

**Prof. Dr. Samuel Nonju**  
**Dean,**  
**International Institute of Paris School of**  
**Business Administration, International Relations and Diplomacy,**  
**Paris, France**  
[samuel.nonju@yahoo.fr](mailto:samuel.nonju@yahoo.fr)

## **TRANS-BORDER RELATIONS BETWEEN TURKEY AND EUROPE**

The imaginary borders drawn-up across Nations that had in primo- “one language and one speech” – were induced by men of an unconscious spirit for purposes of greed, as opposed to mutual satisfaction of wants that should supposedly link political entities together in times of peace and of war. And thus, the delimitation of territorial boundaries- demarcation- that had not hindered the intuitive impulses in man to seeing beyond his nose, and the amplification of the desire to acquire that that the other people possess, either by trade or by the use of force to acquire and to proclaim ownership title. In an essence, the purpose or thought of man in drawing imaginary lines that becomes demarcations from other political entities are but signs that specifically carry the notion of being attached to a particular culture that had successfully constituted itself as such, and the demonstration of the spirit of belongingness – patriotic or alien- with its ramifications, whose wants are far from being satisfied endogenously, despite the pre-existence of the initial expression of being autonomous and the quest for the preservation of Sovereignty, thanks to the- We, the People- declaration as a unified body of language, culture that came out from darkness to light.

An illustration of such demarcation, for example, can be found in a Historical Journal and Litterature of June 26, 1786, entitled, “Nouvelles Politiques-Turquie”, where the author portrayed magnanimously the issue affecting the Court of St Petersburg and Constantinople. The parties examined the means suited towards the exploration of the pursuit of their objectives as the authority authorized an unusual trade in the fore-bearing market of St Petersburg. Trans-border relations are vital, if, per adventure, we consider the different points of friction that might occur in harnessing and entertaining and containing these bureaucratic complexities compounded in diplomatic-religious sphere of influence and interferences of the period. The former seat of authority of Orthodoxy, Constantinople, indeed exercised tasks that never seemed to jeopardize the success of the leadership role, as decisions took the form of pragmatism among the two prominent Actors in the geo-political arena of the time. Subsequently, the underpinning point worth noting, has been the fact that the quest for diplomatic control was at variance, as it did epitomized the ardent desire of a politically constituted entity and culture to having to cross the rubicon or to franchise the territory right ahead of the state, all in the interest to continue to promote a certain viable trade. This notion of “interpénétrabilité des états nations” according to Raymond Aaron, finds itself adjusted as it corroborates to what was highlighted during the period mentioned, even

if tensions of low intensity would tend to attract other sorts of diplomatic-grammatical synthesis for an eventual existence in the nature-hood of a state.

For as much as water seeks its level at all times, so also it is in the elementary existence of man as his thoughts are characterized to be one that has the power to go over to the other side, if we can recall the lamentation of Jules Cesar, on his way to expand transalpine trade and eventually to subdue a people and its culture and civilization, said, while crossing to Egypt: “ despite my sudden fall, Je te tiens,..l’ Egypt en Afrique, et ce,..dans ce vast Continent..” could be seen as another scenario where the illustrative ambitions of “ tress-passers” to other states sought for the cementing of relations as well as enhancing of its culture vis à vis the recipient civilization. The language of nations in transactional practices are multifaceted indeed through divers canals, without demonstrating such notion as of, “you aren’t better than the other, If the other in trade declare the right price, taking into consideration the labor, the excavated parcels of land, the commodity thus produced, the market to be served and why?, and why not?, and hence, the re-apprehension of the said trade that supposed to lessen the burden of states in competition. The abuse of knowledge on what was known as “cost effective metrics”- an assessment of all variables affecting resource-trade development and extraction that incorporates the environmental costs, damages, and the rebuilding of lands are great questions that Global Trade could address, as these are widely accepted by all civilized cultures and for the humanity in general.