michael, "Atatürk's Legacy versus Religious Reassertion: Secularism and Islam in Modern Turkey," **Mediterranean Quarterly**, Fall, 1992.
- Chomsky, Noam (with E.S. Herman), **Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media**, Pantheon, 1988.
- _____, **Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies**, South End Press, 1989.
- _____, **Deterring Democracy**. New York, Hill and Wang, 1992.
- Durrell, Lawrence, **Bitter Lemons of Cyprus**, London, Faber and Faber, 1957.
- Eisenman, R., "Creativity, Social and Political Attitudes, and Liking or Diskliking David Duke," **Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society**, 30 (1992) pp. 19-22.
- "Student Attitudes Toward David Duke Before and After Seeing the Film 'Who is David Duke?'" **Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society**, 31 (1993), pp. 37-38.
- Ghassemlou, Abdul Rahman, **Kurdistan and the Kurds**, London, Collets, 1965.
- Gökalp, Emre, "Turkey gives Iran information on Islamic terror," **Turkish Daily News**, February 8, 1993, p. 1, 11.
- "Religious Affairs Director says no to politics in Islam," **Turkish Daily News**, March 4, 1993, pp. 1, 11.

- Hacker, Andrew, "Paradise Lost," *New York Review of Books*, May 13, 1993, p. 33.
- Heper, Metin, "The Strong State as a Problem for the Consolidation of Democracy," *Comparative Political Studies*, 25/2 (1992), pp. 169-194.
- _____, "Consolidating Turkish Democracy," *Journal of Democracy*, 3/2 (1992).
- Ibrahim, Youssef M., "Islamic Nations see Double Standard in U.S. Raid," *New York Times*, June 29, 1993, p. A 4.
- İmset, İsmet G. and Yetkin, Murat, "Turks ask after Bombing: Is it Serbia's turn?" *Turkish Daily News*, January 16, 1993, pp. 1-11.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin, "Political Culture and Regime Stability: The Case of Turkey," *Journal of Economics and Administrative Studies*, 2/2 (Summer 1988), pp. 149-179.
- Kinross, Lord, *Atatürk: The Rebirth of a Nation*, Nicosia, K. Rüstem and Brother, 1981.
- Kempster, Norman, "Angry over Bosnia, Turks may halt use of air base," *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 28, 1993, p. A.4.
- Kohen, Sami, "Turkey urges immediate intervention in Bosnia," *Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 12, 1993, p. 21.
- Lapidus, Ira, *A History of Islamic Societies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Lewis, Bernard, "Muslims and the West: Muslim Rage," *Current History*, 1991.
- Matthews, David. *The Cyprus Tapes*, London, K. Rüstem & Brother, 1987.
- Meisler, Stanley, "Butros Butros-Ghali," *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 28, 1992, p. A 12.
- Oberling, Pierre. *The Road to Bellapais*, Boulder, Social Science Monographs, 1982.

- Reed, John Shelton, "Continuity and Change in the Regional Stereotypes of Southern College Students, 1970-87," **Sociological Spectrum**, 11/4 (1991), pp. 369-377.
- Rostow, Dankwart, **Turkey: America's Forgotten Ally**, New York, Council on Foreign Relations, 1987.
- Rushdie, Salman, "The Struggle For the Soul of Islam," **New York Times**, July 11, 1993, p. 19.
- Siegman, Henry, "The Holocaust Analogy Is Too True," **Los Angeles Times**, July 11, 1993, p. M 5.
- Stavrinides, Zenon, **The Cyprus Conflict: National Identity and Statehood** (no publication information given).
- _____, "British warning for Clerides on set of ideas," **Cyprus Weekly**, April 2, 1993, p. 2.
- Swan, George S., "Constitutional Majority Rule and The Cyprus Constitution: The 1983 Cyprus Crisis in Critical Perspective," **Boston College Third World Law Journal**, 5/1 (1984), pp. 1-35.
- Yetkin, Murat, "Ceasefire regarded as a chance for democratization," **Turkish Daily News**, April 1, 1993, p. 1.
- Zarycky, George, "An unparalleled cowardice on Bosnia," **The Press Democrat** (Santa Rosa, CA.), July 28, 1993, p. B 7.
- "Abortion Militancy may be on rise," **The Press Democrat**, July 15, 1993, p. A 3.
- "Clinton plân: Dağ fare doğurdu," ("Clinton Plan: The mountain delivers a mouse") **Cumhuriyet**, February 12, 1993, p. 11.
- "Cyprus could be 'second Bosnia'" **Cyprus Today**, April 3, 1993, p. 3.
- "Groups tell Clinton the facts of Cyprus Life," **Cyprus Today**, Feb. 27, 1993, p. 2.
- "HEP deputies create trouble for Turkey in the United States," **Turkish Daily News**, May 21, 1993, p. 3.
- "Operation N. Iraq costs Ankara \$ 50 m." **Turkish Daily News**, Jan. 5, 1993, p. 12.

"Sheik ul-Islam in Germany is unserious and wrong," **Turkish Daily News**, April 2, 1993, p. 3.

"UN blames Turkish Cypriots for failure," **CT**, November 28, 1992, pp. 1, 3.

Statistical Yearbook of Turkey, 1991, Ankara, State Institute of Statistics, Prime Ministry, Republic of Turkey.